THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

REF

Parl. Papers.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
LIBRARY

GOLDSMITHS' LIBRARY

620050

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_july-24-august-21-1867_189

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

30° & 31° VICTORIÆ, 1867.

VOL. CLXXXIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF JULY 1867,

TO

THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF AUGUST 1867.

Fifth and Last Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,
23, PATERNOSTER ROW [E.C.]

1867.

BIBL.
LONDIN.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, PRINTER, 23, PATERNOSTER ROW.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLXXXIX.

THIRD SERIES.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 1867.

Page

Ireland—Unenclosed Burial Grounds—Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Lord Naas 2

Trinity College (Dublin)—Resolution—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [18th June]—

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable that the Fellowships and Foundation Scholarships of Trinity College, Dublin, should be exclusively appropriated to those who are members of the Established Church,"—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

And which Amendment was—

To leave out from the word "House" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "The constitution of the University of Dublin should be altered so as to enable and fit it to include Colleges connected with other forms of religion than that of the Established Church, and that the members of such Colleges should be entitled to share in all the benefits now enjoyed by the members of Trinity College,"—(*Mr. Monsell,*)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:—Debate *resumed* 3

After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*:—Main Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 108, Noes 108:—

The Numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker declared himself with the Noes.

Church Rates Abolition Bill [Bill 13]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Hardcastle*) .. 34

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Gorst*:)—Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided*; Ayes 129, Noes 99; Majority 30:—Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

Sunday Trading Bill [Bill 34]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 35

After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress, to sit again *To-morrow*.

Railway Companies Relief Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir William Gallwey, Mr. Beresford Hope*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 279] 39

Bank Post Bills (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 281] 40

Indemnity Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Hunt*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 280] 40

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 25.

Banns of Matrimony Bill (No. 216)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*Lord Houghton*) 40
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* the 2nd of *August*.

Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge) Bill (No. 235)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Kimberley*) 43
Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months,") (*The Lord President.*)
After debate, on Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided*; Contents 46, Not-Contents 74; Majority 28.
Resolved in the *Negative*; and Bill to be read 2ª on *this Day Three Months*.
List of Contents and Not-Contents 75

Hyde Park—Question, Lord Ebury; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham 76

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 25.

Expiring Laws—Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 78

The Oaths Commissioners—Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 78

India—The Indian Budget—Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 79

Army—The Snider Rifle—Question, Major Walker; Answer, Sir John Pakington 79

Cattle Plague—Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Lord R. Montagu 79

District Prothonotaries, Court of Common Pleas, County Palatine of Lancaster Bill—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Colonel Wilson Patten 81

Bleaching, Dyeing, and Printworks Acts—Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 81

The Carriers Act—Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. S. Cave 82

Navy—The Coastguard—Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Corry 82

Navy—Punishment of Cadets—Question, Mr. Bass; Answer, Mr. Corry 82

France—The Fishery Convention—Question, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 83

Parliamentary Elections Bill—Question, Sir George Grey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 84

Increase of the Episcopate Bill—Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir Roundell Palmer 84

Christchurch Ordinances Bill—Question, Viscount Galway; Answer, Sir Roundell Palmer 85

Meetings in Royal Parks Bill—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 85

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill—Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 86

Tancred's Charities Bill—Question, Mr. Dent; Answer, Lord R. Montagu 86

Private Executions Bill—Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 86

INDEMNITY BILL—Question, Mr. Hadfield ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 86

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 87

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read :—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair :"—

ARMY OF RESERVE—MILITIA BALLOT—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "inasmuch as it is the ancient and undoubted prerogative of the Crown to require the Military service of its liege subjects, and inasmuch as liability to personal Service, within the limits of the United Kingdom, has always been and still is the principle on which the Militia Force is founded, it is desirable, in framing any scheme for the establishment of an Army of Reserve and for the more complete and economical organization of the Military capabilities and defensive power of the Nation, to consider how far this ancient principle should be practically enforced, and how it can be best applied with least inconvenience to the people,"—(*Lord Elcho,*) —instead thereof 87

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question :"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS IN IRELAND—Question, General Dunne ; Answer, Lord Naas 103

TIPPERARY AND WATERFORD ELECTIONS—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "whilst this House regrets that it should be necessary to employ military escorts for ensuring the safety of Voters at Elections in Ireland, it is of opinion that the nature of the intimidation exercised at the recent Elections in the Counties of Waterford and Tipperary not only renders in such cases such a protection essential, but is further of opinion this House should pass a measure which will enable the Voter to freely and fully exercise the franchise in such a manner as he desires, without exposing himself to personal risk,"—(*Major Jervis,*)—instead thereof .. 104

After debate, Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £63,250, Increase of Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Men of the Militia.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 118

(2.) £20,000, Additional Pay to the Army Reserve Force.

(3.) £50,000, Increase of Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Privates, Royal Marine Corps.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 138

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow ;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

FORTIFICATIONS AND WORKS—*considered* in Committee 140

After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to ;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

Poor Law Board, &c. (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 271]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 142

After long time spent therein, Bill *reported ;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Courts of Law, &c. (Salaries and Expenses) Bill—*Presented,* and read the first time [Bill 282] 146

Offices and Oaths Bill [Bill 272]—

Lords' Amendment *considered* 147

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present ; House counted, and 40 Members not being present, House adjourned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 26.

Page

STATUE OF MR. CANNING—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—*Moved*,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to give Directions that the Statue of Mr. Canning may be restored to its original Position or to a Site not more remote from the Houses of Parliament than that on which it used to stand,"—(*The Lord Campbell*) 147

After short debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn*.

Railway Companies Bill (No. 262)—

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill,"—(*The Duke of Richmond*) 156

After short debate, Motion *agreed to;* House in Committee accordingly.

An Amendment made; the Report thereof to be received on *Tuesday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended (No. 262.)

AGRICULTURAL GANGS—Question, The Earl of Lichfield; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham 164

Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) Bill (No. 254)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 167

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 26.

CHARTERED CATTLE MARKETS—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 168

BROWN'S CHARITY BILL — Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 169

RELIGIOUS RIGHTS IN WORKHOUSES — Question, Sir Rowland Blennerhasset; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 170

ARMY—GOOD CONDUCT MEDALS—Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Sir John Pakington 171

ECCLESIASTICAL APPOINTMENTS (WEST INDIES)—Question, Mr. Remington Mills; Answer, Mr. Adderley 171

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy .. 172

PROTHONOTARIES' FEE FUND—Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Colonel Wilson Patten 172

MOLDAVIA — PERSECUTION OF JEWS — Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley 173

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

IRELAND—DIETARY IN COUNTY PRISONS—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is the opinion of this House, that it is the duty of the Government to take steps to increase the dietary in the County Prisons in Ireland, especially for prisoners confined beyond two months,"—(*Mr. Blake*,)—instead thereof 173

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

STATE OF IRELAND—Observations, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, 181; Reply, Lord Naas:—Long debate thereon 227

ABYSSINIA—IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that

ABYSSINIA—IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS—Amendment—*continued.*

proper steps may be taken to procure the release of Her Majesty's Consul and other subjects of Her Majesty at present held prisoners by the King of Abyssinia, if necessary, by force of arms,"—(*Mr. Henry Seymour,*)—instead thereof .. 232

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment *withdrawn.*

Original Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn*:—Committee *deferred* till Monday next.

Courts of Law [Fees] Bill—Resolution *reported;* Resolution *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Attorney General*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 287] 255

Clerk to Justices in Counties Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Colvile, Mr. Paull, Mr. Pease*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 286] 255

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 288] 255

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill—*Presented,* and read the first time [Bill 285] 256

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 29.

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill (No. 227)—

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill,"—(*The Earl of Malmesbury*) 256

Amendment *moved* to resolve, "That for the Purpose of effecting a Settlement of the Question of the Redistribution of Seats the proposed Scheme is inadequate, and that it is expedient to provide the Means of giving more Representatives to large and important Constituencies than are given by this Bill,"—(*Viscount Halifax.*)

After long debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 59, Not-Contents 100; Majority 41:—List of Contents and Not-Contents .. 301

Resolved in the *Negative*:—Original Motion *agreed to.*

House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1 and 2 *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Occupation Franchise for Voters in Boroughs) .. 302

Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs) 304

Clause 5 (Property Franchise in Counties) 324

Clause 6 (Occupation Franchise in Counties) 327

House *resumed;* and to be again in Committee *To-morrow.*

Vice President of the Board of Trade Bill (No. 99)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Duke of Richmond*) .. 327

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 3ª accordingly, and *passed.*

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 29.

IRELAND—POOR LAW MEDICAL SALARIES—Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, Lord Naas 329

PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL—Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Walpole 330

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION AND CAPITULAR ESTATES MANAGEMENT ACT—Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy .. 330

ARMY—THE 86TH REGIMENT—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir John Pakington 330

FRANCE, PRUSSIA, AND DENMARK—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley 331

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL—Questions, Sir John Ogilvy, Colonel French, Mr. M'Laren; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir James Fergusson 331

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, no money considerations should delay the promotion of Lieutenant Frederick Nind Woodall and Lieutenant and Adjutant Henry Currie of the 74th Highlanders, and Lieutenant and Adjutant Romaine F. Stirke, 69th Regiment,"—(*Colonel North*,)—instead thereof 335

After short debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 65, Noes 54; Majority 11:—Amendment *negatived.*

REVENUES OF INDIA—Questions, Mr. Otway; Answer, Colonel Sykes .. 338

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £74,621, to complete the sum for the British Museum 342
After debate, Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £531,865, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1868, for Public Education in Great Britain" 361
After long debate, Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the Clock; Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

Parks Regulation (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 273]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 382

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House deems it inexpedient to proceed further at the present moment with any Bill touching the regulation of the Parks,"—(*Mr. Locke*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 133, Noes 88; Majority 45:—Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee:—Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday.*

Dominica Loan Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Adderley*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 291] 404

LORDS, TUESDAY, JULY 30.

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill (No. 227)—

House again in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 7 (the Occupier to be rated in Boroughs, and not the Owner: Provisoes) 405
Clause 8 (First Registration of Occupiers) *agreed to* 421
New Clause (Restriction as to Number of Votes in certain Counties and Boroughs) 441
New Clause (And in the City of London) 468
Clause 9 (No Elector who has been employed for Reward at an Election to be entitled to Vote) 468
Clause 10 (Disfranchisement of certain Boroughs), *agreed to.* .. 469
Clauses 12 to 14 *agreed to* 473

House *resumed;* and to be again in Committee on *Thursday* next.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, JULY 30.

Page

MILITARY KNIGHTS OF WINDSOR—Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 474

COURTS OF LAW AND EQUITY—Question, Sir Roundell Palmer; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 474

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL—THE PROPOSED SATURDAY SITTING—Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 475

Factory Acts Extension (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 236]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 476

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House is not prepared, without further evidence, to interfere with the free exercise of labour to so great an extent as is contemplated by the present measure,"—(*Mr. Moffatt,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Motion *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Hours of Labour Regulation (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 258]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 484

After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.* [House counted out.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 31.

PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT MONUMENTS—Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 486

Agricultural Children's Education Bill [Bill 152]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Fawcett*) .. 487

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Beach:*)—Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

After long debate, Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Masters and Workmen Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 77]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 518

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* with an Amendment; as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next.

Commons Inclosure Act Amendment Bill [Bill 151]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Neate*) .. 521

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Leeman:*)—Question, "That the word 'now,' stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived:*—Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *put off* for three months.

Sale of Liquors on Sunday Bill [Bill 96]—

Order for Second Reading read 522

Moved, "That the Order for the Second Reading be discharged."

Motion *agreed to:*—Order *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Metropolitan Buildings and Management Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Tite, Colonel Hogg*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 293] 522

Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hunt, Lord Naas*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 294] 522

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1.

Page

North British Railway (Carlisle Deviations) Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" 523
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 3ª accordingly, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill *passed* and sent to the Commons.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby 525

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill (No. 227)—

House again in Committee (according to Order) 526
Clause 15 (Certain Boroughs to return One Member only.)
Clause 16 (Certain Boroughs to return Three Members) 595
Clauses 17 to 27, inclusive, *agreed to* 595
House *resumed;* and to be again in Committee *To-morrow.*

Agricultural Gangs Bill (No. 268)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Duke of Buckingham*) .. 595
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1.

METROPOLIS—HALL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Bruce 596

TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES—Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 598

THE RECENT COURT-MARTIAL IN JAMAICA—Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, The Attorney General 598

NAVY—NAVAL RESERVE AT THE LATE REVIEW—Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Corry 599

THE WELSH COLONY IN PATAGONIA—Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Stanley 599

IRELAND—MILITARY AT DOWNPATRICK—Question, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answer, Lord Naas 600

IRELAND—CHURCH REVENUES COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Lord Naas 602

NAVY—LIME AND BUDE LIGHTS—Question, Mr. Kendall; Answer, Mr. Corry 602

IRELAND—ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 603

INDIA—BANDA AND KIRWEE PRIZE MONEY—Question, Colonel North; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 603

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES AND ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF ACTS—AN IRREGULAR QUESTION—Observations, Mr. Speaker 604

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 604

PARLIAMENT—THE COUNT-OUT ON TUESDAY—Observations, Mr. O'Beirne; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 604

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

IRISH RAILWAYS—Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Lord Naas:—Long debate thereon 606

SUPPLY—Committee—*continued.*

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN CATTLE INTO LIVERPOOL—RESOLUTION—
Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "Cattle arriving from Spain and Portugal may be removed by Rail from Liverpool to Manchester and Salford, under somewhat similar regulations to those in force at Harwich and Southampton for conveyance of Foreign Cattle to London,"—(*Mr. Graves,*)—instead thereof 629

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

NATIONAL ART COLLECTIONS—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—
Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions for the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider and report what portions of the National collections of Fine Arts ought to be exhibited in the New National Gallery in Trafalgar Square, and other Museums, &c.,"—(*Mr. William Cowper,*)—instead thereof 634

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS — MINUTES OF EVIDENCE—THE WHORTLEBERRY CASE—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, in all cases of summary convictions before justices of the peace, it is desirable that Minutes of the Evidence on which the conviction was founded should be recorded, and preserved for future reference in case of need,"—(*Mr. Taylor,*)—instead thereof 644

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

£507,428, to complete the sum for Post Office Packet Service; no part of which sum is to be applicable or applied in or towards making any payment in respect of any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863, to Mr. Joseph George Churchward, or to any person claiming through or under him by virtue of a certain Contract bearing date the 26th day of April 1859, made between the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Admiralty (for and on behalf of Her Majesty) of the first part, and the said Joseph George Churchward of the second part, or in or towards the satisfaction of any claim whatsoever of the said Joseph George Churchward, by virtue of that Contract, so far as relates to any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863 658

After short debate, Vote *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock; Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 2.

Parliamentary Reform — Representation of the People Bill (No. 227)—

House again in Committee (according to Order)
New Clause (Power to Vote by Voting Papers.) 705
New Clause (Regulations as to Voting Papers) 732
Clauses 28 to 32, as amended, *agreed to* 735
Clause 33 (Payment of Expenses of Conveying Voters to the Poll illegal) 735
Clauses 34, 35, 36, *agreed to* 735
Clause 37 (Receipt of Parochial Relief) 735
Clauses 38 to 42, as amended, *agreed to* 736
Clause 43 (Residence for Electors of the City of London extended to twenty-five miles) 736

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill (No. 227)—*continued.*

Clauses 44 and 45, as amended, *agreed to* 737
Clause 46 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery) .. 737
New Clause (Returning Officer, &c., acting as Agent, guilty of Misdemeanour) 737
New Clause (Demise of the Crown not to dissolve Parliament.) .. 737
Clauses 48 and 49 *agreed to*
Clause 50 (Temporary Provisions consequent on Formation of new Boroughs) 749
Clause 51 *agreed to.*
Clause 52 (General Saving Clause) 749
Clause 53 *agreed to.*
Clause 54 (Construction of Act) 750
Clause 55 *agreed to* 751
New Clause (Saving Clause as to Dissolution of Parliament) .. 751
Clause 55 (Interpretation of Terms) 751
Schedules *agreed to* with Amendments:—The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 282.)

Poor Law Board, &c. Bill (No. 271)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Devon*) .. 752
Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 2.

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Bill [Bill 14]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 753
Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient that the provisions in this Bill by which it is proposed to impose upon the local authority the obligation, if and when required by the owners, to purchase condemned properties at prices to be ascertained under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, should receive the assent of this House,"—(*Mr. Bazley,*)—instead thereof.
Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee.
After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

India—Banda and Kirwee Booty—Question, Mr. Denman; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 764
Jamaica—The Prosecution of Mr. Eyre—Question, Major Anson; Answer, The Attorney General 764
The Commissioners for Crown Lands—Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Hunt 765
Weights and Measures—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 765
Parliament—Meeting in the Tea-Room—Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Mr. Speaker:—Short debate thereon 766
Metropolis—Threatened Meeting in Hyde Park—Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 769
Colonial Bishops—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Adderley .. 769

[*August* 2.] Page

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

INDIA—FAMINE IN ORISSA—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that she will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Papers which are necessary to complete the Report and Appendices of the Famine Commission, and of any Minutes by Members of the Supreme Council of India relating to the Famine, or Dissents or Minutes by Members of the Indian Council in London on the Despatch of the Secretary of State for India (Public, No. 99),"—(*Mr. Henry Seymour,*) —instead thereof 770

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

EDUCATION—MR. ARNOLD'S REPORT TO THE SCHOOLS INQUIRY COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy .. 818

Original Question, by leave, *withdrawn:* — Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill [Bill 232]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 819

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next.

Railways (Ireland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Lord Naas, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 298] 821

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 5.

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill (No. 282)—

Amendments *reported* (according to Order.)

Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs) 821
Clause 5 (Occupation Franchise in Counties) 831
Clause 17 (Certain Boroughs to return Three Members) .. 837
Clause 29 (Power to vote by Voting Papers) 838
New Clause (Regulations as to Voting Papers) 839
Schedule F (Voting Paper Forms) *agreed to* 842
Clause 49 (Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery) .. 842

Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow,* and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 293.)

Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) Bill (No. 254)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 842

After short time spent therein, the Report of the Amendments to be received *To-morrow;* and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 294.)

Master and Servant Bill (No. 248)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Lichfield*) .. 844

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* next.

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 5.

NAVY—TWIN SCREW—Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Corry .. 848

IRELAND—COLLEGE OF SCIENCE IN DUBLIN—Question, Mr. Leader; Answer, Lord Naas 848

IRELAND—IMPORTATION OF SHEEP—Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Lord Naas 849

CRETE—TREATMENT OF CHRISTIANS—Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Lord Stanley 849

[*August* 5.] Page

IRELAND—SEA COAST FISHERIES—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Lord Naas 850

THE SOCIETY OF ENGINEERS—Question, Mr. Hughes; Answer, Mr. S. Cave 851

IRELAND—CASE OF RICHARD JENNINGS—Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Lord Naas 851

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 852

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read:—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

GREENWICH HOSPITAL—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the cost of management of Greenwich Hospital is too great, and ought to be reduced,"—(*Mr. Seely,*)—instead thereof 853

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SUPPLY—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

MR. HENWOOD'S SEA-GOING MONITORS—Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 869

CASE OF EDWARD GREENLAND—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Correspondence on the subject of the recent grant of a free pardon to Edward Greenland (late manager of the Leeds Banking Company), who was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for perjury,"—(*Lord Frederick Cavendish,*)—instead thereof 871

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE DECLARATION OF PARIS—Observations, Mr. J. Stuart Mill:—Short debate thereon 876

IRELAND—HABEAS CORPUS SUSPENSION ACT—Observations, Mr. Whalley .. 894

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £128,635, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Advances for Greenwich Hospital and School, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1868" 898

After debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £821, for the Salary of Inspector General of Hospitals, be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Candlish*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question, put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £259,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1868, for Public Education in Ireland, under the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland" 908

After debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Sir John Gray,*)—*agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock; Committee also report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Companies Act (1862) Amendment Bill [Bill 221]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Stephen Cave*) .. 929

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 6.

Page

Parliamentary Reform — Representation of the People Bill (No. 293)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Earl of Derby*) .. 930

After debate, on Question, *agreed to* :—Bill read 3ª accordingly :—On Question, That the Bill do pass ?—Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

Protest of The Earls of Ellenborough and Selkirk against the Third Reading 952

Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication) Bill [Bill 278]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Lord Stanley of Alderley*) 953

An Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months,")—(*The Earl of Lucan.*)

After short debate, then the said Amendment (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Then the original Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn* ; and Order for Third Reading *discharged.*

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 6.

METROPOLITAN POOR LAW ACT—Question, Lord Charles Bruce; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 957

UNITED STATES—THE "ALABAMA" CLAIMS—Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, Lord Stanley 958

METROPOLIS—STATUE OF CANNING — Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Lord John Manners 958

IRELAND—SIR ROBERT KANE—APPOINTMENT— Question, Mr. Leader; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 959

POSTAL—AMERICAN MAILS—Question, Mr. Graves ; Answer, Mr. Hunt .. 960

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill [Bill 288]—

Order for Committee read 961

After long debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Contagious Diseases (Animals) (*re - committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 228]—

Order for Committee read 991

After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

Parliamentary Reform — Representation of the People Bill [Bill 237]—

Lords' Amendments to be considered upon *Thursday,* and to be *printed* [Bill 302] 1002

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1003

INDIA—SIMLA COURT MARTIAL—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—*Moved,*

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to re-consider the sentence of the Court Martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis, with a view to reinstate that Officer in his rank in the Army and in his Regiment," —(*Mr. Brett*) 1004

After long debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give effect to the recommendation to mercy contained in the sentence of the Court Martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis,"—(*Mr. Otway.*)

After further short debate, the House *divided;* Ayes 48, Noes 66; Majority 18.

[*August* 6.] *Page*

Metropolitan Municipal Government Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. J. Stuart Mill*) 1040

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill for the better Municipal Government of the Metropolis, *ordered* (*Mr. Mill, Mr. Thomas Hughes, Mr. Tomline*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 303.]

Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 304] 1041

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7.

SIERRA LEONE—LAW COURTS—Question, Sir J. Gray; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1042

YELLOW FEVER IN THE MAURITIUS — Question, Mr. J. A. Smith; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1042

PARLIAMENT—CUSTODY OF PETITIONS — Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Speaker 1044

Uniformity Act Amendment Bill [Bill 68]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Fawcett*) .. 1048

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Bentinck.*)

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 34, Noes 41; Majority 7:—Words *added*:—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *put off* for three months.

Libel Bill [Bill 215]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) 1050

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

After debate, Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 79, Noes 18; Majority 61:—Main Question, put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Increase of the Episcopate Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 213]—

Order for Committee read 1069

After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee.

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered upon *Friday*, and to be *printed.* [Bill 307.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 8.

Church Rates Abolition Bill (No. 256)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Earl of Morley*) .. 1080

An Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Three Months,")—(*The Lord Delamere.*)

After short debate, on Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 24, Not-Contents 82; Majority 58.

Resolved in the *Negative;* and Bill to be read 2^a on *this Day Three Months.*

List of Contents and Not-Contents 1093

Banns of Matrimony Bill (No. 216)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 1094

After short time spent therein, Amendments made:—The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow*, and Bill to be *printed*, as amended (No. 311.)

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 8.

INDIA—SIMLA COURT MARTIAL—Notice, Mr. Darby Griffith; Observations, Mr. Brett 1100

MOLDAVIA—TREATMENT OF JEWS—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley 1101

[*August* 8.]

Page

VOLUNTEERS AT SHOEBURYNESS—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1101

DUCHY OF LANCASTER—Questions, Mr. Gorst, Mr. F. Stanley, Mr. Childers; Answer, Colonel Wilson Patten 1102

IRELAND—VALUATION OF COUNTIES—Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, Lord Naas 1103

TURNPIKE TRUSTS—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1103

VETERINARY CONGRESS AT VIENNA—Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 1103

ARMY—FORTS AT PORTSMOUTH AND SPITHEAD—Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1104

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS—Question, Mr. Bass; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave 1104

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY—Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1105

THE INDIAN BUDGET—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 1105

THE CATTLE PLAGUE—Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 1105

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1105

THE SLAVE TRADE—Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1106

CONSECRATION OF BURIAL GROUNDS BILL—Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1106

THE ABYSSINIAN CAPTIVES—Question, Mr. H. Seymour; Answer, Lord Stanley 1107

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill [Bill 302]—

Order of the Day for the Consideration of the Lords' Amendments read .. 1108

After short debate, Lords' Amendments *considered.*

(The Page and Line refer to the Bill (227) as printed by the Lords.)

Clause 3 (Occupation Franchise of Voters in Boroughs) 1114

Line 10. After ("all") insert ("Poor.")

Line 11 and Line 12. Leave out ("for the Relief of the Poor.")

After short debate, Lords' Amendments *disagreed to.*

Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs) 1118

Line 29. After ("House") insert ("or being one and the same set of Chambers or Rooms not separately rated.")

After short debate, Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Property Franchise in Counties) 1123

Leave out Clause 5.

After short debate, Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendments," put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 235, Noes 188; Majority 47.

Amendments as far as Amendment in page 5, "after Clause 8 insert Clauses A and B," *disagreed to.*

Clause A (Restriction as to Number of Votes in certain Counties and Boroughs) 1126

Moved, "That this House do disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

After long debate, Question, "That the House do disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put.

The House *divided;* Ayes 204, Noes 253; Majority 49:—Division List, Ayes and Noes:—Amendment *agreed to.*

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill [Bill 302]—*continued.*

Clause B (Restriction as to Number of Votes in the City of London) .. 1183

Moved, "That the House do disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment,"—(*Mr. Crawford*:)—Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 188, Noes 252; Majority 64:—Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendments, as far as Amendment in Page 10, "after Clause 27, insert Clauses C, D, E, F, G," *agreed to* 1185

Clause C (Power to Vote by Voting Paper) 1185

Amendment proposed, in Line 1 of the Clause, after the word "County" to leave out the words "or Borough,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or Borough' stand part of the Clause."

After short debate, Question, "That the words 'or Borough' stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Moved, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Clause as amended,"—(*Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens*:)—The House *divided;* Ayes 258, Noes 206; Majority 52:—Division List, Ayes and Noes.

Clause 46 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery) .. 1197

In Page 16, Line 41, on Question that the Lords' Amendment leaving out "corruptly" be agreed to:—After short debate, on Question, Amendment *disagreed to.*

Clause I (Returning Officer, &c., acting as Agent guilty of Misdemeanor) 1197

After short debate, on Question, Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 54 (Construction of Act) 1197

In Page 18, Line 35, after "Act," insert—

"Provided that so much of Clause 78 of the last-mentioned Act as provides that nothing in that Act contained shall entitle any Person to Vote in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for the City of Oxford or Town of Cambridge in respect of the occupation of any Chambers or Premises in any of the Colleges or Halls of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge shall not apply to the franchises conferred by this Act."

After short debate, Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment,"—(*Sir Roundell Palmer,*)—put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 188, Noes 164; Majority 24.

Clause L (Saving Clause as to Dissolution of Parliament) .. 1198

Clause amended, and *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed:"—Mr. GLADSTONE, Mr. CARDWELL, Mr. VILLIERS, Sir ROUNDELL PALMER, Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER, Mr. COLVILE, Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS, Viscount ENFIELD, Mr. MONCREIFF, and Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN.

Militia Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir John Pakington, Colonel Herbert*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 308] 1199

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 9.

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill (No. 293)—

Ordered, That the Commons Reasons and Bill, with the Amendments, be *printed,* and to be taken into consideration on *Monday* next (Nos. 317 & 318) 1199

GENERAL POST OFFICE—POSTAL CONVENTION WITH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INDIA, AND CHINA—Convention *presented* (*The Duke of Montrose*) 1200

PARLIAMENT—ARRANGEMENT FOR THE REPORTING OF SPEECHES IN THIS HOUSE—

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Arrangements for reporting the Speeches of the Members of the House, and with special Reference to certain Proceedings in the Reporters' Gallery on Thursday, the 11th of July,—(*The Marquess of Westmeath*) 1202

After short debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Factory Acts Extension Bill (No. 296)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Devon*) .. 1205
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

Admiralty Court (Ireland) Bill (No. 273)—
House in Committee (according to Order) 1212
After short time spent therein, Amendments made:—The Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and to be *printed* as amended (No. 326.)

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 9.

Memorials of Political Prisoners—Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1217
Ireland—Lunatic Asylums—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Lord Naas .. 1219
Alleged Murder of Captain Speer—Question, Mr. Cubitt; Answer, Lord Stanley 1220
Turkish Bonds—Question, Sir John Simeon; Answer, Lord Stanley .. 1220
Holyhead and London Railway Fares—Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Mr. Hunt 1221
The New Law Courts—Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Lord John Manners 1221
Police—Constabulary Reports — Question, Mr. Whitworth; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1221
Abyssinia—English Consul at Massowah—Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Lord Stanley 1222
Crete—English Vice Consul at Khanea—Questions, Mr. Henry Seymour, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Lord Stanley 1222
Ecclesiastical Titles Act—Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Speaker 1223
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill—Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1224
Removal of Roman Catholic School Children—Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1224
Turnpike Expenditure—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1224
Business of the House—Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Reply, Mr. Fawcett 1225

SUPPLY—Civil Service Estimates—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £162,387, to complete the sum for Department of Science and Art.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1226
(2.) £5,711, to complete the sum for the University of London.
(3.) £13,918, to complete the sum for Scottish Universities.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1241
(4.) £1,515, to complete the sum for Queen's University in Ireland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1241
(5.) £2,265, to complete the sum for Queen's Colleges in Ireland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1241
(6.) £700, Royal Irish Academy.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1242
(7.) £2,183, National Gallery of Ireland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1242
(8.) £1,500, to complete the sum for Belfast Theological Professors, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1242
(9.) £11,895, to complete the sum for the National Gallery.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1243
(10.) £1,650, British Historical Portrait Gallery.
(11.) £11,215, to complete the sum for Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, &c.
(12.) £2,600, to complete the sum for Board of Manufactures, Scotland.
(13.) £53,799, British Department, Paris Exhibition.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1245
(14.) £2,300, Learned Societies, Great Britain.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1246

[*August* 9.] Page

SUPPLY—Civil Service Estimates—Committee—*continued.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £25,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1868, for the Entertainment of Foreign Potentates.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1246

£15,000, Paris Exhibition, Department of Science and Art.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1260

Question [August 5] again proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £259,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1868, for Public Education in Ireland, under the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland" .. 1262

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £236,195, &c.,"—(*Sir John Gray* ;)—After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

£730, Commissioners of Education in Ireland, *agreed to* 1285

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2) Bill [Bill 285]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 1285

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient to proceed further with the construction of the Fortifications for the defence of the Dockyards and Naval Arsenals of the United Kingdom until a Select Committee shall have reported upon the plans upon which such works are being erected,"—(*Mr. O'Beirne,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient to proceed further with the construction of the Fortifications for the defence of the Dockyards and Naval Arsenals of the United Kingdom until the strength and sufficiency of the proposed Fortifications and Iron Shields has been tested by actual experiment, by submitting them to the fire of the most powerful known guns,"—(*Lord Elcho,*)—instead thereof 1289

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered* in Committee 1291

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

COMMONS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 10.

Parliament Square—Statue of Mr. Canning — Observations, Mr. Beresford Hope:—Debate thereon 1291

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2) Bill [Bill 285]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time" 1300

After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Naval Knights of Windsor Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 300]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1300

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*); *presented,* and read the first time 1303

Courts of Referees Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Dodson, Colonel Wilson Patten, Mr. Woodd*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 311] 1303

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 12.

Page

New Forest — Petitions *presented* (*Viscount Eversley:*) — Short debate thereon 1304

Parliamentary Reform—Representation of the People Bill (No. 318)—

Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendments, and Commons' Reasons for disagreeing from some of the Amendments made by the Lords, *considered,* (according to Order) 1306

Moved, "To agree to the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords,"—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

After short debate, on Question, *agreed to.*

Then it was *moved* not to insist upon the Amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed as far as Page 29; on Question, *agreed to* 1326

Then it was *moved* to insist upon the Amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed in Page 29, Line 20, and Page 31, Line 21; on Question, *Resolved* in the *Affirmative;* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on the said Amendments: The Committee to meet *forthwith.*

Banns of Matrimony Bill (No. 311)—

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read 1326

After short debate, on Question, Bill read 3ª, with the Amendments; an Amendment made; Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. Bill (No. 307)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 1327

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; Report *brought up.*

After short debate, Amendments made; Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow,* and to be *printed* as amended (No. 332.)

Army Reserve Bill (No. 320)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Longford*) .. 1328

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Militia Reserve Bill (No. 314)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Longford*) .. 1328

Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Postal Communication with the Australian Colonies—Question, The Earl of Carnarvon; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham 1329

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 12.

Turnpike Trusts—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir James Fergusson 1332

Army—Captain Scott's Claims for Rifling Ordnance—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1333

Famine in the West of Ireland—Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland 1333

Army—Volunteer Capitation Grant—Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1334

Ireland—Attack on a Wesleyan Missionary—Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland 1334

Ireland—Case of Charles Flynn, Pauper Lunatic at Mohill—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland 1335

[*August* 12.] Page

RAILWAY COMMISSION—Question, Mr. M. T. Bass; Answer, Mr. S. Cave .. 1336

MERCANTILE MARINE—Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave .. 1337

COAST OF ABYSSINIA—Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Lord Stanley 1337

EGYPT—ENGLISH WORKMEN IN EGYPT—Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, Lord Stanley 1337

SANITARY REPORT—Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu .. 1338

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Speaker 1338

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL — Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland 1339

APPROPRIATION BILL—Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Speaker 1340

IMPRISONMENT FOR CHURCH RATES — Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1340

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS—Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 1340

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Governor General of India should be empowered, with the sanction of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to conduct the business of each Department of Government in concert with one or more members of his Council instead of the whole Council:—That, in order to insure better attention to the affairs of Trade and Agriculture, an additional member of the Governor General's Council in India should be appointed to superintend those affairs:—That the Government of Bengal should be placed upon the same footing as the Government of Bombay:—That one nominated and one elected member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India should cease to hold office at the end of each year:—That the members of the Council should retire in rotation according to their length of service, whether as members of the Council or as East India Directors:—and, That the existing practice of recording by Resolutions of this House certain financial facts relating to India should be discontinued; and that instead thereof, the Estimates for all Expenditure in Europe of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council should be approved by a vote of this House before the same is incurred," —(*Mr. Ayrton,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS *considered* in Committee 1389

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 30th day of April 1866 was £48,935,220; the total of the direct claims and demands upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium, was £8,452,153; the charges in India, including Interest on Debt and the value of Stores received from England, were £32,668,771; the charges in England were £4,981,185; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £67,043, making a total charge for the same year of £46,169,152; and there was an excess of Income over Expenditure in that year amounting to £2,766,068,"—(*Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

After long debate, Amendment proposed, in line 1, after the word "That," to insert the words "it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that."

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

Contagious Diseases (Animals) (*re-committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 228]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1417

After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 13.

Page

Factory Acts Extension Bill (No. 296)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Earl of Devon*) .. 1433
After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 3ª accordingly, and *passed.*

JAMAICA—CASE OF MR. EYRE— Question, The Earl of Shrewsbury; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham 1437

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 13.

CASE OF THE "TORNADO"—Question, Mr. B. Cochrane; Answer, Lord Stanley 1447

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE—Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 1447

CONSOLIDATION OF THE POOR LAWS—Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1448

COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH AUSTRIA— Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Lord Stanley 1448

ARMY—REWARDS FOR MILITARY SERVICE—Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1449

CASE OF HAYES AND BARRY—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 1449

ARMY—PROMOTION IN THE 96TH REGIMENT— Question, Captain Hayter; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1450

DISTRICT METROPOLITAN LUNATIC ASYLUMS—Question, Colonel Hogg; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1450

ARMY ENLISTMENT BILL—Question, General Dunne; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1451

METROPOLIS—STRAY DOGS—Question, Sir P. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 1452

INDIAN PRIZE MONEY—Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir S. Northcote 1452

METROPOLIS—BETHNAL GREEN WORKHOUSE—Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1452

Parks Regulation (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 273]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1453
After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

MERCHANT SHIPPING LAWS—RESOLUTION—*Moved,*

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that the Laws with reference to Merchant Shipping should be revised and consolidated, and that such Amendments should be made therein as will better protect the interests of the public and the mercantile marine of this Country,"—(*Mr. O'Beirne*) 1487
After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARTILLERY—RIFLED CANNON—RESOLUTION—*Moved,*

"That the experiments that have been made with Cast-iron Guns lined with coiled wrought-iron, justify the belief that these Guns may be thus made available for the purpose of modern warfare; that a great saving of public money would thus be effected, and that this system of conversion is deserving of the serious and immediate attention of the War Department,"—(*Major Anson*) 1498
After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

CASE OF JAMES SCOTT—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—*Moved,*

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a Copy of the Correspondence and Memorial relating to the case and conviction of James Scott of Birmingham, who was convicted of the wilful murder of John Pryse at the Assizes holden at Warwick on the sixteenth day of July last, and was sentenced by Mr. Baron Pigott,"—(*Mr. Newdegate*) 1509
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

POLITICAL PRISONERS—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—*Moved*,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be pleased to extend Her most gracious pardon to all persons now in prison in the United Kingdom and the Colonies for political offences,"—(*Mr. Rearden*) 1514

After short debate, Motion put, and *negatived.*

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14.

NAVY—TENDERS FOR ENGINES—Question, Mr. Graves ; Answer, Mr. Corry .. 1516

NAVY—MARINE ENGINES ORDERED AND RE-SOLD—Question, Mr. Graves ; Answer, Mr. Corry 1516

Contagious Diseases (Animals) (*re-committed*) **Bill** (*Lords*) [Bill 228]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1516

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, with Amendments ; as amended, *considered ;* Amendments made :—Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

Order for Third Reading read 1526

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

Traffic Regulation (Metropolis) Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 97]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) 1527

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months,"—(*Mr. Alderman Lawrence :*)—Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question : "—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to :*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

Metropolitan Improvements Bill [Bill 55]—

Order for Second Reading read 1533

Order *discharged :*—Bill *withdrawn.*

London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance Bill [Bill 43]—

Moved, "That the Bill be read a second time *To-morrow*,"—(*Sir James Fergusson*) 1534

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "That the" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "said Order be discharged,"—(*Mr. Ayrton*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question :—After short debate, Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Bill [Bill 14]—

Order for Committee read 1535

Order *discharged :*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Parks Regulation (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 273]—

Order for Committee read 1536

Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 15.

London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (Arrangement) Bill—

Bill read 3^a 1536

After short debate, Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

[*August* 15.] *Page*

Increase of the Episcopate Bill (No. 331)—
Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order) 1539
After short debate, a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords disagreeing to some of the said Amendments.

Companies Act (1862) Amendment Bill (No. 333)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Duke of Richmond*) .. 1544
After short debate, on Question? *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Investment of Trust Funds Bill (No. 246)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 1546
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

INSURRECTION IN CANDIA—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—*Moved*,
"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for such further Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments in alliance with Her Majesty, as may have occurred since the date of the 5th February this year, respecting the Insurrection of Candia, the Means employed for its Pacification, and the Assistance afforded to the Insurgents, either by the Greeks, the Greek Government, or the Natives or Governments of any other Countries,"—(*The Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*) .. 1547
After short debate, Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS—Notice withdrawn (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) .. 1558

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 15.

NAVY — CHIEF ADMIRALTY CHEMIST AT PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD — Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. Corry 1559

IMPRISONMENT FOR CHURCH RATES—Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1560

YELLOW FEVER AT BERMUDA—Question, Admiral Erskine; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1560

EAST INDIA, CHINA, AND AUSTRALIAN MAILS — Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Mr. Hunt 1561

POLICE SUPERANNUATION FUNDS—Question, Mr. Howes; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 1564

SCOTCH JUDICIAL ANNUAL RETURNS — Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Graham Montgomery 1564

ARMY—LATE INSPECTION OF CHATHAM GARRISON—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1565

ARMY—VOLUNTEERS' CAPITATION GRANT—Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1566

NAVY — NAVAL ARSENALS AND DOCKYARDS—Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1566

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE OF THE ADMIRALTY COURT — Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1568

NAVY — ADMIRALTY CONTRACTS — MARINE ENGINES—Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Corry 1568

NAVY—MARINE DEPOT AT DEAL—Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Mr. Corry 1569

THE NEW LAW COURTS—Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Lord J. Manners 1570

METROPOLITAN COMMON FUND — Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1571

Parks Regulation (*re-committed*) **Bill** [Bill 273]—
Bill again *considered* in Committee 1571
After short time spent therein, House *resumed* [No Report.]

[*August* 15.] Page

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS AND ST. EDMUND'S, DUDLEY—Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan ; Answer, Mr. Mowbray 1591

Consecration of Churches and Churchyards Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 276]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1592

After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed* with Amendments, and an amended Title.

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 16.

Hours of Labour Regulation Bill (No. 341)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl of Devon*) .. 1594

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES—Observations, The Earl of Lichfield ; Reply, The Earl of Devon 1597

Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) Bill (No. 294)—

Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order) 1602

Moved, to insist on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed,—(*The Lord Cranworth*) 1602

After short debate, on Question, whether to insist? their Lordships *divided ;* Contents 7, Not-Contents 11 ; Majority 4 :—*Resolved* in the *Negative* :—List of Contents and Not-Contents 1604

Protest of Lord Cranworth 1604

A consequential Amendment made, and a Message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 16.

METROPOLIS—THE NEW POOR LAW ACT—Question, Colonel Hogg ; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1605

ARMY—SERGEANT INSTRUCTORS OF VOLUNTEERS—Question, Mr. Otway ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1606

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL—Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1606

METROPOLIS—PARK LANE—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence ; Answer, Lord John Manners 1606

METROPOLIS—MARLBOROUGH HOUSE GATE—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence ; Answer, Lord John Manners 1608

TRAFFIC OF THE METROPOLIS—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1608

THE CATTLE PLAGUE—Question, Mr. Read ; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu 1609

IRELAND—THE IRISH CHURCH COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre ; Answer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer 1610

BUENOS AYRES—CASE OF THE "CESTUS"—Question, Mr. Norwood ; Answer, Lord Stanley 1610

SUPREME COURT OF SIERRA LEONE—Question, Mr. O'Beirne ; Answer, Mr. Adderley 1611

ARMY—MILITARY STORE CLERKS—Question, Mr. Otway ; Answer, Sir John Pakington 1612

NAVY—GREENWICH HOSPITAL—Question, Mr. Norwood ; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox 1612

India—The Indian Loan—Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote 1613

Increase of the Episcopate Bill (*Lords*) [Bill 318]—

Moved, "That the Lords' Reasons for disagreeing with certain of the Commons' Amendments be considered this day month,"—(*Sir Roundell Palmer*) 1614

Motion *agreed to* :—Order *discharged* :—Bill *withdrawn*.

Moved, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn to *Monday* next."

Ecclesiastical Titles Act—Observations, Mr. Newdegate .. 1614

Case of Martin Cuncanon—Question, Major Anson; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 1628

Motion *agreed to* :—House at rising to adjourn till *Monday* next.

LORDS, SATURDAY, AUGUST 17.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate, House adjourned.

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 19.

Ritualism — The Royal Commission — Report of the Commissioners—Observations, The Archbishop of Canterbury 1630

Clerical Vestments (No. 2) Bill (No. 72)—

Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned Debate on the Second Reading of this Bill 1631

After short debate, Further debate on the Motion for Second Reading *put off sine die.*

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 19.

The House met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate, House adjourned.

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 20.

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper without debate, House adjourned.

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 20.

The House met, and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate, House adjourned.

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

The Royal Assent was given to several Bills; And afterwards a Speech of The Lords Commissioners was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by The Lord Chancellor.

Then a Commission for Proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

The LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Wednesday*, the *Sixth* day of *November* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Wednesday*, the *Sixth* day of *November* next.

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21. Page

REPORT OF THE RITUAL COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy 1639

VAGRANCY IN THE METROPOLIS—Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy 1640

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT—

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS in the House of Peers .. 1640

LORDS.

SAT FIRST.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 16.

The Lord Willoughby d'Eresby, after the Death of his Father:

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

MONDAY, JULY 29.

For *Downpatrick, v.* David Stewart Ker, Esq., Chiltern Hundreds.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14.

For *Stroud, v.* George Poulett Scrope, Esq., Manor of Northstead.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21.

For *the College of the Holy Trinity of Dublin, v.* The Right Hon. Hedges Eyre Chatterton, Vice Chancellor of Ireland.

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 24.

Coventry—Henry Mather Jackson, Esq.

THURSDAY, JULY 25.

Birmingham—George Dixon, Esq.

MONDAY, AUGUST 5.

Gloucester County—Edward Arthur Somerset, Esq.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 8.

Downpatrick—William Keown, Esq.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21.

Stroud—Henry Self Page Winterbotham, Esq.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE *NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*
APPOINTED TO MEET 1 FEBRUARY, 1866, AND THENCE
CONTINUED TILL 5 FEBRUARY, 1867, IN THE THIRTIETH
YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

FIFTH AND LAST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 24, 1867.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—Henry Mather Jackson, esquire, *for* Coventry.

SELECT COMMITTEE—On Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, Mr. Solicitor General *added.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Railway Companies Relief*; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)*; Indemnity.*

First Reading—Merchant Shipping* [274]; Consecration of Churches and Churchyards* [276]; Prorogation of Parliament* [277]; Patriotic Fund* [278]; Railway Companies Relief* [279]; Indemnity* [280]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [281].

Second Reading—Public Works (Ireland)* [262]; Weights and Measures (Dublin)* [263]; Dublin Metropolitan Police* [246].

Committee—Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal* [245]; Sunday Trading* [34] [R.P.]

Report—Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal* [245].

Considered as amended—Galashiels Jurisdiction* [234]; Morro Velho Marriages* [265].

Third Reading—Church Rates Abolition* [13]; Dundee Provisional Orders Confirmation* [257]; Wexford Grand Jury* [264].

Withdrawn—Church Rates Regulation* [42]; Associations of Workmen* [21]; Land Contracts (Ireland)* [32]; Mines, &c. Assessment* (*re-comm.*) [174].

IRELAND—UNENCLOSED BURIAL GROUNDS.—QUESTION.

MR. O'REILLY said, he would beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to give Burial Boards in Ireland compulsory powers for taking land required for the enlargement of existing unenclosed Burial Grounds?

LORD NAAS said, that no doubt great evil was felt in many districts, owing to the impossibility of obtaining land for the enlargement of existing unenclosed burial grounds; but, at the same time, considerable objection was felt to giving compulsory powers to Burial Boards, especially in the neighbourhood of large towns where buildings of considerable value might be interfered with. He thought that in any measure to be introduced, it would be well to include enclosed as well as unenclosed burial grounds. It was not, however, the intention of the Government to introduce any measure on the subject this Session; but if, on careful inquiry during the Recess, he should find it possible to provide a remedy by legislation for the evil complained of, he should be prepared next Session to introduce a Bill on the subject.

TRINITY COLLEGE (DUBLIN).

RESOLUTION. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [18th June],

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable that the Fellowships and Foundation Scholarships of Trinity College, Dublin, should be exclusively appropriated to those who are members of the Established Church,"—(*Mr. Fawcett,*)

and which Amendment was,

To leave out from the word "House" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "The constitution of the University of Dublin should be altered so as to enable and fit it to include Colleges connected with other forms of religion than that of the Established Church, and that the members of such Colleges should be entitled to share in all the benefits now enjoyed by the members of Trinity College,"—(*Mr. Monsell,*)

—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. BRUCE said, that during the debate which took place on that question some five weeks ago—a most important admission had been made by the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Lord Naas)—namely, that the state of collegiate education in that country was most unsatisfactory. Such an admission could not but be regarded by the House as tantamount to a declaration that the Government were prepared to consider the subject; and although it could not be expected that the Government should be in a position now to announce what their policy was with regard to it, at the same time it was most desirable that there should be some declaration of opinion on the part of the House as to what that policy ought to be. At present they had before them two propositions — that of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) for throwing open the Fellowships and foundation scholarships of Trinity College, Dublin, to all religious denominations; and that of the right hon. Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) for altering the constitution of the University of Dublin so as to enable it and fit it to include Colleges connected with other forms of religion than that of the Established Church, and to entitle the members of such Colleges to some of the benefits now exclusively enjoyed by the members of Trinity College. If the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton stood alone, he should have had no hesitation in giving it its support; but still he entertained some objections to it, which were met by the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Limerick, and therefore he preferred to support the Amendment. There was an ample provision for the higher education of members of the Established Church in Trinity College. There were also the Queen's Colleges, which provided nominally indeed for all, and which substantially met the requirements of the Presbyterians, especially in Belfast; but the benefits of which, unfortunately, owing to the strong feeling prevalent among the Roman Catholics in favour of a denominational system, reached only a portion of that numerous community. It was impossible that things could be allowed to remain as they were. Parliament, if it wished to produce contentment and satisfaction in Ireland, ought to show that it was prepared to treat all sections of the Irish people in an equal and impartial spirit, and to meet the wants and requirements of all religious denominations with an even-handed justice which recognizes no distinction of creed. His own desire in reference to that question was not to degrade the Protestants of Ireland in matters of religion to the level of the Roman Catholics, but to raise the Roman Catholics to the level of the Protestants; and he thought that object might be most fully attained by adopting the Motion of the right hon. Member for Limerick. The Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton was open to the objection that it would give deep offence to a large and important class in Ireland, and would ultimately have the effect of depriving the Members of the Established Church of the means of giving a high denominational education, especially to their own clergy, whom it was most desirable to educate together with the laity, and that, after all, its only result would be to create another Queen's College in Ireland—a result, under present circumstances and in the actual state of public feeling, hardly desirable. He should prefer to leave Trinity College as it was, a denominational College for the education of all, but with certain advantages for Members of the Established Church; but he thought it was a matter of great importance that the examining body should be altogether independent of the teaching body, whose functions were perfectly distinct and could not be confounded without injury, and he would therefore desire to separate the University of Dublin from Trinity College, and to make them two distinct bodies independent of each other. His right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick had read a quotation from a contemporary despatch with the view of showing that the original object of the foundation of Dublin University was broadly national. However that might be, it seemed to him clear that Trinity College, at least, was destined for education in the principles of the Protestant religion and for purposes of proselytism. But whatever may have been the original object of Queen Elizabeth, he believed it was her intention, as it decidedly was that of the two succeeding Sovereigns, that the University should be a University in reality, not in name, and that other Colleges besides Trinity College should, sooner or later, be established. There was a most explicit statement in the charter of James I. on that subject; and when they recollected that the foundation of Trinity College took place in 1592, only a few years before the termination of the reign of Elizabeth, they might gather that the declaration contained in the charter of James I. was made with a full knowledge of what were the original intentions with which the University of Dublin was founded. In the charter of James I. the reason assigned for giving Dublin University a representative in Parliament was that Bills were frequently brought before the House which were intended (as it was expressed in the barbarous Latin of those days)—

> "*Pro dispositione et preservatione redditum, revenditionum et possessionum dicti Collegii ac aliorum collegiorum sive aularum in dictâ Universitate in posterum erigendarum et stabiliendarum.*"

It was clear that, in the opinion of James I., there would be brought before the House, measures for increasing the number of the Colleges and Halls in connection with the University. Charles I. extended further the charter of the University; and although those three Sovereigns were not actuated by a philosophical persuasion of the righteousness of religious toleration, at any rate it was known that they entertained a very strong sympathy towards the professors of the old religion, both in England and Ireland; and, but for the deep prejudice then existing in the minds of the English people towards the Roman Catholics, some provision might have been made for the education of the latter. Even by an Act passed in the reign of a later monarch, to whom nobody would attribute any strong attachment to the principle of religious toleration — namely, by 33 *Geo.* III., c. 21—it was provided—

> "That it should be lawful for Papists to take or hold degrees or any professorship, or to be Masters or Fellows of any College to be hereafter founded in this kingdom (Ireland), provided that such College shall be a member of the University of Dublin, and shall not be founded exclusively for the education of Papists."

He thought the time had come when they ought to consider how justice might be done to the Roman Catholics of Ireland in this matter. The Roman Catholic people of that country, in spite of the enormous burdens imposed on them by the necessity of building and maintaining their churches, supporting their clergy, and sustaining all those charitable institutions which were an honour to the voluntary spirit of Ireland, had raised a sum of not less than £120,000 for the foundation of a Roman Catholic College. That sum was, of course, found altogether insufficient at once to build and properly endow the College; and it would be for the interest, not only of the people of Ireland, but of the whole Empire, if the State were to show itself liberal in providing the means of furnishing an efficient staff of professors and tutors for such an institution. He knew it might be said that the Queen's Colleges would be adequate to supply the wants of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland were it not for the opposition of the priests; but he asked whether, in this country, where priestly influence was certainly not predominant, there was not a decided preference shown for denominational education? In Ireland religious differences were broader and deeper than in England, and therefore it was not unnatural to suppose that both among the Protestants and the Roman Catholics there should exist a widespread and deep-seated feeling in favour of denominational education. But when it was urged that this opposition was entirely owing to the priests, it was fair to ask themselves what had given the priests such influence? Was it not the policy pursued towards Ireland by this country for centuries? Acts of violence and confiscations had placed almost the whole property of Ireland in the hands of men different in religion, different in many cases in race, from the majority of the Irish people. For many centuries the notion of extending to the mass of the people the political and religious advantages enjoyed by the favoured minority, would have appeared to their rulers the height of folly and absurdity. Political equality had been secured; but even to this day, the vast majority of the Irish people laboured under serious and irritating disadvantages both as regarded religious equality and the provision of education in its higher branches. Under such circumstances, whenever the people of Ireland required support or sympathy, they naturally turned to their clergy, and it was not surprising that they should now have followed their advice in this question of denominational education. That they should do so was the result of our own policy, and one which could be neither wondered at nor disregarded. In all legislation for Ireland they were bound to consider what were the deep feelings and convictions of the people, and the attempt to legislate for them on the opposite principle must, in future, as in times past, end in failure and mischief. If, instead of vehemently denouncing priestly influence in Ireland, they sought, by improving the education and intelligence of their flocks, to raise the feeling entertained by the people towards their spiritual teachers into a sentiment of enlightened reverence and respect, they would see the same result as was seen in France, Belgium, and other countries where the Roman Catholic religion existed, and where it was not in permanent antagonism to the State. The plan he advocated was to grant subsidies to a Roman Catholic College or Colleges on proper conditions, in order to enable them to employ a competent staff of tutors and professors; and these conditions should provide for the just influence of the State in fixing the constitution of the governing bodies. It was right that the clergy should have their due influence in such institutions; but it was not desirable that the arrangements for providing secular instruction in them should be left entirely in the hands of the clergy of any denomination whatever. He believed that the time was not far distant when, both in this country and in Ireland, they must provide greater means than they had done for a more advanced education, both of the middle and upper classes in Ireland. They would be obliged to scatter all over their great centres of population, institutions—whether they called them Colleges or Universities — having professors who should be able to give systematic instruction to the people, and thus to raise the middle classes of this country to a level with those of Germany and France, in respect to the means of obtaining a cheap and complete education. The noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland stated that a system, such as that pursued at the London University, would be repugnant to the feelings of all sects in Ireland; but what, he would ask, was the system of the London University? It was nothing but an examining body which acted indirectly on education by refusing to admit students to matriculation or honours unless they proved themselves worthy of those distinctions by passing an examination of a high standard. No attempt, he might add, was made to interfere with the existence of Trinity College, Dublin, as a collegiate institution. All that he, and those who supported his view of the question, sought to effect was to add to the existing educational institutions of Ireland one great examining body, to which students from Roman Catholic or any other Colleges in that country might go for examination, and be subjected to a certain standard of proficiency. And had not Trinity College itself, after all, made some approach to the system of the London University? Had it not done largely that which the late Government had been blamed for doing in the case of the Queen's University in Ireland? At the present moment the students of Trinity College amounted, in round numbers, to 1,200; and of those 300 only enjoyed the benefits resulting from residence within its walls on which his noble Friend had recently dilated. 300 more resided in Dublin in the vicinity of the College, and had the advantage of being able to attend lectures there, many of them living at home, while others occupied lodgings. The remaining 600 were placed precisely in the same position as those students who, from all parts of England, came up for examination to the University of London. But then it was said that, under the system proposed, it was utterly impossible to constitute a governing body such as was suggested, whose members would act cordially together, and command the respect and confidence of all parties. His noble Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland had asked whether it was possible to conceive two such men as the Provost of Trinity College and the President of Maynooth acting together in that manner? His answer was that nothing was, to his mind, more simple. He had not the pleasure of knowing the actual Head of Trinity

College; but he did know some of the most distinguished of its Fellows, any one of whom might, some day, with great propriety, be selected to be its Head; and he was sure they would find no difficulty in acting with such a man as Dr. Russell; while, from the slight acquaintance which he had with that gentleman, he was convinced it would be to him an easy and agreeable duty to act with either the Head, or any of the Fellows of Trinity College, for the purpose of conferring a great national benefit on the people of Ireland. Such a course as that which he advocated had been already tried, and with complete success. Whatever might be the objections to the London University, nobody had ever ventured to assert that its examinations were not conducted with perfect impartiality. The Examiners were appointed without regard to the religion of the students whom they would have to examine, who consisted of members of every persuasion, including Roman Catholics, who came up to London to be examined from all quarters of the kingdom, and who were thus subjected to a test which was admitted on all hands to have worked most satisfactorily. As things at present stood, there were no means provided in Ireland for stimulating its various educational institutions into active exertion by enabling their students to submit themselves to some such high standard of examination. That being so, the question arose whether the want could be supplied by creating *ad hoc* a new University in that country? From what had fallen from the Chief Secretary for Ireland, it might be supposed that the Government proposed to take some such course; but then no specific assurance had been given by the noble Lord on the subject. For his own part, he must contend that what was required was not so much to multiply as to reduce the number of the examining bodies in that country. One well-constituted body of Examiners would, he thought, be amply sufficient to secure the object which he desired to see attained, and the voice of all intelligent people in Ireland, with the exception of those who were animated by extreme party feeling, was, he believed, in favour of that view. But, be that as it might, it was, at all events, impossible, after the declarations which had been made on the part of the Government, that the question should be allowed to rest, or that a policy should be much longer pursued which presented constantly to the eyes of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland a prospect of a great preference given to the members of the Protestant persuasion in reference to the education of their children, while adequate means of education were denied to their own. Under those circumstances, he hoped that some Member of the Government would rise in his place, and, if not in a position to give some specific assurance on the subject, would, at all events, inform the House that it would be fully considered by them during the Recess. Meantime, he was prepared to express his opinion with respect to it by supporting the Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick should he press it to a division. Should that Amendment be withdrawn, he would give his vote in favour of the proposal of the hon. Member for Brighton, and thus show the people of Ireland that he, at all events, was determined to aid them in seeking to obtain that equality in the matter of education to which he thought they were entitled.

MR. O'REILLY said, the Roman Catholics of Ireland would never be satisfied unless they were placed in reference to the question of education in a position of perfect equality with their Protestant fellow-subjects. That object could, in his opinion, best be attained by leaving the members of each religious persuasion free to carry on the teaching of their children in the manner they preferred, and then bringing the results of that teaching to a common test by examination. There was one thing, at all events, which was not to be endured, and that was that great institutions should exist largely endowed by the State, for the benefit of one section of the community to the prejudice of the just claims of another. The Roman Catholics of Ireland, therefore, were not satisfied with the position which Trinity College occupied. Though it had taken considerable steps in the path of toleration, Roman Catholics were excluded from the government of that body and from an equal share in some of the privileges of the establishment. The Government of this country, seeing how just were the claims of the Irish Roman Catholics with regard to education, had instituted the Queen's Colleges. But the mistake committed by the Government was that they established as a system, not what the people of Ireland desired, but what they thought would be good for them. It was not advantageous to the teaching of history, or of ethics, that the professors of those branches of education should have constantly to come to a halt lest they should trench on the religious opinions of their hearers. Instruction in such subjects would be better given in separate institutions, where they might be taught freely. The Roman Catholics of Ireland claimed an equal share of the rewards of education with their Protestant brethren, provided they showed equal ability and equal aptitude to pass the necessary tests. How was that to be ascertained? A separate charter might be given to the Roman Catholic University in Ireland; while Trinity College might be allowed to retain the special advantages of its education for members of the Church of England, granting degrees to persons belonging to other religious denominations. But he should prefer to have an examining University in Ireland, where students of all classes might meet together for the purpose of submitting to an examination without at the same time surrendering their peculiar religious opinions. The advantages of such a system would be great, in a literary point of view, inasmuch as it would tend to promote a noble and generous emulation between the students of the various educational establishments throughout the country. Such was the proposal of the Government, with the one exception, which was the great blot of their plan, that the University of Dublin should retain special advantages as a separate University. If there was to be one examining University in Ireland, it must include Trinity College as well as the students of all other institutions; and it should be borne in mind that from its first establishment the University of Dublin was separate from the College of the Holy Trinity, and was founded with the intention of adding other Colleges to it. By the proposal of the right hon. Member for Limerick, Trinity College would lose nothing of its own government, its influence over education, its prestige, or its high standing in the literary world. The Protestants of Ireland were entitled to retain in their own hands the education of their own children and of the ministers of their own religion; and the only effect of the proposal would be that the students would in the test of their education enter into competition with the students of other establishments throughout the country. Why Trinity College, with all its prestige and great resources, should shrink from throwing in its destiny with those institutions he was at a loss to understand. The noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland, indeed, objected to such a scheme as that which he had indicated. He (Lord Naas) could not perceive how the Provost of Trinity College and the President of Maynooth could sit on the same Board and settle the course of education to be adopted. Nobody, however, proposed that they should settle the course of education. [Lord NAAS: They must.] Persons of different religious persuasions were members of the Senate of the University of London, but they did not deem it to be any part of their duty to settle, for instance, what the course of education should be at the Roman Catholic College of Ushaw, where he (Mr. O'Reilly) was educated. It was only proposed that a Board, consisting of the representatives of both religions, should settle the tests of education. So far as Latin and Greek and mathematics were concerned there was, no doubt, a certain scheme of examination laid down. But on the subject of history, was any course settled as to the system of instruction which should be pursued? At Ushaw, Lingard's *History of England* was taken as the text-book, whereas in other Colleges connected with the London University the text-book was *Hume*. At Ushaw the students learnt history, and when they came up to be examined in London they were not asked how they had learnt it, for he himself had passed through the examination with others who held, on religious questions, totally different opinions. No two men would be likely to agree better in determining the rules to be laid down for the examination of students than the Provost of Trinity College and Dr. Russell, the President of Maynooth—the two eminent persons to whom the noble Lord had referred. Trinity College was largely endowed by the action of the State in former ages, but those endowments were always subject to the revision of Parliament. The Motion before the House in effect stated that those endowments should no longer be held for the exclusive advantage of the Protestants of Ireland, but should be extended so as to enable the University to afford equal benefits to the Roman Catholics and the other religious communities in that country. The Roman Catholics of Ireland would not seek to force their way into Trinity College if its members would consent to join them in the establishment of a common institution, such as he had mentioned, to supply the test of education throughout the country. If Trinity College refused to do that, the logical conclusion to be drawn from the refusal was that they claimed to hold exclusively the privileges with which they had been endowed by the action of the State for the benefit of the whole people of Ireland. In that case the Roman Catholics would contend that those endowments must be opened to every Irish citizen, whatever might be the religious opinions he entertained. He, however, should cordially support the Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick. He hoped to see it accepted by the House. He believed it contained the safest, broadest and easiest solution of the difficulties connected with the question of education in Ireland. If, however, the House should reject the proposal of his right hon. Friend, he should vote in favour of the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton.

Mr. PIM said, he thought it was of the greatest importance to Ireland that the question of education should be settled on a fair basis, and the only fair basis, in his opinion, was that the members of all religious denominations in that country should be placed, in dealing with the subject, in a position of pefect equality. The Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton would, if carried, attain that end, and if it were the only means of securing what he looked upon as a *sine quâ non* he should be prepared to give it his support. Such was not, however, the case, and believing that the Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick suggested a more satisfactory mode of settling the question he should vote in its favour. The proposal of the hon. Member for Brighton would not satisfy any party in Ireland. It would be distasteful alike to Roman Catholics and Protestants, and would produce results which would, he feared, be seriously detrimental to the interests of an institution of which Ireland had just reason to be proud. It was very natural that the Roman Catholics should wish for a system of education strictly in accordance with their religious feeling. The members of other religious denominations also usually acted on similar principles, and sent their sons to schools conducted in accordance with their own religious convictions. A third plan had been suggested —namely, the establishment of a third University which would bear the same relationship to the Roman Catholics as Trinity College did to the Protestants of Ireland. This scheme was well worthy of attention, but for his own part he was disposed to think that a single University with affiliated Colleges would be found to answer best. The plan of the right hon. Member for Limerick had the advantage of leaving the collegiate system untouched, and a single University would, in all probability, as compared with three Universities, maintain a much higher standard of education; for, whereas in the case of three Universities, the tendency might be to lower the standard of qualification in the competition for students, the rivalry between the various Colleges would have the opposite effect, if the students of each were ultimately to be subjected to the same educational test. He was afraid that, in the event of three Universities being established, the present high standard of education in the Dublin University would not be maintained, and that the competition amongst them would, by lowering the standard, prove injurious to the interests of all classes. He hoped that, during the Recess, Her Majesty's Government would give their earnest attention to the subject, so that when Parliament met next Session, they could announce to the House what their intentions were with respect to this subject, which was one of the highest importance to Ireland. Whatever settlement might be proposed, he trusted it would embrace a perfect equality between the different religious bodies in Ireland. Nothing else could be expected to give satisfaction to the people. There must also be an endowment for the Roman Catholic College, such as would place it on a complete equality with the Protestant institutions; without that he believed a satisfactory settlement would not be arrived at. Believing that the Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Member for Limerick suggested a more satisfactory mode of settling the question than the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton he should vote in its favour.

Mr. GRAVES said, that the question was how to provide for what was an admitted want in respect to education in Ireland. No one felt more than he did the necessity of some change in the collegiate system as regarded the Roman Catholics of Ireland. The House had before it two propositions. He would first consider that of the hon. Member for Brighton. It was not one that would meet the views of the people of Ireland. Without meaning to use words offensive to the hon. Member for Brighton, it showed an utter ignorance of the wants and feelings of the people of

Ireland. It was another effort to force a system of mixed education, which was only another name for godless education, upon she sister country. Looking to the past as regarded the course of mixed education in Ireland, he regarded this as another effort to exclude all religious teaching from the general education of the Irish people. The right hon. Member for Limerick's proposition dealt more practically with the question; it was also more comprehensive and more likely to give satisfaction; but he was unable to agree in the views of the right hon. Gentleman. The whole question was as to the possibility of having a mixed Board of Education working in perfect unity and dealing out perfect justice to all parties. That was the issue raised, to which they ought to apply their minds. The hon. and gallant Member for Longford pointed to the success of the London University in respect to the tests of education established for various Colleges; but he thought that the hon. and gallant Gentleman ought to have looked to Ireland for a board of a similar character to that he had referred to, when he wanted to prove the success of a mixed board. The hon. and gallant Gentleman, then, need not have gone far for this example, for he need only point to the University of the Queen's Colleges, where the system he was advocating was admittedly a failure. He doubted much if such an institution was calculated to secure that perfect unity of thought, purpose, and aim, which was necessary to the efficient control of the educational system of Irish Universities. He hesitated to follow the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick in his Amendment. He did not think that that proposition would at all meet the difficulty. He (Mr. Graves) feared that they were not proceeding in the right direction. In place of dealing with that eminently successful institution, the University of Dublin, he thought that they should rather let it proceed in its prosperous course without interference, and see whether they could not build up another institution equally well suited to its special wants, where the religion of its students would be carefully looked after, and where they would be all brought up in their own creed, without exposing them to the difficulties and inconveniences of a mixed education, such as was proposed by the hon. Member for Brighton. He was also afraid that great jealousy would arise in Trinity College, from any system by which the national stamp would be placed as it were upon what he would call the manufacture of other religions. The education given in Trinity College was of a very high standard and had impressed upon it the stamp of a national character. Under such a system as that proposed by the hon. Member for Brighton, he thought that that standard would be much reduced. In the Petition presented that day on the subject by the Lord Mayor of Dublin, he could not discover one word in favour of either of the propositions before the House, and it might therefore be considered that neither of them would meet with the cordial co-operation of the Roman Catholic priesthood or people of Ireland. If he might make a suggestion it would be one rather in the direction of the view of the late Vice President of the Council of Education (Mr. Bruce), when he suggested the withdrawal of both propositions, and that this question should be left to her Majesty's Government, to be dealt with in the coming Recess, not by abstract propositions, but by a carefully considered measure—framed after consulting the best authorities—which would meet the wishes of the masses of the Irish people, and at the same time impart equal justice to all.

MR. M'LAREN said, he thought that the view taken by the hon. Member for Liverpool as to the impossibility of Roman Catholics, and members of the Established Church, and of the various Dissenting bodies, meeting together on common ground in the University of Dublin, was altogether contradictory to experience as gathered from the existing systems in other countries. No educational institutions in the United Kingdom had been more prosperous than the Colleges and Universities of Scotland. There every man might walk in without any question as to his religious opinions being asked him. He was simply told that he must attend the regular classes if he wished to take the degree of A.M. or M.D.; that he would be examined in due time by the proper Examiners, and if he came up to the required standard would obtain a degree and be entitled to any honours or emoluments which the University could bestow. No question was raised as to difference of faith in any class, unless it were the divinity classes, and even there young men belonging to any religious denomination might attend if they chose. When they saw such a system existing as it had done for centuries without any quarrels being engendered, it could not be contended that it was impossible to work such a system in Ireland. To make such an assertion implied that the people of Ireland were more unreasonable than the people of other countries; that they would quarrel about matters respecting which others were content to remain at peace; and that in order to afford a likelihood of any improvement, they must create new institutions, which would probably turn out more objectionable than the old. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick had suggested a Roman Catholic University; that was a proposal of which he could not approve. The present University of Dublin was a national institution. Men who were educated there got the stamp of the nation in the form of a degree. If they established a Roman Catholic University it would be not national but sectarian. A sectarian institution had no more right to give a national degree than a Lord Mayor of London had to confer the honour of knighthood. Within the last twenty years a splendid new College had been established in Edinburgh by the Free Church of Scotland, with a staff of professors and without any Government aid; but that College had never asked for power to confer degrees. They educated men up to the required standard, and when degrees were granted it was to those who conformed to the rules and attended the additional classes necessary to enable them to undergo the examination with credit in the national University. That system was attempted to be carried into effect to some extent last year by the late Government, with whose measures, as a whole, he did not concur. But he considered that proposal, enabling young men educated in any school to be examined in the University of Dublin and get their degrees if found qualified, to be most admirable. Next to that proposal, the Motion for the hon. Member for Brighton met his approval. It opened up —at least to a great extent—the existing honours and emoluments of the University to Roman Catholics, who had as good a right to share in those honours and emoluments as the members of the Church of England.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he was obliged to the hon. Member for Edinburgh for the expression of his approval of the attempt made by the Government last year to do something for the settlement of this great question of University education in Ireland. He thought the change proposed by the late Government with regard to the Queen's University was a wise one. He begged Scotch and other Members not to judge the question of Irish education too exclusively by Scotch ideas and experience, because if they did they would miss the real difficulties of the question, and fail to do justice to the people of Ireland. The differences existing between the various Protestant denominations with regard to University education ought to be of a comparatively trifling character; but in dealing with Protestants and Roman Catholics—the latter considering themselves not a sect but a nation in Ireland, feeling its own claims and the position it ought to hold in its own country—the difficulties were enormously increased. Therefore the examples of England and Scotland would not settle the question in Ireland. It was not his intention to go over again the ground so well traversed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Bruce) for he went along with his right hon. Friend in everything he said in regard to the duty of the Legislature to bring about a perfect system of equality in educational as well as ecclesiastical matters between the different portions of the population of Ireland. He agreed with him also as to applying to this subject that fertile and vital principle laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone)—namely, that in these matters, which, as regards Ireland, were domestic and internal, the feelings and wishes of the Irish people should be considered first and above all things, and that, without taking that principle into account, they were not likely to do justice and give satisfaction to the people of Ireland upon this subject. The hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves) made an attack on the system of mixed education, and said that the Senate of the Queen's University afforded an example of the discord that system produced. This was said because the Senate had had a debate on one question—the acceptance of the supplemental charter. But that body had acted together with remarkable harmony and facility on all ordinary educational questions which had come before them, both previously to and after the acceptance of the supplemental charter. If the hon. Member for Liverpool read the programme drawn up last year for the future examinations of the students, under the supplemental charter, which was now unfortunately suspended, he would see that distinguished persons of different religious views had been able to agree on a programme of the most enlightened, practical, and satisfactory kind. It was to him a matter of great sorrow that it was not to be carried out, and the responsibility of its rejection rested with the present Government. He hoped the hon. Member for Liverpool would not be the only Member who would speak on the Ministerial side of the House on this subject. [Lord NAAS: I have already spoken in this debate.] He was aware of it. The noble Lord made an excellent speech of three-quarters of an hour, but it was entirely of a negative character. The noble Lord pointed out the difficulties of the question before the House, but gave no information as to whether the Government had any plan for the remedy of the evils complained of. He trusted that the Government would make some more decided declaration before allowing the House to go to a division on the present Motion. He differed from the noble Lord, who thought that anything like the system of the London University was totally unsuited to Ireland. There was room in that country for both the systems, which might be described as the College and Examination systems. He had a strong feeling as to the advantages of the College system, but half a loaf was better than no bread. If the system of the London University was found suitable to England, in Ireland it would be even more suitable; because Ireland was a poor country, and a great number of Irish families found it impossible to afford the expense of sending their sons to reside at Trinity and other Colleges. The best course would probably be to open the University of Dublin in connection with a variety of Colleges, including Trinity College, the Queen's Colleges, and the Catholic University College. But unless the Government had in view some system of University education for Ireland, superior to that proposed last year, there would be good ground for condemning their conduct in refusing to carry into effect the change recommended by the late Government. It would only have been necessary for the present Government to have brought in a Bill to remove all doubts as to the validity of the supplemental charter, which the late Government would have done had they remained in office, and then a change satisfactory to large classes in Ireland would have been carried into effect. It was impossible to see how diligently and wisely the Senate of the Queen's University had applied themselves to carry out the powers conferred on them by the supplemental charter without coming to the conclusion that the Queen's University, if it were to be maintained at all, must be made an infinitely wider and larger institution for the people of Ireland then it had been as confined to the Queen's Colleges. He regretted that the Government, through the Attorney General for Ireland, had sanctioned an application to a Court of Law in order to do away with powers conferred by the late Government on the Queen's University. He would support the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Limerick.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHATTERTON) said, that observations had been made respecting his action, as Attorney General, with regard to the Chancery proceedings in reference to the supplemental charter to the Queen's University. Similar observations had been made elsewhere, where he had had no opportunity of replying to them, and he was glad now to be able to do so. The facts were these — an objection had been raised to the validity of that charter, when the present Government came into office, and he had been applied to officially to allow his name to be used in the suit as Attorney General. That was a matter of form, which he could not have refused, and what he had done was merely Ministerial. He had given no opinion in the matter one way or another. It would have been a dereliction of duty had he declined to accede to the application. With regard to the suggestion that the Government should have brought in a Bill on the subject of the supplemental charter, what right would the Government have had to decide by a legislation a question between private parties while it was still *sub judice*.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, that what he meant was that the Government might have brought in a Bill at a later period when the question had been decided.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHATTERTON) observed, with regard to the question under discussion, that he thought there was no case for the interference of the House, and neither the Motion nor the Amendment should be adopted. The question was exceedingly embarrassed by the manner in which it had been brought before the House, for the Motion and the Amendment were not more opposed to the subject before the House than they were to each other. The object of the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton was to break down all distinctions, and throw open the endowments and privileges of Trinity College to persons of every religious denomination. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick was for preserving intact all the privileges of the College as distinguished from the University, and allowing other Colleges to be affiliated to it. Both, while opposed to each other, were hostile to the institution of Trinity College, Dublin, whose rights it was his duty and privilege to defend. He was amazed when he heard the hon. Member for Brighton state the other day that that institution had an endowment amounting to £92,000 a year. A Return had been made, pursuant to the order of the House, of the income of Trinity College, from which it appeared that the net annual income of its property, which was incapable of increase, was £31,369 19*s*. 8*d*., a sum very little exceeding that—£30,000—derived annually from the Consolidated Fund exclusively for the support of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth. Besides this there was an estate—not part of the corporate property —which belonged to the Provost of the College, amounting to £1,500 a year net. But even if that were added to the £31,369 19*s*. 8*d*., how much did the actual annual income fall short of the sum of £92,000? The hon. Member for Brighton also said that it was the fault of Trinity College that its revenues were not much greater; but the entire property was regulated by Act of Parliament, and each tenant paid a rental which was definitively fixed for ever. The College also derived a revenue from property which had belonged to private donors, amounting to between £5,000 and £6,000, and about £10,000 was received in College fees; so that the whole income derived from all these sources amounted to about £50,000. The education at Trinity College was as free as at any institution in the realm. Men of any religious denomination, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, Turk, Jew, or infidel, had a perfect right to go up to Trinity College, enter there, matriculate and be examined, just as freely as at the University of Edinburgh, to which the hon. Member (Mr. M'Laren) had referred. There was nothing exclusive but the corporate body and the Divinity professorships. A Divinity school must be exclusive from its very nature. The corporate body, which had existed for 300 years, consisted of the Provost, seven senior Fellows, and eighteen junior Fellows, and seventy foundation scholars, who must all be members of the United Church of England and Ireland, but no other person connected with the College was necessarily of any religious denomination whatever. The seventy foundation scholarships were established in the reign of Elizabeth, candidates for which must be of the Established Church. Was it desirable that these should be thrown open to persons of any, and every, religious belief? The late Mr. O'Connell—whose opinion, it was to be presumed would carry weight with the opponents of the College—when examined on oath before a Committee of the House of Lords in 1825, was asked (*vide* Evidence, p. 158)—

> "Would not one measure tend very much to conciliate the Roman Catholics, and to do away the unpleasantness to which you have referred—namely, that of leaving the election of scholarships open to both religions, which they are not now?"

His reply was as follows:—

> "I doubt that, and I will state why. As Trinity College, Dublin, is constituted, it is intended for the education of the Protestant clergy. I do not think it would be a wise thing to give the scholarships to Catholic young men. I think that young men of talent, who are intended for the Protestant Church, ought to have those scholarships."

Some years ago, with the view of obviating objections to the exclusive nature of these scholarships, the Board of Trinity College established a number of non-foundation scholarships which were in all respects equal to these, and were open to every man on examination without distinction of religious creed. The candidates for both classes of scholarships were examined together, and every man who was found equal in merit to any one who obtained a foundation scholarship was awarded a non-foundation scholarship equal in value to the foundation scholarship. Yet this was put forward by the hon. Member for Brighton as a matter of complaint. Now, as to the governing body—namely, the Provost and Fellows—would it, in the present state of Ireland, be advantageous that that governing body should consist of men belonging to different religious persuasions? Unfortunately, the experiments which had been made in that direction had not been successful. One of these was the

National Board of Education, consisting of Prelates of the two Churches, the United Church of England and Ireland and the Roman Catholic Church, and it was matter of experience how badly that had worked. The tenets of the Roman Catholic religion were aggressive. Roman Catholics considered it to be their duty to propagate their religion by all legitimate means, and especially by education. One principle of that Church was, that they could not join in mixed education. Bishop Moriarty, when examined before the Select Committee, said, the reason of the withdrawal of the Roman Catholic Prelates from the Board of Education was a matter of principle—that it was inconsistent with the doctrines of their Church for the clergy to take a part in any education that was not entirely under their own control.

MR. MONSELL said, he rose to Order. The right hon. and learned Gentleman was not entitled to quote the proceedings of a Committee which had not yet reported.

MR. SPEAKER: If the right hon. Gentleman is doing so, it is irregular.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHATTERTON), said, he would then merely put it as a matter of public notoriety. Every hon. Member knew what had actually taken place—that the Roman Catholic Prelates had withdrawn from the National Board avowedly because it was inconsistent with the doctrine of their Church to take part in any education which was not entirely under their own control. But to come to the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick, why did he propose that—

> "The constitution of the University of Dublin should be altered so as to enable and fit it to include Colleges connected with other forms of religion than that of the Established Church, and that the members of such Colleges should be entitled to share in all the benefits now enjoyed by the Members of Trinity College?"

Would he include the Queen's University of Ireland? Taking Dublin University as a College, how could there be any hope of having a united governing body when Roman Catholics would object even to the history of England being taught, except one particular history, written by a Roman Catholic, was adopted. They would not be able to read even Hume and Smollett in such a College. How could any curriculum of education be agreed on? Trinity College was an avowedly Protestant institution, and that was the reason why it had been attacked by Roman Catholic Members. The estates which were granted in the time of Elizabeth and James to Trinity College were granted on the same principle as the grants to the nobility, and were wholly different from a Parliamentary grant, which might give the Parliament a *primâ facie* right to interfere. The estates of Trinity College were as good in title as those, for instance, of the Duke of Devonshire. What, then, was the cause for the proposed interference with the right of property enjoyed by the College? Every man, of whatever religion, could go to Trinity College and attain all the advantages of the College—degrees in arts, law, medicine. Why was the Legislature to interfere with the sacred rights of property? Trinity College had done its duty faithfully and well in furthering the education of the youth of the country—the object for which it was founded. Its system of education was enlightened, extended, and liberal; and why should the State interfere? The objection urged was a mere sentimental one; there was no single practical grievance. Twenty-five years ago, when at Trinity College, he was in the habit of associating daily with many gentlemen of the Roman Catholic religion who were being educated there, and in no institution could there be more harmony than then existed among them. The Roman Catholic gentlemen who had attended there would bear advantageous comparison with any who had been educated elsewhere; and they looked back to the days they had passed in Trinity College, Dublin, as some of the happiest days in their lives. They enjoyed every freedom; every facility and advantage was open to them, with the exception of the Fellowships connected with the governing body. Those who insisted on separate education for themselves were not justified in taking from Protestants the advantage they enjoyed in the existing College. Trinity College said to Roman Catholics, "Walk in; the doors are open to you to be educated if you like." But because they would not walk in, because they said they would have an education of their own, was that a reason why they should say that Protestants should not govern their own College? Was it because the Roman Catholic clergy would not allow the Roman Catholic youth to go there that the privilege of free education at that University should be denied to Protestants? In Dublin there were 6,000 graduates, and 1,218 students last year received education in the College. The education differed from the

English system to the advantage of the students. They had more facilities offered for residence, which was in itself good; but, at the same time, it did not compel residence, because persons might come up from private schools or private tutors, and offer themselves for examination without a day's residence. If they chose to reside in Dublin the students could go to the tutors free of expense, and get the best education which Ireland could afford; so that while every inducement was held out to students to reside, it by no means made that residence essential. Was not the real nature of the Amendment to compel the University to share their endowments among other Colleges which Roman Catholics liked better? He would call attention to the skilful manner in which the Amendment had been framed. It proposed that the members of other Colleges should be entitled to share in all the benefits of Trinity College. Did this not mean that they were to share in the emoluments? The sum was not too great for the duties attached to the teaching; it was very little more than that given at Maynooth. Roman Catholics were as free to go to Trinity College as anybody else. If anything had been altered it was to their advantage. But if they did not wish to go there, let not the privilege be taken away from those who now enjoyed it. No case had been made out either for the original Motion or for the Amendment. For the sake of peace and harmony he hoped neither would be adopted. The smart of such a change would not be got over for many generations. Would it be wise or politic to create such a sore and grievous wrong? He appealed with confidence to the good sense and feeling of hon. Members on both sides of the House. It was better to let things alone, and not to create another subject of annoyance and sectarian animosity in Ireland, which it would take years on years to overcome, merely to meet a sentimental objection where there was no practical grievance whatever.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, that he found no fault with the Ministerial action of the right hon. and learned Gentleman in the matter of the supplemental charter. What he said was, that the legal proceedings might have been avoided if the Government had decided by their own action a matter of public policy. He did not deny that a grievance might be made if the Amendment were carried, but he thought if the change desired were proposed by the Government it would not be felt as a grievance.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, that the right hon. and learned Gentleman had ably defended Trinity College; but he regretted that he had not stated what the Government would agree to with regard to the great question of Roman Catholic University education in Ireland, if they rejected both the Motion and the Amendment. As to the Roman Catholic grievance being only sentimental, the right hon. and learned Gentleman had shown that a sentimental grievance might also be felt among Protestants. He said that tampering with the College in the way proposed would create a sore which it would require years to heal; but, if the change were made, the Protestants would enjoy the same education as now. They would therefore be in the same position as the Roman Catholics, of whom the right hon. and learned Gentleman said that they could now get all they wanted, and that their grievance was only sentimental. But a grievance did not cease to be a grievance because it was sentimental. A great many grievances in Ireland were sentimental grievances. It was all very well to tell an Irish Roman Catholic that he could obtain his degree at the London University; but were the hon. Members sitting on the Ministerial Benches in favour of denominational education or not? They were in favour of it in England; but they advocated mixed education in Ireland. What course had the Government taken with respect to the supplemental charter of last year? What they had said came to this—that they would use the University degree as a means of forcing Roman Catholics into mixed schools. If hon. Members opposite would act in the spirit of compromise it might be possible to preserve the denominational system in both England and Ireland. Why should there not be a University in Dublin which should represent not only the 500,000 Protestants, but the 4,000,000 of Roman Catholics? He wanted to know what course the Government were going to adopt with reference to this question. They opposed every plan brought forward on the denominational system, and yet they had neither the courage nor the straightforwardness to say whether they accepted or objected to the supplemental charter, nor to bring in a measure themselves dealing with the matter. The question was, whether the system of mixed education in Ireland had succeeded or not? If it had failed, why should any attempt be made to continue it, and why did not the Government come forward with a proposal for denominational education instead? But if, as he supposed, this view was entertained by no great number of hon. Gentlemen opposite, why was the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton resisted? Whatever differences of opinion might prevail between the two sides of the House on some points of this subject, he supposed that no one would deny that the Roman Catholics in Ireland ought to enjoy the benefit of University education. If hon. Gentlemen opposite continued to reject every attempt at a compromise, the Church of England party on the Liberal Benches would be compelled, under a view of the absolute necessity of extending education at all hazards, to vote with those who were in favour of a secular as against a denominational system. He trusted that before the debate closed they would hear from the Ministerial Bench a definite announcement of the policy that the Government intended to pursue.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he did not rise to defend the course which had been taken by the Government on this question, but merely to point out the difficulty in which the Liberal party found themselves with reference to all questions of a religious or an educational character. The Liberal party in this country in supporting the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland virtually accepted the Ultramontane opinions pronounced by the Papacy, and were, therefore, at variance with the Liberal party throughout the world. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) had said that the only satisfactory basis in Ireland was one of complete religious equality. But what would be the position of Ireland if such a policy was carried out? The Roman Catholics, governed by an Ultramontane hierarchy, would be in an immense majority, and would absolutely decide all questions relating to religion, education, and learning, upon their own principles. That would be the inevitable sequence of the policy adopted by the Liberal party. The policy of England, on the contrary, had always been that, whatever might be the numbers or creed of those who sought education, toleration should be extended to them. The Church of Rome, on the contrary, was both intolerant and aggressive. As he thought it improper to make an assertion of this nature in the House without supporting its accuracy by confirmation and proof, he desired to ask their attention to two or three instances in confirmation and proof of what he had said. He held in his hand the despatch, a Copy of which he had moved for a short time since, addressed by Prince Gortschakoff to the Russian representatives abroad in reference to the rupture of the relations between the Holy See and the Court of Russia, and the abrogation of the Concordat of 1847. In this despatch the following sentence occurred:—

> "The Emperor's word was loyally fulfilled by the conclusion of the Concordat of 1847; it granted to the Roman Catholic Church all that it was possible to grant within those limits (the limits assigned by the Constitution and laws of Russia). But in Russia the Holy See has pretended at all times to the faculty of going beyond those limits.'

In confirmation of this there was appended a note—"'The essence of the Catholic religion is to be intolerant,' wrote, in June, 1804, the Cardinal Secretary of State, Gonsalvi, to Cardinal Caprara." He (Mr. Newdegate) would show that this intolerance was not peculiar to the Church of Rome in her relations with Russia only, by two extracts, with which he would trouble the House from the syllabus of the "Errors of our Time," which were condemned in the encyclical letter of the Pope, issued in 1864. One opinion which was condemned ran thus—

> "The entire direction of public schools in which the youth of Christian states are educated, except —to a certain extent—in the case of episcopal seminaries, may and must appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority whatever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the taking of degrees, or the choice and approval of the teachers."

This was condemned by the Pope as one "error," because the supremacy which he claimed for himself and his Church was ignored. The following was condemned as another heretical opinion:—

> "The system of instructing youth which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church, and in teaching it exclusively the knowledge of external things, and the earthly ends of social life, alone, may be perfectly approved by Catholics."

If any illustration were needed to satisfy the House that the doctrines of the Papacy, in these points, were entertained or practised in full force by the Bishops of that persuasion in Ireland, it would be found in the pastoral address of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, to the Roman Catholic clergy and people of Ireland, which contained a series of resolutions expressing the judgment of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops on the subject of mixed education in reference to the Roman Catholics of Ireland. One of those resolutions was—

> "That schools for Catholic youth should be such as to ensure for them the benefit of a safe secular education and adequate religious instruction in the faith and practices of the Catholic Church. They should, therefore, be so subordinated to bishops in their respective dioceses as that no books may be used in them for secular instruction to obstruct the ordinary objects; and that the teachers, both as to appointment and removal, and the selection of all books for religious instruction, and the arrangements for it, be under the instruction of the same ordinary."

And again —

> "That, in accordance with the decision already pronounced by the Holy See, we reiterate our condemnation of the present system of education established in the Queen's Colleges; that we cannot but declare that the said system has failed signally, notwithstanding the enormous expense entailed by it upon the country; and that we consider that the only means for the Government to free itself from the responsibility of maintaining the present useless, expensive, and obnoxious system would be to give over the Colleges of Cork and Galway, situated in Catholic provinces, to be conducted on Catholic principles, while the Presbyterians are provided for in the College of Belfast, and the members of the Established Church in the University of Dublin."

These were the principles of the Church of Rome. When the right hon. Gentleman, therefore, talked about adopting the basis of perfect religious equality in Ireland the principle carried out would really amount to the enthronization of intolerance in that country. The Liberal party were in considerable difficulty, for they wished to adopt the principle of equality, and yet saw that if they did so they must enthrone intolerance in Ireland. The United Church of England and Ireland was tolerant, and because she was tolerant, she preserved her power and position. But if the Roman Catholic Church was to be allowed equality with the Established Church by virtue of the numerical predominance of her worshippers in Ireland, she must attain the supremacy at which she aimed, and nothing could then restrain her intolerance except the establishment of a civil power based upon the principles of absolutism. Nothing would be left but to repeal the Union, which was based upon the toleration of the Established Church, and to supplant the present beneficent and tolerant system, by a Government whose despotic powers might be found sufficiently powerful to check the intolerant assumptions of the Church of Rome. The House had had before its eyes the example of Poland, and of the bloody revolution which was the result of the attempt of the Czar to establish toleration there in spite of the Roman Catholic Church, while acting upon the principle of equality. The example was one that ought not to be forgotten.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he had never heard before, either that the Union was based upon toleration, or that the Church of England was particularly distinguished by the possession of that characteristic. The predominance of the Established Church in Ireland was a strange illustration of the universal toleration which the hon. Member (Mr. Newdegate) supposed to form the basis of the Irish Union, and he thought that English Dissenters would be able to dispel the theory that in this country the Church of England was remarkable for toleration. Those Members who represented the Church in that House had bitterly, wickedly, and pertinaciously opposed every attempt to give the Dissenters the rights which the Roman Catholic Members of the House were most desirous to obtain for them. It was said that the Roman Catholic Church was an aggressive Church, but how, in reference to the question before them, had the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland shown itself to be aggressive? The Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland only asked to be allowed to educate their youth according to their own principles. They asked for denominational education — the same thing that was insisted upon by the Protestant Bishops of England and which the Government demanded for the people at large. And when Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland asked for the same thing they were denounced, not only as bigots, but as aggressors. Was it repugnant to reason or liberty to ask for the Roman Catholics the rights they were so willing to concede to others? He could not understand why the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland should be considered bigots because they asked for in Ireland what the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury asked for in England. The Roman Catholic Bishops were governed by conscience, and why should not their conscientious feelings be respected when the conscientious feelings of the Protestant Bishops of England were treated with consideration? The Roman Catholic Bishops did not want to interfere with the faith of the Protestants; they only wanted to have their own men, youth, and children protected from aggression. The Roman Catholics wished simply to establish protection for themselves; they did not assail the religious liberties of other people. The evidence of Daniel O'Connell was quoted by the Attorney General for Ireland, but he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that that evidence was given forty-two years ago, before emancipation, when the Roman Catholics scarcely dared to ask or hope for anything. The right hon. Gentleman quoted the opinion of O'Connell in this matter because it served his purpose; but he refused to accept the opinions of that great man in regard to matters of even greater and more urgent importance than the question under the consideration of the House. It was the duty of the Government to have brought in a Bill for the purpose of removing any doubts which might exist in reference to the validity of the supplemental charter. They had insinuated a vague promise of what they might be prepared to do in reference to this question; whereas they ought to have had the courage to declare, "Here is a great difficulty and the cause of much contention; we have given to it a fair and due consideration, and this is the decision at which we have arrived." They knew that there was an earnest desire on the part of the Roman Catholics to have the matter settled, but they would not do anything to settle it. The feelings of the great majority of the people must be respected. What was to be done? Was there any Member of the Government present who would give, not a supplemental charter, but a supplemental statement of their opinions or policy? The Roman Catholics had been taunted with taking £30,000 a year for Maynooth. They did not ask for that. The grant was made as a matter of Imperial policy, and he should be glad to get rid of it as soon as possible. But the Roman Catholics would be great fools if they gave it up before the settlement of the Irish Church question and all its anomalies, and so long as the *Regium Donum* was maintained he should vote for the grant to Maynooth. The Government, and any future Government, would disappoint the people of Ireland and every liberal-minded man and damage their own reputation if they did not deal with the matter in a bold and comprehensive spirit. One great inconsistency which characterized the conduct of the Protestant gentlemen in Ireland in dealing with the question of education in Ireland was that they maintained

Mr. Maguire

that the Roman Catholics ought to be content with any system of education, while they themselves would not be content with anything of the kind. The fact could not be denied that sooner or later this question would have to be settled, for the feelings of the great majority of the Irish people would have to be respected.

MR. BENTINCK said, he wished that, instead of merely asserting it, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork had pointed out some instance of the intolerance of the Church of England. Take the case of church rates. Had the Church of England been intolerant in that matter? The members of that Church had used all their efforts to settle that question in a just and equitable manner. And who had thrown obstacles in their way? Hon. Gentlemen opposite, who were the advocates of unconditional abolition. Who were the most intolerant parties—those who approached the matter in a spirit of fairness, or those who demand the complete surrender of the rates? With regard to the Universities, hon. Gentlemen opposite were not disposed to settle that question unless all the endowments which belonged to the Church of England were given up. The friends of the Church had always said, "Come to these institutions to be educated;" but their opponents said, "We will not settle the question until you give up all the endowments left for the Established Church." Who, then, had been the tolerant party upon that subject? The point in this case was whether or not the Fellowships and foundations of Trinity College were to be appropriated to others than Members of the Established Church in Ireland, and he could not support such a proposition. The hon. Member had stated that the Roman Catholics had always been ready to advocate the rights of the Dissenters in England; but might there not have been a tacit understanding between those parties that if the Roman Catholics helped the Dissenters to pull down the Established Church in England, the Dissenters would help the Roman Catholics to pull down the Irish Church? The hon. Member had made use of terms in reference to the King of Italy for which he ought to rise in his place and offer an apology. He (Mr. Bentinck) had always personally been in favour of denominational education; on that ground he had steadily supported the Maynooth grant. Still, however, the toleration exhibited by himself and hon Members in his neighbourhood ought to meet with some return, and all they asked was that, having permitted denominational education in respect to a Church of which they were not members, the members of that Church should extend the same privilege to them. If the Roman Catholics enjoyed the advantages of denominational education, why should they seek to deprive the members of the Church of England, which included all the upper and middle classes of this kingdom, of the same benefits?

MR. WHALLEY said, that having for many years, during which he had endeavoured to bring under the notice of the House the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholics, recognized the disinclination of the House to enter into a discussion of these matters, he intended to abandon further attempts in that direction within the House. He would not discuss the details of the question until the occupants of the Treasury Bench stated whether in their opinion it was desirable to encourage the spread of the Roman Catholic religion. He wished, however, that the House should consider what it was the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church aimed at when they spoke of equality. In a local newspaper of the 15th of July, Dr. Goss, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Liverpool, was reported to have used certain words, on a former occasion, in reference to the Queen's Supremacy, which had a particular significance, when taken in connection with a book lately published by Dr. Cullen, in reference to claims to the allegiance of the people of England superior to those of Her Majesty, and containing an exposition of the indefeasible right of a descendant of the Stuarts to the Throne of England. Dr. Goss was reported to have stated—

> "They knew that Queen Victoria held Her power, not by Divine right, but by the will of the people, for the Stuart was set aside first by his own unnatural daughter, aided by William of Orange, who usurped the Throne, and then subscribed an Act of Parliament which vested the succession in the English Crown. Therefore, the Queen did not assume Her power by Divine right, but by the will of the nation. She had the same power exercised by Cromwell, the Protector, who beheaded Charles the First, because he held his power by the voice of the nation."

In reading this passage to the House he had discharged a duty—to bring this subject under the notice of the Attorney General.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

MR. FAWCETT said, he could not have voted for the Amendment, not because he objected to its principle, but because it raised an issue different from that which he had endeavoured to raise as clearly, as distinctly, and as simply as he could in the Resolution he had submitted. The Amendment related simply to the University. His Resolution had reference to the endowments of the Colleges, and sought to do in respect of Trinity College what had been done by the House with regard to the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge—namely, to give to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, whatever their religious opinions, the right to enjoy the endowments of the Colleges.

Main Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 108; Noes 108:

And the Numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker stated that this was an abstract Resolution, which if agreed to by the House would not even form the basis of legislation; but undoubtedly the principle involved in it was one of great importance, and if affirmed by a majority of the House it would have much force. It should, however, be affirmed by a majority of the House, and not merely by the casting vote of its presiding Officer. For these reasons he declared himself with the Noes.

CHURCH RATES ABOLITION BILL.

(*Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Baines, Mr. Trevelyan.*)

[BILL 13.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Hardcastle.*)

MR. ACLAND said, he had notified his intention of moving the re-committal of the Bill for the purpose of considering the following additional clause:—

> "The restoration or rebuilding of any Church situated in a parish in which a landowner has land, or the building of a new Church in such parish, shall be deemed to be an improvement of land within "The Improvement of Land Act, 1864," and all the provisions of the said Act shall apply accordingly; moreover, for the purposes of the said Act as amended by this section, an Archbishop, Bishop, Rector, or Vicar, or other person holding any ecclesiastical benefice, shall be deemed to be a landowner in respect of the lands held by him in respect of his see or benefice."

He thought it advisable that in passing a Bill of this nature provision should be made by which equitable and voluntary arrangements on the part of landowners for the support of the Church fabrics in rural places might be facilitated. As the landlords were likely to benefit by the abolition of church rates, it was only right that an opportunity should be afforded them of voluntarily and permanently aiding the Church funds. Since the Bill passed through Committee, he had used his utmost exertions to ascertain the views of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen upon this subject; but he had been totally unable to ascertain their opinions or to obtain their support to the adoption of any intermediate course. As hon. Gentlemen on his own side of the House were anxious to send this Bill to the Lords, he should, in the absence of any indications of support from the other side of the House not propose his Resolution.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Gorst.*)

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 129; Noes 99: Majority 30.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SUNDAY TRADING BILL—[Bill 34.]

(*Mr. Thomas Hughes, Lord Claud Hamilton, Sir Brook Bridges.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Penalties for selling, offering, and exposing for Sale).

Mr. LOCKE said, he believed the House was not aware of the nature of the clause it was about to pass. It enacted that no person could hawk, carry, sell, expose for sale, or deliver any goods except as thereafter mentioned. It was very extraordinary that such a clause as that should be prepared. It would include any person selling an orange, a newspaper, a Bible, a prayer-book, a psalm-book, or, in fact, anything. The hon. Member for Lambeth (Mr. Hughes), who introduced the Bill, would do well to postpone it until the new Parliament assembled, because it was admitted that the present Parliament did not represent the bulk of the people. See what the household and lodger franchise would do with the Bill. If the people chose to restrict themselves they had a right to do so, but he would not consent to curtail their

privileges. The House of Lords had twice rejected Bills of the kind, because they did not think it possible to make people religious by Act of Parliament. The hon. Member for Lambeth appeared to found his Bill on the evils of the New Cut. It was very hard that so strong a measure should be passed because there were inconveniences in the New Cut. Why should not persons be allowed to do what they pleased if they did not inconvenience anybody else? He would ask the hon. Gentleman not to go on with the Bill.

Mr. THOMAS HUGHES said, it was evident the hon. and learned Member for Southwark had not read the Bill—especially that part relating to excepted articles—or listened to the discussion on the Motion for a second reading. The sale of oranges and newspapers was not interfered with. Everything he had advanced was considered by the House on a former occasion, and yet the Bill was read a second time. He declined to enter into a fresh discussion on the general principles of the Bill, but assured his hon. and learned Friend that there were some places in his own borough which as much needed the sanitary and economical reforms this Bill proposed as the New Cut. He, too, thought it undesirable to attempt to make people religious by Act of Parliament.

Mr. SCHREIBER said, he wished to ask the Attorney General, whether the provisions of the Bill respecting excepted articles would nullify the effect of the Act of Charles II. with regard to those articles? If so, Sunday Trading would be on a better footing under the Bill than it was at present.

Sir BROOK BRIDGES said, that the hon. and learned Member for Southwark seemed to think that the evils dealt with by the Bill did not exist. He was of a contrary opinion, and thought the Bill a step in the right direction. Representations had been made to him on the part of the lower classes highly approving the measure. It was certainly not an attempt to make the world religious by Act of Parliament.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he wished to ask the hon. Member for Lambeth, whether this Bill was to be limited to the metropolis? The 4th clause provided that any prisoner previously convicted would be subject to imprisonment with hard labour for not less than six months. That he thought was a very large power to leave in the discretion of a magistrate.

Mr. BRADY said, he was opposed to

the whole principle of the measure. The Bill had not received the consideration it ought to have had. He knew very well the neighbourhood to which allusion had been made in Lambeth, and he knew also that the Bill did not emanate from the poor working people, but from certain shopkeepers who thought their interests were interfered with by the competition of the Sunday shops. It was well known that many of the working men did not obtain their wages from their employers till between eleven and twelve o'clock on Saturday night; and sometimes their employers were even obliged to borrow from the publicans in order to pay their workmen. How could the poor man who had to walk home, perhaps five or six miles from his work on Saturday night, find opportunity to buy until the Sunday morning? The Bill would work a great deal of moral injury to the labouring classes. If this Bill were passed it would be morally impossible for the poor to procure those articles which were absolutely necessary for their sustenance. The poor should have an opportunity of purchasing their necessaries as well as the rich, and the one should not be deprived of this privilege any more than the other. He moved that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Brady.*)

MR. POWELL said, that the remarks just made were in favour of the Bill. The payment of wages on Saturday night was one of the greatest evils under which the working classes laboured, and if it could be remedied by any Act of Parliament he should be most happy to support such a proposal. The Bill was not a shopkeepers' measure, and the better class of shopkeepers were indifferent to it so far as their own interests were concerned. The small shopkeepers, on the other hand, who were obliged by the strength of competition to keep open their places on Sundays, would be themselves the first to rejoice if Parliament took the matter in hand and relieved them from so irksome a duty by compelling all without distinction to close their shops. The hon. Member for Lambeth had on a former occasion stated that the Bill consisted of two parts — one being for the suppression and the other for the legalizing of certain trades on Sundays. He (Mr. Powell) could not sanction any Bill that proposed to legalize any branch of Sunday trading. He should like to know whether the hon. Member for Lambeth would support a clause for keeping in force the Act of Parliament of the reign of Charles II?

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, the Bill had been very ill-drawn, and he believed no tradesman, not even if he had received an University education, would understand what he might do under it. He could not believe that it had been drawn by a lawyer. He had discussed the matter with tradespeople, and a hairdresser had said to him, "You'll support us, of course?" "Oh, no," was the answer; "Why should I?" "If we shut up on Sundays," said the hairdresser, "others will open." He told him that did not matter, asked him whether he had no moral feeling, and assured him that if he did not get his reward in this world he would in the next. The hairdresser did not seem to understand this at all, although he explained to him that the cabmen who did not run on Sundays got their reward in this world. The small trades-people looked at the question on very narrow grounds, talked of their little ones, and the loss of profits. He objected to the Bill also because it was a persecuting measure. The penalties were increased to an extraordinary extent. If a poor man were found guilty under the Act, he would be liable to cumulative penalties, so that he might have to pay £10 or £20 for a single day. He wished the pretended friends of the poor, who were in reality their bitterest enemies, would act a little consistently by proposing to shut up the Zoological Gardens and Clubs, and the other places of resort of the wealthier classes. He believed the Bill a worthless jumble, and that the greatest folly into which the pretended friends of the poor could fall was to attempt to make people religious by Act of Parliament. He could not understand why, if the Bill was a good thing, it should be limited to places having 10,000 inhabitants or upwards. In most parts the Sunday was very well observed, and the people were becoming more and more religious. These harsh restrictions would create great disgust.

MR. THOMAS HUGHES said, that he regarded the Act of Charles II. as inoperative; attempts had been made in his own borough and in other places to carry it out. The present Bill would be a partial substitute for it, but in other cases that Act would remain unaffected. He did not propose to apply the Bill to country towns, because he did not know whether it was wanted there.

The Committee *divided :* — Ayes 20 ; Noes 82 : Majority 62.

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Certain cases to which this Act does not apply).

SIR BROOK BRIDGES said, he moved the insertion of "butcher's" before "meat." There were preserved and other meats, which he thought should not be dealt with. If opposed, however, he did not press his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR BROOK BRIDGES moved the omission of the words "fish, poultry, and game."

MR. LOCKE said, he could not but remark on the difficulty in settling exemptions, and on the absurdity of this kind of legislation. Some would wish to exempt eggs, others bacon, others sausages, and others cigars. He objected, moreover, to nine o'clock being the hour after which no purchases should be made, since working men did not like to be forced to get up early on the Sunday morning, and the churches were not opened till eleven. He could not understand who had asked the hon. Member for Lambeth for this Bill. Working men who objected to buying after nine were quite at liberty to abstain from doing so, but why should they ask Parliament to prohibit it? They must be excessively fond of legislation, and must think that Parliament, even though it had Reform to deal with, was in want of a job.

MR. BARCLAY said, he would propose to insert "ten" instead of "nine" in line 6, with the view of rendering the operation of the Bill less stringent to the working classes.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he thought "poultry and game" might be omitted from the list of articles allowed to be sold.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he was sure the Bill could not go on.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress, to sit again *To-morrow.*

RAILWAY COMPANIES RELIEF BILL.

On Motion of Sir WILLIAM GALLWEY, Bill for the Relief of Railway Companies as regards their Agreements to work unprofitable Branch Lines, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir WILLIAM GALLWEY and Mr. BERESFORD HOPE.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 279.]

BANK POST BILLS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HUNT, Bill to render perpetual an Act passed in the Session holden in the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth years of Her present Majesty, intituled "an Act to permit, for a limited period, compositions for Stamp Duty on Bank Post Bills of Five Pounds and upwards in Ireland, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HUNT and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 281.]

INDEMNITY BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Secretary GATHORNE HARDY, Bill to Indemnify such Persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for offices and employments, and to extend the time limited for those purposes respectively, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary GATHORNE HARDY and Mr. HUNT.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 280.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, July 25, 1867.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Church Rates Abolition* (256); Dundee Provisional Orders Confirmation* (257); Wexford Grand Jury* (258).

Second Reading—Banns of Matrimony (216); Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge) (235), *negatived ;* Naval Knights of Windsor* (252).

Committee—Railways (Scotland)* (162); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (221).

Report—Vaccination* (239).

Third Reading—Naval Stores (No. 2)* (234); Sir John Port's Charity* (206), and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Real Estate Charges Act Amendment [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 69]; Chatham and Sheerness Stipendiary Magistrate [30 & 31 *Vict* c. 63]; Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 62]; Court of Appeal Chancery (Despatch of Business) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 64]; Turnpike Trusts Arrangements [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 66]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 65]; Judges' Chambers (Despatch of Business) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 68]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 67].

BANNS OF MATRIMONY BILL—(No. 216.)

(*Lord Houghton.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD HOUGHTON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that it related to a matter which was of ecclesiastical and antiquarian interest, and at the same time of practical importance; its object being to remove the doubts which appeared to exist, respecting the proper time of publishing banns of marriage in church. People had been so accustomed to hear the banns of matrimony read after the Second Lesson that it might appear almost superfluous to raise any doubt on the subject; in point of fact, however, grave doubts had arisen, and legislation was necessary. A case which came before Baron Alderson led to a judgment which showed that the law on the subject was not settled, and it was well that all doubts should be set at rest. He found in the Report of the proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation that some of the clergy were in favour of having the publication of banns take place after the Nicene Creed; but the almost universal custom was to have the publication after the Second Lesson, and this Bill would confirm that practice. The main object of the publication of banns was to give them publicity, and that publicity could be much better secured by publishing the banns at the Morning Service than would be the case if they were published at the Evening Service. The present Bill would indemnify any clergyman who had hitherto published banns at a wrong period, and establish the legality of all such marriages. He believed that in the other House of Parliament there had been no serious opposition to the Bill; and he hoped that their Lordships would now give it a second reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Lord Houghton.*)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, he had no objection to the second reading, though he thought there was some doubt as to whether the first clause should be adopted before a decision was come to by the Commission, which was considering this among other subjects.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD did not object to the Bill being read a second time, because it would remedy an evil; but he did not think Parliament ought to settle in a hurried manner any absolute time at which the banns should be published. The noble Lord (Lord Houghton) was mistaken in supposing that it was the almost universal custom to publish the banns after the Second Lesson. In many churches the custom was to publish them after the Nicene Creed. There should, however, be no question as to the legality of the marriages which had already been solemnized at whatever time the banns had been published, and it was most desirable that the indemnification clause should be passed.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON said, that while the question remained in uncertainty, banns would continue to be published at two different times in different churches. The object of the publication of banns was, that any person who objected to any particular marriage should be present and have an opportunity of making his objection; and if the time were not fixed the person who wished to object might suppose that the banns were not to be published on that day, and the very object for which banns were published would be lost through the uncertainty which existed as to the time. He therefore thought it would be infinitely preferable to pass this Bill than to allow that uncertainty to remain.

LORD LYVEDEN inquired as to the time at which the Report of the Commission was likely to be drawn up.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that as the Commissioners were very widely separated as regarded residence there was a difficulty in getting them together to consider the Report. The matter was of great importance. They had had a great deal of evidence on the subject of the publication of banns, and the impression which that evidence had made upon his mind was that the publication of banns was perfectly illusory. The object of publishing the banns was to give a notification to those persons who might be interested that a marriage was about to take place; but for that purpose the publication was of no use whatever. They all knew from their own experience that in the great London parishes when banns were published no one attended to them at all. In the country persons in general had a great objection, when they were about to be married, to having the banns published in their own parish, and the consequence was that they procured a fictitious residence in another parish and got the publication performed elsewhere. He should be glad to see banns swept away altogether, and some other method devised for giving notice to those interested. But it appeared that there were in many cases most distressing doubts as to whether marriages which had taken place were legal in consequence of the time when the banns were published, and those doubts he thought Parliament ought instantly to set at rest. The publication of banns was not a religious matter, and it did not signify one farthing whether banns were published after the Second Lesson or after the Nicene Creed. He hoped most earnestly that there would be no postponement of this Bill, which would set at rest the uncertainty at present existing.

Lord DE ROS observed that in some of the country churches in Ireland there was no publication of banns at all.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Friday* the 2nd of *August.*

TESTS ABOLITION (OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE) BILL—(No. 235.)

(*The Earl of Kimberley.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that the object of the measure was to enable persons to share in the government of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge without any test as to their religious persuasion. In bringing forward such a measure he felt a very deep sense of responsibility. Having been himself educated at Oxford, and having a deep respect and regard for his University, he could assure their Lordships that he should not make such a proposition had he not come to the conclusion, after serious reflection, that it was calculated to improve and benefit both that and the sister University. He would first state to their Lordships the progress this measure had made in the other House. A Bill, not precisely the same as the present, and applying only to the University of Oxford, was introduced into the House of Commons in 1864, and passed a second reading by a small majority; but it went no further that Session. In 1865 it was introduced again with a similar result. In 1866 a Bill almost the same as the present was introduced, and passed its second reading by a majority of 114; but it was driven off to so late a period of the Session that it was unable to pass through its remaining stages. It was again introduced during the present Session, and so great was the progress which it had made in the opinion of Members of the House of Commons, that the second reading was agreed to without a division. In Committee a proposal was made which materially altered the character of the Bill, applying its provisions to the University of Cambridge as well as to the University of Oxford, and that alteration was carried, in a House of more than 400 Members, by a majority of 83. The Bill came up to their Lordships, therefore, recommended by a very strong expression of opinion in the other House, and he was sure it would receive, under these circumstances, the fullest consideration from their Lordships. Now, at present, the state of the law on this subject was different at the two Universities. At Oxford, until 1854, all persons were obliged on matriculation to declare their unfeigned assent to the Thirty-nine Articles —clearly a most unwise requirement—but under the Act of that year that provision was abolished, and no religious test was imposed at matriculation or on taking the degree of B.A. On proceeding, however, to the higher degree of M.A., all persons were obliged to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles and to the tests imposed on clergymen, one of the oaths pledging them to use only the Book of Common Prayer in public service and in the administration of the Sacraments. They had also to subscribe to the Ratifications of the Thirty-nine Articles, one of which stated that Queen Elizabeth was Queen of France—a rather singular proposition. These tests were obviously intended for persons in Holy Orders only, and it could not be reasonable to require laymen to promise to use the Prayer Book in public service and in the administration of the Sacraments; and if, moreover, it was preposterous to require young men to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles before taking their B.A. degree, it was equally preposterous to require them to do so on taking their M.A. degree. He maintained that absurd as it was to require young men to subscribe *ex animo* to the Thirty-nine Articles, which contained according to some 500, and according to others 900 distinct propositions on the most abstruse theological questions, it was not much less unwise to require such a test from laymen at any age. He believed there were many men who were attached members of the Church of England, but who were yet unable conscientiously to subscribe to everything contained in the Articles. At Cambridge the circumstances were rather different. Under the Cambridge University Reform Act of 1856, persons not belonging to the Church of England might proceed to the M.A. degree without any test; but before becoming Members of the Senate at Cambridge or of the governing body of the University, they must subscribe tests which could only be taken by members of the Church of England; so that in effect no person could become a member of the governing body of either University without taking the test. Before discussing the objections to Dissenters being members of the governing body it was well to understand the nature of that body. At Oxford the principal governing body was the Hebdomadal Council, consisting of the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Proctors, six Heads of Houses, six Professors, and six elected members of Convocation; and it was a singular fact that several of the Professors were not required to take any test, so that, without being members of the Established Church, they might be elected to the Hebdomadal Council. The governing body of Cambridge only differed from that of Oxford in certain details. He might rest the defence of this Bill on the ground that it was not probable that any large number of persons not belonging to the Church of England would become members of Convocation, and that the infusion of so small a body of Nonconformists would not produce any material change. But he should not be dealing candidly with their Lordships if he did not say that the Bill rested upon a broader ground. The principle of the measure was that the great Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were, in fact, national institutions, and that they ought to be open without distinction of religious opinion to every subject of the Queen. To say that Nonconformists were dangerous persons and not fit to be entrusted with the education of youth at the Universities was an argument only intelligible of bygone times and not of the present day, when they had already broken down the system of exclusion, and Nonconformists and members of the Church had a right to be placed on an equality up to the degree of Bachelor of Arts. If they excluded Dissenters, it must be on the ground that the Universities were exclusively Church corporations. He, however, maintained that the Universities were essentially lay corporations. He would not assume, as some asserted, that the Nonconformists amounted to one-half of the population, for that was probably an overestimate; but they were a very important body in the State, comprehending many men of wealth and intelligence, and he believed it to be of great importance that they should have access to the Universities and be admitted to a share in their government. What were the dangers to be apprehended? It was said that the Bill would interfere with the religious teaching of the Universities; but it did not interfere with the theological degrees or teaching of the Universities. The Bill was confined to the Universities properly so called, and did not interfere with the Colleges; and the government of the Universities still remained with Convocation, which consisted wholly of members of the Church of England. It was not essential that Examiners at Cambridge should be Masters of Arts; they might be Bachelors of Civil Law, and an Examiner might be a Jew or a heretic. He maintained that this Bill would be an advantage not merely to Nonconformists, but also to the Church itself. It would be a great advantage to the Nonconformists to be subject to the influences of the Universities. They would be brought into contact with bodies of a venerable character, and nothing would be more likely to remove that narrowness of opinion with which they were sometimes charged. The Bill would be an advantage, on the other hand, to the Church, because the contact with persons not of her communion would be sure to engender a more comprehensive spirit. He was afraid that the Bill was likely to be severely opposed; for, to his great regret, he found that the noble Duke the President of the Council, the Minister of Education of the present Government, gave notice the other night of his intention to propose the rejection of the Bill. He did not expect such a Motion from a Member of the Government, because the Government had offered no opposition to this Bill in the Commons; but now the President of the Council, specially charged with the education of the country, came forward and said on behalf of the Government that it was not fitting that the Universities should be opened to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, but that they ought to be maintained as narrow Church corporations on ancient Conservative principles. He believed that these narrow views were as much out of date in Church matters as in political legislation. He asked their Lordships to pause before they rejected this Bill. If they passed this Bill, and if there should come a time of danger to the institutions of the country, the Universities would be the rallying point of all that was good and wise; if, however, they rejected it now, he ventured to prophecy they would have to pass it in a short time, and then, instead of being regarded as a graceful concession, it would be held as inflicting a humiliating defeat on the Church of England.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Kimberley*).

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that the noble Earl had truly reminded their Lordships that the Bill proposed to re-open a question that had been very recently under their consideration. In 1854 an Act had been passed, after very mature deliberation, regulating the future government of the University of Oxford: in 1856 a similar Act was passed regulating the University of Cambridge; and both those Acts were based on the Report of a Royal Commission which had carefully inquired into all the changes that were necessary. Now, his first objection to this Bill was, that, after so short an interval as thirteen years in one case and eleven in the other, it re-opened questions which were then maturely considered, and asked Parliament to revoke its deliberate decision, and, to some extent, to stultify its previous legislation. The noble Earl had not brought forward a single argument for now propounding this measure. If it had been shown that circumstances had changed, and that a large number of Dissenters had entered, or were anxious to enter, the Universities, or if it had been shown that opinion had long been divided on the matter, their might be some justification for asking their Lordships to review their legislation on this subject. But the noble Earl had not been able to adduce any such reasons, or to show why any new system should be adopted, except that many Dissenters were anxious to obtain greater influence in the Universities, and chose to describe themselves as "branded" by being excluded from them. He wished to draw their Lordships' attention to what the noble Earl had said with regard to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The noble Earl had correctly stated the present position of the law. At Oxford no religious tests were required at matriculation, or on taking the Bachelor's degree in Arts, Law, or Medicine; but a test was required before taking the Master's degree, which conferred a seat in Convocation. At Cambridge the law differed in this respect—that the minor degree and the degree of M.A. might be taken without any test, and persons not members of the Church of England might even vote in the election of Members of Parliament for the University, but no one could be a Member of the Senate without declaring himself a *bonâ fide* member of the Church of England. When this Bill was first introduced it was consequently confined to the University of Oxford, but it had since been extended to include Cambridge. It could not be pretended, therefore, that any stigma or brand was imposed on Nonconformists at Cambridge, and the existing system had worked perfectly well, for a large number of Dissenters were graduates, and Roman Catholics and Jews might also take degrees. Indeed, the debates in the other House in 1864, 1865, and 1866 turned wholly upon Oxford, and this was the first occasion on which, not content with making an important change in that University, the promoters of the Bill had extended its application to Cambridge, notwithstanding the opposition of a large majority of the members of that University. The Bill, as drawn, somewhat concealed its real purpose. It drew a distinction between offices tenable by laymen and those for which degrees in divinity were required, and it seemed unreasonable, *primâ facie*, to impose on laymen the same declarations as those imposed on clergymen. The real issue, however, which it raised, was not whether some of the tests related to events long past and required amendments in their terms, but whether persons not members of the Church of England, and, indeed. directly opposed to it, should be admitted into the governing body. The noble Earl (the Earl of Kimberley) had told them that the Colleges were not included in the Bill: now the fact of excepting the Colleges was a strong argument against the Bill, for why should the Universities be dealt with in a way different from that of the Colleges? According to Clause 3, if a Fellowship were attached to a Professorship in the University, a person admitted to the governing body might not be a member of the Church of England. When they came to consider what the effect of this would be upon the Convocation at Oxford, it was important to bear in mind what were the duties of Convocation, which was entrusted peculiarly with the whole government of the University. The object of this Bill was to introduce an alien body into Convocation, and to give them the rights and powers of interference with the government of the University. It was quite fair that the principle of the Bill should be raised; but it was also fair that the issue should be put clearly before their Lordships, and that upon that issue their Lordships' decision should be based. In order to show the drift of the measure, he would read a few sentences from the speech of the very able Gentleman who introduced the Bill and had charge of it in the House of Commons. It would then be seen that the ground taken up by the promoters of the measure was not merely the admission of persons not connected with the Church of England to the benefits, powers, and privileges of the governing body, but also the abolition of all religious tests and teaching of whatever kind. The words of Mr. Coleridge were—

> "It must be plain, I think, to any one who studies the signs of the times, and who lives at all amongst educated men, that the Church will be obliged greatly to widen her gates and largely to liberalize her tests if she is in any way to retain within her communion the substantial majority of men of religious feeling and religious thought. . . . Can any fair man doubt that already the Thirty-nine Articles are costing us dear?"—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxv. 1221-2.]

Now, that was a fair position to take up, and the line of argument a fair one; but let it not be thought that the argument could be one-sided. It was the fashion of certain highly cultivated and intellectual people to object to religious tests, and to maintain that in these days, when thought ought to have a large amount of expansion, anything which should circumscribe religious opinion should be put an end to. But their Lordships should remember that if that were done in one direction it should be done in another. Their Lordships had been lately engaged in some warm debates on a subject which was now creating a great deal of interest throughout the country, and had heard language of a very fervid character from a noble Earl who was accustomed to urge the House with great eloquence to pass measures which should stay the influx of Popery into the Church of England, and prevent religious ceremonies gaining ground within her which were contrary to her doctrines and principles; but were their Lordships prepared to adopt the line of argument laid down by Mr. Coleridge, and to say that they would widen the gates of the Church of England, do away with the Thirty-nine Articles, and abolish religious tests—that they would do all this in one direction and not do it in another? He maintained that unless they upheld the essential features of the Church of England in the case of the Universities, any legislation on the subject of Ritualism which might take place in consequence of the Report of the Commission would be at variance with the principles of justice. What would be the effect of admitting to the governing body of the Universities persons of different religious opinions? Was there anything more likely to excite religious discord and increase religious animosities? Could there be anything more detrimental, more poisonous to the state of society, than to have the governing body of the Universities composed of men of every variety of creed which was known to exist? There could be but one solution to the difficulty—the Universities would become purely secular institutions—if peace and harmony were to be secured they could be secured only on such a basis. But were their Lordships prepared to place those great institutions, which guided the minds of the youth of this country, on a purely secular foundation? He would put a case in point—they knew how great the influence of Dr. Newman was at Oxford in former years, and there had been a pet scheme in certain quarters to establish a Roman Catholic College in Oxford; the idea had been frequently mooted, and if facilities had been granted it might have been founded there. Let their Lordships conceive what would be the effect of this measure if Roman Catholics were admitted to the governing body:—for with respect to Dissenters he acknowledged that the case was different, because on the main principles of Christianity Protestants of all denominations were united—but let their Lordships contemplate the harmony which would be likely to exist when the principles of the Church of England and those of the Church of Rome were brought into antagonism in the governing body. He must further oppose the Bill because it was totally at variance with a principle which had always been upheld by the legislation of this country. Not very long ago the Act was passed relating to endowed schools and a great deal of debate arose on the subject. It was asserted with a certain amount of justice, that, as these endowments were given in the first instance for the benefit of the Church of England, they should be appropriated to that purpose; but, on the other hand, it was not deemed fair to exclude children or other denominations from the advantages of the schools, and therefore in 1860 an Act was passed providing that persons not belonging to the Church of England might be ad-

BIBL. LONDIN

mitted to the schools, but that none should become Governors unless they were of the religion of those for whom the schools were originally intended. That principle was also carried out with regard to the national schools. Where, in thinly peopled localities, there were not means for supporting two schools it had been thought fit to enable persons not belonging to the Church of England to benefit by the education of the Church of England schools, and to introduce the "conscience clause" for their protection. But had the question been seriously raised that persons not belonging to the Church of England should have any part in the direction of those schools which were mainly supported by the contributions of the members of the national Church? The same principle was applicable to the great Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. He thought their Lordships would agree with him that this subject had not been well or happily brought forward. The state of things at Cambridge was a perfectly fair one; and there was no difficulty in acceding to the proposal that Oxford should be placed in the same position, so that persons should be able to take their M.A. degree without subscribing a religious test—subject, of course, to the condition that to enable any person to form part of a governing body of the University he must be a member of the Church of England. But the promoters of the Bill were not satisfied to accept this as a fair compromise, and showed their *animus* by including Cambridge in the Bill, though the system there was as fair as it could be consistently with the rights of the Church. He would only read in conclusion the statement made by the learned Gentleman who introduced this Bill into the House of Commons—a Gentleman of the highest honour and candour, who scorned not to make the House fully aware of its true objects and purposes. Mr. Coleridge said of the Bill on that occasion—

> "But, on the other hand, I should not be dealing candidly with the House if I disguised from it that the Bill put forward a very important principle. It will establish the nationality of the University as against the Church of England; it will destroy its exclusive character, and change its constitution.".—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxv. 1425-6.]

It was because he was not prepared to advise their Lordships to change the constitution of our ancient Universities that he begged to move them to read this Bill a second time this day three months.

Amendment moved, to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months.")—(*The Lord President.*)

The Duke of Marlborough

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE said, that among those of their Lordships who were connected by office with the Universities, it was not improbable that he should be the only supporter of this Bill. It was with sincere regret that he found his opinion at variance with those which he had no doubt preponderated in the University of Cambridge, for it would be much more gratifying to him to support by his vote in that House the opinions entertained in the University upon any matters which were thought to affect its interest. With respect to the state of opinion in the University of Cambridge, one of the Petitions he had just now presented was from the University in its corporate capacity. That Petition met with no opposition, and must be considered as representing the sense of the authorities of the University. The other Petition was signed by 170 resident members of the University, and by twelve out of the seventeen Heads of houses. The whole number of resident members was about 280; that was the number on what was known as the electoral roll of the University. Thus, upwards of 100 resident members of the University had not signed the Petition. He did not mean to say that all those who had not signed it were in favour of the Bill. No doubt some might have been prevented by absence, and others might have formed no decided opinion upon the subject; but he believed he might say on good authority that two-sevenths of the resident members approved the Bill. Now, considering in how great a degree the resident members consisted of clergymen, and how easily, as all experience showed, the apprehensions of the clergy were excited upon any measure which in their view might possibly affect the privileges of the Church, he did not think that such a minority as he had described was either unimportant or insignificant. Now, what were the objections taken to this Bill? One had been alluded to by the noble Duke, and was put prominently forward in the Petition of the University. They complained that Parliament should think itself free to deal with this question at all. They urged that it was only a few years since the affairs of the University passed under the yoke, and an Act received the Royal assent, effecting considerable alterations in the constitution, the government, and the educational concerns of the University generally; and they said they had a right to expect that Parliament would not again interfere in the affairs of the University. Now, to a certain extent, he was willing to admit the force of this objection. Upon this, as upon every other question, he thought that it was most undesirable to disturb, without very strong reasons, arrangements which were considered at the time to be a settlement of any question, and which were accepted as such at the time by the parties concerned. He thought it would be very unreasonable and impolitic to introduce measures effecting alterations in the principal provisions of the Bills passed upon the subject of the University unless it could be shown distinctly that the intentions of Parliament at the passing of those Bills were evaded. But the question of the relations of Dissenters to the University appeared to him to stand upon a different footing. It was not originally intended to include that subject at all in the Oxford and Cambridge Bill. When my noble Friend below me introduced the Bill, he said he was in favour of the admission, but thought it unadvisable then to deal with that subject. It was only by an Amendment introduced in the House of Commons that the subject was in any respect included in the Bill. The case of the University of Cambridge no doubt differed considerably from that of the other University. Larger concessions were made at Cambridge than at Oxford; but anyone who would read the debates at that time in the House of Commons would see that the arrangements made with respect to Dissenters were treated by all those who advocated their admission as altogether unsatisfactory, incomplete, and such as could not be regarded as a settlement of the question. It appeard to him, therefore, that so far as the admission of Dissenters to the University was concerned, Parliament was not precluded from again entertaining that question. But the principal objection made to the Bill, one which lay at the root of all the opposition to it, was that which had reference to the connection between the University and the Church. He was of opinion that that connection, as far as regarded the purposes for which it was valuable, would not be in danger of sacrifice by this Bill. What were the aspects in which the Church of England character of the University was particularly manifested? They appeared to him to be these:—The course of religious services in the chapels of the several Colleges was, as far as he was aware, at Cambridge, at least, the only form of religious instruction required by the Heads of Colleges, and these were exclusively the Services of the Church of England. Again, there was the fact—a most valuable and important one in its influence on the whole nation—that a large proportion of the clergy of the Church were educated at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. With respect to the first point, the Bill would not have the slightest effect upon the Colleges; at least that was true in regard to the University of Cambridge, and he did not think it would have more operation in the Colleges of Oxford. So far as the provisions of the Bill extended, the Heads and Fellows of every College at Cambridge would still remain members of the Church of England. He did not wish to be misunderstood upon this question. He was not opposed to another Bill in the House of Commons, which had passed the House of Commons, and which, to a certain degree, repealed the Act of Uniformity, and it was quite true that if that Bill became law, the Colleges would be at liberty to propose Nonconformists to their Fellowships. It would be a wild and extravagant idea to suppose that the Church of England character of those Colleges would be appreciably diminished. The Colleges would be unaffected by this Bill, and there was not the slightest reason to suppose that the religious services of the Colleges would be in the slightest degree interfered with. This remark applied also to the question of young men designed for Holy Orders resorting to the Universities. Fortunately for the Church of England, their general education was the same as that of other young men; and it appeared to him impossible to conceive in what respect this Bill would operate so as to prevent their joining the Colleges. It was quite true there was a certain theological examination, but that was purely voluntary. It was said that the Bill struck a blow at the connection between the Church and University by admitting Dissenters to the governing body, and there seemed to be a mysterious notion of the mischievous influences which would be exerted by the presence of Dissenters in what was called the governing body. It was quite true that if the Bill passed Nonconformists would be admitted to the Senate of the University of Cambridge; he was not sufficiently acquainted with the University of Oxford to say whether it would be the case there or not. No doubt, the Senate was the legislative body of the University, but it could only decide questions submitted to it by the Council of the Senate, and it therefore became important to consider how the Council was constituted. It was elected of Heads of houses and other members by what was called the electoral body, and this consisted almost exclusively of Fellows and Heads of houses. This Bill made no alteration with respect to the electoral body, which would consist, as at present, exclusively, or almost exclusively, of members of the Church of England. This was pretty good security that no Dissenting influence was likely to be felt strongly in the Council, and no measure would be entertained by the Senate which had not received the sanction of the Council. It was well known that non-resident members of the Senate did not take a prominent part in the affairs of the University, and that all practical questions affecting the regulation of the University were virtually decided by the resident members. Even if Dissenters were to become more numerous than there was any reason to suppose they would in the Senate, there was really no change in the religious character of the University which they could be desirous of affecting. The only subjects of a religious character which entered into the examination were the *Acts of the Apostles* and *Paley's Evidences of Christianity;* the examination in these subjects was very simple; a certain number of Dissenters passed it every year; and he was not aware that in a single instance any objection had been raised by a Dissenter. There was therefore really no great grievance to Dissenters in the character of the examination. The facts, then, were that Dissenters would not be able to exercise any great power in the Senate; and, if they could, there was not any object for which they would desire to exert it. Perhaps it might be urged as an objection against this Bill that it would remedy a merely sentimental grievance; but, if no mischief would follow from the admission of Dissenters, why were they to be placed in a position of inferiority? Unless mischievous consequences were likely to ensue from their admission, we had no right to expose them to inequality. In one of the Petitions from the University, reference was made to the Report of a Commission of Inquiry of the University of Cambridge, and a passage from that Report was quoted in such a manner as to suggest that the Commissioners opposed their authority to this Bill. The Commissioners were very eminent persons, intimately acquainted with, and equally attached to, the University, and the passage of their Report referred to would hardly bear the construction put upon it. They said that the question of the relation of Dissenters to the University was not one upon which they were expressly called on to report, and they therefore confined themselves to indicating the principles on which the question ought to be considered. As this part of the Report possessed considerable importance, he would ask their Lordships' attention to this extract from it—

> "Beyond this line there lies another and a larger question, on which we do not enter—namely, the expediency of admitting persons to degrees in arts, and law, and physic, who are not members of the Church of England. The subject would present comparatively few difficulties if it involved only the conferring of a certificate and title of academical proficiency. But the real difficulty lies in another point, whether the internal system of collegiate discipline and the course of academical administration could be so adjusted as to comprehend persons of different religious opinions, without the neglect of religious ordinances, the compromise of religious consistency, or the disturbance of religious peace. Not seeking to disguise our impression of the greatness of the difficulty, we yet desire to express our sense of the importance of the question itself. The University is a great national institution invested with important privileges by the favour of the Crown or the authority of the Legislature. It exercises a most extensive influence on the education of the higher and middle classes of the community, and, consequently, on the intellectual, moral, and social character of the nation. But its capacity of exercising this high prerogative fully and completely must depend on its keeping pace with the progress of enlightened opinion, and moving in sympathy and unison with the spirit of the age. It is one of the noblest characteristics of our times that the barriers which so long excluded so many of our fellow-subjects from the equal enjoyment of civil rights on account of differences in religious opinion have happily been removed by the prevalence of a generous and wise policy. The University will be placed more or less in a false position if it estranges itself from this great movement of liberal progress. There is a manifest and intelligible challenge to it to throw open the advantages of its system of education, under proper securities, as widely as the State has thrown open the avenues to civil rights and honours. Undoubtedly, many of the endowments of its Colleges are connected with the Church by links which it would be an injustice to sever. Its school of theology is identified with the Church and incapable of a separate existence. But as a great school of liberal education for the lay professions, for the pursuits of general literature and science, for the business and offices of active and public life, it should seem to be capable of a

> freer range and a more extended usefulness without any compromise of duty or apostacy of principle. Were it to enter on this more open course in a spirit of generous magnanimity, it might draw to itself a yet larger measure of public sympathy and even find increased safety in thus identifying itself with the liberal policy of the age."

Now, it certainly appears to me that that would be entirely in agreement with the objects of the present Bill. When they state that certain endowments were connected with the Church, it might not unfairly be inferred that there were other endowments which might, without injustice, be conferred upon Dissenters. There were various Professorships in regard to which it was impossible to assign any reason why they should not be open to Dissenters. Then, again, a member of the Senate had no endowment at all; and he did not believe that any of the persons who signed that Report would object to the admission of Dissenters to the Senate of the University. He might mention that two of the Commissioners were non-resident members of the University—namely, the noble and learned Lord the Master of the Rolls and Sir John Herschel; and he wished particularly to point out that the other Commissioners were men who had passed the greater portion of their lives in the University, and were therefore practically conversant with the details of the University system. The Chairman was the late Bishop of Chester, who had been tutor and subsequently Master of Christ's College. Dr. Peacock, the late Dean of Ely, also sat upon the Commission, as did also a gentleman still living—Professor Sedgwick, whose fame was sufficiently well known to their Lordships. He had been informed that the Professor cordially approved the present measure. It was important to recollect that the three Commissioners whom he had just referred to were gentlemen whose sincere attachment to the University was beyond all suspicion. He might likewise refer to the name of the Secretary to the Commission, and although, of course, it did not necessarily follow that the Secretary approved the Report in all respects, still it might be assumed that he agreed with it generally. The Secretary was Dr. Bateson, at that time Public Orator of the University, and now Master of St. John's College. He had no authority to state what opinion Dr. Bateson entertained in regard to this measure; but, at all events, his name was not appended to the Petition which had been presented against it. Now, it was alleged by the Petitioners that the attempts to legislate on this subject had already produced mischievous consequences in the University; but could any one suppose that if the present measure were rejected by their Lordships the subject to which it related would be allowed to drop? No one who had paid careful attention to the history of the gradual removal of religious disabilities in this country could doubt that this question would be continually brought forward in the other House of Parliament, and few could entertain any doubt as to the ultimate result. The agitation said to have been already produced by this question would be increased rather than diminished by the rejection of this Bill. For his own part, he was convinced that the sooner this question was settled the sooner would the University relieve itself from the reproach of retaining a system of exclusiveness. For that reason he should give his vote most cordially in support of the second reading of the Bill.

THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH said, that, as no Member of the House had spoken from that Bench, he would venture, as one, the greater part of whose life—neither a short nor an inactive one—had been devoted to endeavours to implant the University more deeply in the affections of the people and to extend its influence, to claim a right to address their Lordships for a very few moments. Of the results of the endeavours in which he had co-operated he had no cause to be ashamed. The charge, in a great measure, of the character of the academical studies, the reform of the University itself, and the establishment of the middle class examinations, which showed how the University had won the confidence of the country, were matters in which he had been permitted to take a share. It was with regret, therefore, that he felt compelled to support the Motion of the noble Duke which tended to the rejection of the Bill. He had availed himself with satisfaction of the aid of Parliament on a former occasion; but the aid of Parliament was then given to remove shackles which the law had itself imposed. He desired that the University should have fair play, and that free scope should be given to the deep public spirit which he knew animated those who were regarded in some quarters as narrow-minded and bigoted. This he would have done, but the law had placed on the University and Colleges shackles which could not be removed without the aid of Parliament. At one point, however, he was forced to stop. The Preamble of the present Bill resembled in some respects the Preamble of the Bill of 1854, but there were two words which had been rightly, honestly, but, he was grieved to say, necessarily omitted. The Bill which was introduced by the noble Earl opposite, the late Prime Minister, began with the same words as the measure now under discussion, "Whereas it is expedient," but it went on to say, "for the advancement of religion and learning." No one, however, could pretend to say that the present measure was intended to advance religion; indeed, the utmost that could be said of it was that it might, perhaps, not impede the progress of religion and learning. At that point, he was bound to stay his hand, and the hands of others if he were able to do so. Gladly would he admit more and more to the benefits of that University to which he owed all, and in particular the honour of addressing their Lordships; gladly would he extend to others what he valued so much himself, were he not restrained by the highest considerations for the interests of the University and of the Church of the country. The whole of the argument which had been adduced in favour of the Bill was based on a fallacy. It had been said that the Universities were national. Now, there certainly was a high and a great sense in which he, for one, would never disclaim their nationality, but the word "national" was very vague, and according to the maxim, *Dolus latet in generalibus*, perhaps it might be said that the Universities were national, because the nation was their parent, but he denied that they were national in that sense. Centuries and centuries ago, before the House of Commons was even thought of, and when their Lordships were only imperfectly sharers of the Government, voluntary associations of men repaired to the banks of the Isis and of the Cam, attracted bands of scholars around them, and admitted them, when sufficiently instructed, to the ranks and duties of teachers. Such was the origin of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; such was the origin of degrees. The Universities of London and Durham, and other new creations, might owe their degrees to the favour of the Sovereign or of Parliament, but that was not the case with respect to Oxford and Cambridge. Then, were the Universities national in another sense? Were the Universities supported by the State? They were not. Of themselves they were not wealthy. The wealth they possessed was owing to their own frugality, to their own skill, to the way in which they had administered their affairs, and in a great degree to the endowments of the Professors, which he himself had joined in establishing. The Universities could not, therefore, in that sense be considered national. But did he disclaim their nationality in another sense? They overshadowed the nation, they tended to form the national character, and so far they affected the history of the world. They had devised a system of education which inquiry after inquiry had proved to be in the main the best and soundest yet devised. In that sense they were national, because they conferred benefits on the nation. If the Universities were great, they were great not because they were national, but they were national because they were great. Was he to question the right of Parliament to interfere with the Universities? He would do nothing of the kind. Their Lordships had heard that evening that the Legislature might do what it pleased. But the pleasure of Parliament was not caprice; its pleasure was to be limited by reason. Parliament might interfere with the Universities, as it had done before; but in doing so it ought to be guided by justice, prudence, expediency, and even delicacy. They had been interfered with advantageously; but let their Lordships call to mind the manner in which the noble Lord who had brought about the measures to which he was referring had acted in the matter. He wrote a letter to the Duke of Wellington, couched in the most courteous language, and acknowledging the great advantages which the Universities conferred upon the country. Further still, the Commissioners were appointed in a spirit of fairness, the University of Oxford having been requested to nominate one of them. Under the Government of Lord Aberdeen negotiations were carried on with the Universities, and when legislation had taken place the measures consequent on it were carried out in a spirit of fairness. The subject before their Lordships was not one which ought to be left to this or that individual Member of the Legislature. Any measure dealing with the Universities ought to be brought forward with the full sanction of Her Majesty's Government. Many of the flaws pointed out during the debate could be—and he believed, if the

Bill were rejected, would be—dealt with by the Universities themselves; and he, for one, would recommend them to take the matter into their serious consideration, and make such changes as might be thought desirable spontaneously, and with all the liberality that was consistent with their duty to God and the Church. He had, he thought, disposed of the argument that the Universities were national. Parliament had not founded them, nor had it given them their wealth. It could, however, interfere with them; but there was strong reason why it should not interfere with them in the manner proposed. It was said that the Bill would make but a very slight concession. If it would admit only a small number, as was contended, was it worth while—was it wise for that end to wound and irritate the feelings of the many? But would the result be small? Was the question at issue really that which had been brought forward? It was said that the effect of the measure would be the admission of certain Christian Nonconformists to the government of the University. But how stood the case? The scholarships, the prizes, the honours, and the first degrees, which were the only test of merit, were open to all men without distinction of creed, or nation, or colour. But they were told that not to throw open Convocation was to put a brand upon the Nonconformist. That view he considered could not be sustained. Was a brand put upon him (the Bishop of Peterborough) because he was not allowed to interfere in the government of Maynooth College? Surely the term was too strong for the occasion. It was no hardship for a man to be excluded from the management of a body whose creed was entirely different from his own. But in fact the test did not exclude the great body of Wesleyan Methodists, the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland, and many other Dissenters. It did, however, exclude those who rejected Christianity altogether in its essence. The abolition of the test would, in point of fact, be the removal of every obligation to profess any creed whatsoever. If it were abolished, a Professor might stand forward and avow any of the forms of unbelief which were included in the materialistic philosophy which prevailed in many of the Universities of Germany. Would they like their sons to be educated in a University where one Professor could as freely deny the existence of a God as another could denounce the Episcopal government of the Church? They were told that Democracy and Conservatism were now synonymous terms,—and he was willing to admit the new political nomenclature. It should be remembered, however, that there could be a good and a bad democracy; it might be a wise form of government, respecting institutions and over-rating that which was venerable. On the other hand, it might be a malignant and destructive form of government, but sure he was that if the new form of government were to prosper it would respect bodies like those on whose behalf he pleaded. It would be tender, and even indulgent towards them, and venerate those great truths which were the glory of the nation.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, he had heard with surprise and regret the speech of the noble Duke the President of the Council. The Bill under consideration having passed its second and third reading in the House of Commons unopposed by the Government, he had, until he heard the remarks of the noble Duke, been under the impression that the Government agreed with its principle. He hoped they would hear from some Member of the Government whether the Cabinet were united in their opposition to the Bill, or whether the noble Duke had merely expressed his own individual opinion. If the Government were opposed to the measure they ought to have come forward in the House of Commons and stated their objections to it. They did not, however, think fit to do so. They did not divide against the Bill, but allowed it to pass; and it was therefore a not unnatural conclusion that the Cabinet approved of its provisions. He had also listened to the speech of the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Peterborough) with deep regret. He alluded to the progress of Democracy, but the conclusion which he (the Duke of Somerset) would draw from the increase of Democracy was, that if, after the new franchise came into operation and large masses of the working classes were admitted, the same Liberal ideas prevailed in the country that prevailed now, they would not long be able to resist the measure which was now proposed. The political power which they were now about to give so largely to the working classes would vastly increase the power of Dissenters in England. These were a body that were peculiarly apt to act together on political questions, and the result would be that they would not rest satisfied till this question, on which they felt so strongly was settled. Was it wise, then, to unite the poorer class of Dissenters against them in a matter of this kind? It would, he contended, be wise to allow Dissenters the privileges which this Bill proposed to give them, and thus encourage them rather to support than to seek to destroy the institutions of the country.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, his chief object in rising was to call the attention of the House to certain remarks that had been made on a former occasion in reference to the Act of 1854. It was truly observed by the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Devonshire) that when that Bill was originally introduced to Parliament by the noble Earl opposite it did not contain any provisions for the admission of Dissenters, and it was also correctly remarked by the noble Duke that the admission of Dissenters was provided for by a clause moved by Mr. Heywood in the House of Commons, and inserted in the measure. The noble Duke went on to say that the admission provided for in that Act was not at the time regarded as satisfactory. Now, it so happened that that Bill was one of the first measures which he (the Earl of Carnarvon) took some share in debating in Parliament, and he could say that both the supporters and the introducers of that Act disclaimed in the most distinct manner any intention of interfering with the government of the Universities, which was in the hands of the members of the Church of England. He had been looking into the debates that took place at that time, and he had marked some passages in three speeches which he desired to bring under the notice of their Lordships. The first was contained in a speech of Mr. Gladstone, who introduced a Bill into the House of Commons. That right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I hold that the discipline and government of the University of Oxford is, and should be, in conformity with the principles of religion held and taught by the Church of England."

The second was to be found in a speech delivered by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) who said—

> "The governing body of the University and the Colleges should be composed of those who belong to the Church of England."

The third was in the speech of a noble Duke not now present, and whom he could consequently mention—the Duke of Argyll—who said—

> "It appeared to him that in this clause the entire governing and teaching powers of the University of Oxford were carefully preserved; and, so long as that was the case he had the most thorough and sincere conviction that these extensions would tend to strengthen the bonds of the Church of England." — [3 *Hansard*, cxxxiv. 1364-5.]

He read these extracts to show what opinion was held on this matter by those who were responsible for the Act of 1854. He thought the University of Oxford had cause to complain that after that Act was passed she was not to be allowed sufficient time to work out the constitution then given to her. It was given to her, and she accepted it in perfectly good faith, and she had since acted with the *bonâ fide* intention of giving effect to it. The introduction, therefore, of these small Bills was to be deprecated; for after all they only touched a small portion of a large question, which nearly every one admitted should be dealt with not piecemeal but as a whole. Instead, however, of such a policy as that being pursued, they had Bills introduced year after year touching this point and that point separately, and it was impossible to say what would be the result if such a course were insisted upon. It was not fair to deal with the Universities in this way; any institution would have a right to complain of the constant recurrence of these small Bills, *à fortiori*, a great seat of learning, whose whole course of study and discipline ought to be as little disturbed as possible. Paradoxical as it might seem, the Bill was open to objection, both as being too small and too large. The Bill had been described as raising a great principle—the nationality of the Universities against the exclusiveness of the Church of England. He thought that a great question of this kind ought not to be raised upon such a measure. There were two or three Bills before the House of Commons dealing with some other part of the University question, and it was only right and reasonable that their Lordships should have these Bills before them, so as to deal with them altogether. If, on the other hand, this was the small question it had been represented by some to be, then he maintained that the course of academical studies ought not be disturbed except on some case of urgent importance. Under these circumstances, he hoped their Lordships would pause before they gave the Bill a second reading. A noble Lord had told their Lordships that the prospects of Reform made it desirable to settle this question. If the passing of this Bill would effect the settlement of this question, it would be a strong reason in its favour;

but the Bill only touched one point in the University question, and could not be expected to lead to its settlement. Their Lordships had now before them a Bill which, whether for good or for evil, effected an enormous and gigantic change in the Constitution of the country. The present measure, however, belonged to a large class of questions which would have to be considered by the new lights and the new conditions of a new Parliament. He strongly deprecated their coming, then, to any decision upon the subject at what he might call the close of one Parliamentary dispensation and the commencement of another.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, that the present Bill affected the University of Oxford, and, as he was one of their Lordships who had been most lately a resident of that University, he wished to say a few words. When a measure was brought forward, on the acceptance or rejection of which depended the extension or contraction of the University, he thought that all who loved and reverenced her were bound to come forward and raise their voices, however feeble they might be, in her behalf. The Bill was in harmony with the legislation of the last thirty years, which had all tended to the abolition of penal laws, and the removal of religious disqualifications. Echoing the sentiments which had been expressed on the other side of the House, he appealed to their Lordships not to stultify themselves, but by passing this measure to adhere to the course which they had hitherto pursued with so much honour and so much success. He denied that the Universities could be in any sense of the term regarded as national institutions so long as they confined their benefits to members of the Anglican Church. The resident members of Convocation might have petitioned against the Bill, but all the members of that body were not ecclesiastics, and every Master of Arts had a right to express his opinion upon the subject. It had been said that the existing test did not exclude Presbyterians from the benefits of the University; but he was acquainted with the case of a Presbyterian who was excluded because he could not conscientiously sign the Thirty-nine Articles. The noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) told their Lordships that Parliament had legislated on this subject in 1856, but had not public opinion changed since 1856? Had it not changed since last year? Had it not even changed during the present Session, during a period of ten minutes? Then it was said that the Bill would interfere with the religious education of the Universities. But did the members of the University ever receive any religious education from the University as such, beyond attending two or three University sermons and being examined two or three times in the schools? Then, too, an attempt was made to frighten them with the old cry that the Church was in danger, and the wedge — the thin end of which it was said, they desired to insert—was burnished up and brought forth shining and glistening as if it had never been used before. Was it to be believed that the very strongest Establishment that this world had ever known, and which had been in existence for 300 years, was to be afraid of a few Dissenters? It could not seriously be argued that by admission of a few Dissenters to the governing body, or even to Fellowships, the existence of the Church of England would be imperilled. It seemed to be assumed that there was some necessary connection between the Church of England and the Universities, but the testimony of lawyers was against the theory that the latter were ecclesiastical foundations. No doubt it was desirable that the clergy should be educated there; but unfortunately the word "literate" now very frequently occurred in the list of persons admitted to Holy Orders. To object to the admission of Dissenters argued either fear or exclusion for exclusion's sake. On the former hypothesis there must be some intellectual inferiority in members of the Church of England, which he entirely denied: the latter involved the principle of protection, which had been abandoned in every other department. He asked who had petitioned in favour of the Bill? Were there not among them some of the greatest and most learned men the University of Oxford had ever known? Had their Lordships put before themselves the injustice which now existed? A Churchman and a Nonconformist entered College together, competed together for College and University prizes, entered the schools together, took their B.A. degree together, and it was only when the crowning of their academic career came—in virtue of no merit or examination, but merely of the lapse of a certain number of terms—that the University made a difference, receiving the conforming Anglican lamb within the fold, and leaving the Dissenting goat to wander in the wilderness. Let them take care that by refusing to deal with this question now they did not hand it over to those who would force upon them a stronger measure, in which the Colleges as well as the Universities might be concerned. Let them not by their vote to-night prevent the University of Oxford from becoming truly national. She asked them to take away that restriction which alone prevented her from being so ; she asked them to open her doors, and to allow them to remain open to the admission of all. He disclaimed all party feeling on this question, and indeed he believed that neither side of the House regarded it in that spirit. If this Bill were rejected those who supported it must proceed to attack the citadel itself, confident that success would attend them in the end, and that they would one day find the doors opened and the flag pulled down. In conclusion he implored them not to reject this Bill, which he looked upon as one of the most important of the Session.

Lord ARUNDELL of WARDOUR, as holding the principle of a State-Church, felt bound to adhere to that principle alike when it operated for and when it operated against him. The Bill might benefit a perhaps increasing number of Catholics, but he should never ask for any concession which he should be unprepared to make in his turn to others. On the broad question his principles were substantially identical with those of noble Lords on that (the Ministerial) side of the House. It was only fair to noble Lords on the other side to say that if the case were reversed he could not vote with them.

The Duke of ST. ALBANS said, that he could speak for this cruel instrument of moral torture from his own knowledge of its working at the University of Cambridge. He could remember there one instance of a student who took high honour in mathematics, another who gained the first degree in the same science—the Senior Wrangler of the year. These gentlemen should have received the final rewards as students, rewards in which their Colleges as well as themselves were interested. But one held the tenets of the Baptists; the other was a member of that other communion which was acknowledged by the Crown and Parliament as that of the State across the Northern border. The tests stood before them to debar their further advance, with the bribe of worldly advantages and its threat of worldly degradation, to tempt them to lie to their God and themselves. He could well remember, on account of the painful impression it made on the minds of their fellow-students, for further advancement to them was impossible, how they went away with the slur of Nonconformity and eccentricity, and took from the scenes of their early triumphs that excellence which would have had its scope there so usefully. Were they likely to be better friends of the Church of England? Mr. Goldwin Smith said—

> "By tyrannizing over conscience you can hardly fail to arouse a rebellion against your tyranny, which will probably be carried by the sense of wrong far beyond the bounds of rational resistance."

The Halls and Colleges of the two Universities, like other establishments of the kind, owed their existence to the piety or impiety of persons of former times. The clergy, then the only educated class, became their natural heads, and these great centres of national education, if not originally granted, lapsed to the Church. But at the present day the laity, as a body, were in advance of the priesthood, even on their own subjects. He would remind those who claimed the Universities for the Church of England, on account of the gift and intention of the founders, that if this were to hold good the Church of Rome should have more than half the Colleges. The question really which this Bill involved was—did the Universities belong to the Church or the nation? If they were to be national, Anglican tests should be abolished, and their duty be national. If they were to be looked upon as a means for propagating Anglican opinions, they should impose their tests at the commencement and not at the end of the academic career. Goldwin Smith asked—

> "Is it to secure unanimity of opinion on religious subjects in the Universities you impose these tests?

In truth, the greatest diversity existed in Cambridge and Oxford, and it existed also in the Church of England, in spite of all these tests. He would go further, and ask if the right rev. Bench itself was marked by such unity? But if the danger was said to be the opening of the Senate, the governing body of the University, to Dissenters, he frankly confessed he did not consider an entire clerical Government a wholesome one. At Trinity College, Cambridge, the pensioner who was lowest in the social grade of undergraduate life redeemed his presence at the College chapel by a fine of money. The soul of the fellow-commoner was priced more highly; while the nobleman's salvation was commuted at the highest price. It would surprise their Lordships to learn that the great College of Trinity, with all her lands and all her wealth, stooped to increase her stores by a fine for non-attendance at the holy Communion, which was levied on all—Christian, Jew, or infidel. All that was proposed by this Bill was to remove tests imposed by political power on candidates for literary and scientific degrees. This Bill had received very careful attention in "another place," and without presuming, as one of the younger Members of their Lordship's House, to seem to impugn their right of discussion, he should be sorry if the country were led to the belief that those Bills which had in view the removal of religious intolerance had no chance in that House.

EARL STANHOPE said, that in the interesting speech of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Camperdown), which they had heard with much pleasure, he was surprised to hear him ask what Petitions had been presented against the Bill. The noble Duke the Chancellor of the University of Cambridge (the Duke of Devonshire) might have supplied him with an answer, for it might be remembered that he had presented a Petition, not merely from individuals, but from the University of Cambridge as a corporate body, against the Bill.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, that the question he had asked was not who had petitioned against the Bill, but who had petitioned in its favour—whether eminent men, both at Oxford and Cambridge, had not done so?

EARL STANHOPE was sorry to have heard the noble Earl imperfectly. As regards the Petition which he had last mentioned, and which had been presented by the noble Duke, he was far from saying that the wishes of the Universities were to be held as absolutely conclusive on the question; but he would say that when the wishes of the Universities had been publicly and deliberately expressed to both Houses of Parliament it behoved their Lordships to see that, without grave cause, those wishes were not set at nought. In his early days when they were discussing a Reform Bill he remembered that great objection was taken to those who wished to proceed slowly, and they were called "bit-by-bit Reformers." Now he objected to the system of bit-by-bit Reform with respect to the two Universities. Like a noble Friend who had spoken before him (the Earl of Carnarvon), he maintained that if they wished to deal with the question of religious disabilities in the Universities they ought to deal with it as a whole, and not from year to year and bit-by-bit. He would not deny that a change in the tests might be made with great advantage. He would admit that with certain guards and limitations to be carefully defined, various academical degrees might be fairly open to those who had not subscribed the religious tests. But this Bill made no distinction, and was liable to the charge of opening the government of the Universities to those who were not Members of the Church of England. The noble Duke who had spoken last (the Duke of St. Albans) asked to whom should the Universities belong—to the nation or to the Church? He answered—to both. To the Church as well as to the nation, because it was the national Church. He maintained that, as long as they recognized an Established Church the government of the two Universities should not be dissociated from the principles of that Church. The noble Earl, to whose speech he had before referred, pointed out how strong the Church of England was; but if the noble Earl only considered the divisions with which it was threatened from within and the many enemies that assailed it from without, he might perhaps come to the conclusion that he had over-rated its strength. In his opinion, all reforms obtained from the body itself which was the subject of reform were more stable and satisfactory than any which were forced upon it from without. Now there was no reason to suppose that the two Universities would not even willingly and gladly relax their rules, so far as they could do so, short of surrendering the control of the governing party. It must be remembered that a new constitution was given to each of these Universities no very long time since, and it was unjust to assume, so shortly after their new constitution, that they were indisposed to accept any practical improvements that could be suggested. He had some little experience in these matters, since during a short period he had the honour to act as an Examining Tutor in one of the public schools at Oxford. He had always found on the part of the University authorities an anxious desire to adopt measures of a liberal and progressive character, short of surrendering the

University to the sway of those who dissented from the doctrines of the Church of England. Was this unreasonable? Could their Lordships wish that the Universities should be dis-associated from the Church of England? While admitting that there were points which he was willing to concede, and relaxations which might properly be made, he believed that the Bill required much more deliberate attention than it had hitherto received. He regretted that the proposal to assimilate, in the first instance, the system of the two Universities, which was a just and politic proposal, had been so coldly received. Without denying, therefore, that improvements might be safely made, he trusted that their Lordships would not sanction the second reading of this Bill, and he should be prepared, without any hesitation, to vote in opposition to it.

EARL RUSSELL: I wish to state as shortly as I can the reasons upon which I shall vote in favour of this Bill. I agree in thinking that there is considerable difficulty in dealing with a question of this kind, which is brought before the House fragment by fragment, and when we do not know the extent to which the House of Commons proposes to go. This Bill has passed the House of Commons with the general assent of a large majority of the House, and with the tacit consent of the Government, though it is met here with a decided negative from the noble Duke the President of the Council. Every noble Lord, therefore, must consider to what principles he will adhere with respect, not only to this Bill, but to other Bills of this kind. In former days, at the beginning of last century, a most able book was published by Dean Stanhope as to the principles on which the Legislature should act; and he used able arguments to show that men should not be admitted to seats in the House of Commons and the House of Lords, or to offices under the Crown, unless they belonged to the Church of England; because, if they did not, there could be no reliance on their support of existing institutions. But, my Lords, able as that argument was, and much as it prevailed for some time, it has been broken down—first, by the admission of Protestant Dissenters into the House of Commons; next, by the declaration of Parliament that Protestant Dissenters should be admitted to office; next, by the measure which admitted Roman Catholics to office and to Parliament; and lastly, by the admission of the Jews and the relaxation of the oaths which placed certain very offensive restrictions upon the Roman Catholics. Having proceeded thus far, I think it is necessary for us to consider, having entirely abandoned these principles of the last century, upon what principles we are to stand at present; and, in considering this, it seems to me that you cannot stop short of this principle—with regard to everything that is properly and strictly ecclesiastical, you must leave the Church of England untouched and unaffected, in order that it may be maintained and preserved; but with regard to those institutions which are not properly ecclesiastical, which are more of a lay character, and which ought to be for the general benefit, in that case you should give the nation the advantage of those institutions, and should not confine them to any class. Looking, then, at the Universities from this point of view, I cannot adopt the principles laid down by the right rev. Prelate. I find that in former times the Universities followed the rule I have mentioned. In the reign of Edward VI. they were Protestant. When Queen Mary came to the Throne the Heads of Houses were immediately changed, and Roman Catholics were appointed. When Queen Elizabeth succeeded, those in turn were ejected, and Protestants were put in their places. So again under the Commonwealth, not a member of the Church of England but Dr. Owen, an eminent Presbyterian theologian, governed the University. I should say that the spirit of the age, and the principles upon which Parliament has acted in the present day, require that, in case of all civil institutions, persons of different religions should have perfect religious liberty, and should enjoy all the benefits which can be conferred by these institutions. In the case of such an office as that of Dean of Arches, who may be called on to decide questions relating to the Church of England, it may be quite right that the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) should choose the person whom he thinks most fit to be intrusted with those duties. It is certainly a part of the University system that theological instruction should be given, but it is not the main feature of the Universities even as they stand. While the religious instruction is strictly confined to the Church of England, very little of such instruction has been given. For my own part, I do not think that it is well to prevent Roman Catholics and Dissenters from attaining all the honours due in the University to industry and learning; it is invidious—it is grating, and most objectionable in point of feeling, to say that they shall not enjoy all the honours and all the privileges, exclusive of ecclesiastical honours or trusts, which the University can confer. It is in that way, and in that way only, that these Universities can become national. I admit that the principle goes further than the present Bill, but not further than the intentions of Mr. Coleridge. The noble Duke the President of the Council, who moved the Amendment, read a declaration of Mr. Coleridge, and ended by saying, "From that declaration I entirely dissent;" I, on the other hand, to that declaration of Mr. Coleridge give my full and entire assent. If a Dissenter attains to classical eminence, he ought to be allowed to become a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and I do not see that in doing so it is incompatible with the interests of that institution, or even with its high reputation in England and the world. I should wish to see, either on the suggestion of Mr. Coleridge, or by the assistance of the Government, something like a system framed and passed by the House of Commons, so that we could say "Aye" or "No" to it. I can find nothing in the way of obstacle to Bills of this kind in what the right rev. Prelate said when he affirmed that the endowments of these institutions had not come from the State. There may be some truth in the allegation that these endowments were left for purposes to which they are not now applied. Taking it as a question of the wills of founders, I am reminded of a remarkable discussion which took place in the House of Commons between two Friends of mine, Sir Robert Inglis and Mr. Sheil—"You surely would not depart from the wills of the founders?" said Sir Robert Inglis. Mr. Sheil thereupon went into the Library and returned with a large volume from which he read the directions in the will of William of Wykeham respecting New College at Oxford. One of these directions was that four or six of the brethren on certain days were to pray for the soul of the founder. Mr. Sheil said—

> "You must attend to the wills of the founders, or what becomes of the will of William of Wykeham?"

Sir Robert Inglis had an answer to that, and that answer is, I think, applicable to the present time. He said—

> "There was a great change of opinion in England, and a Reformation took place, and so made it necessary and made it right to act in a way different from that indicated in the will of founders."

I believe that was a good defence, and I say, in a similar spirit, that the times are changed; that now there is a wish that these institutions, which can be properly lay institutions, should be no longer the monopoly of the Established Church, but should be thrown open to the laity of England. If I am right in that—if that change has taken place, the House of Commons will be right in sending up Bills of this nature, and we shall be right in supporting them. It would be more convenient to have them altogether, and I should wish to have them together; but, together or separately, I must maintain the principles of civil and religious liberty which, I think, are involved in this Bill, and I should go contrary to my principles and convictions if I voted against it.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH said, he could not give a silent vote. While as a Dissenter he felt grateful for the relief which the Bill proposed to afford, he would warn their Lordships, lest in attempting to deal liberally they sacrificed a great principle. The second clause of the Bill provided that no person, on taking a public Professorship, should be required to subscribe to any article of faith, or to make any declaration on oath respecting his religious profession. For one, he would never cease to urge the necessity of maintaining some public recognition of religion in education. He was most hostile to a godless system, and was convinced that, if we did away with the test of religious belief, there was no knowing what mischief we should come to. Their Lordships would not expect him to be the apologist of the Church of England; but he thought they were bound, in the interests of the community at large, to see that there was a definite recognition of religion on the part of all who undertook to teach the youth of the country. There was no subject — except, perhaps, pure mathematics—in the teaching of which the mind of youth might not be more or less operated upon by a Professor. It was obvious that in history, geology, and many other studies, religious faith or the want of it in the Professor, might operate most mischievously upon students; and on this ground alone he must vote against the Bill.

LORD DENMAN said, the noble Earl

opposite (Earl Russell) had asked on what principle measures like the present would in future be opposed? He would reply, the principle was, that Dissenters should not belong to the governing body of the University. If, by the adoption of safeguards, Dissenters could be admitted to Fellowships, let them be admitted; but do not let every safeguard be abandoned. He looked upon principle as that which induced a man to suffer for his opinions. He much preferred to the noble Earl's family's original title to Woburn, the case of his own ancestor, of whom in a verse (with a fearful false quantity) it was written—

> "Rectorem Ordsalia Maria regnante remotum,
> Restituit Princeps Elizabetha Gregi."

He believed if Dissenters were to govern Universities and Schools, that such a scene as he had witnessed that morning (it being St. James's day), of the boys of the school where the noble Earl was educated attending Divine service, could not have taken place.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 46; Not-Contents 74: Majority 28.

CONTENTS.

Devonshire, D.
Grafton, D.
Saint Albans, D.
Somerset, D.

Camden, M.
Normanby, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E. [*Teller.*]
Lichfield, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.

Falmouth, V.
Halifax, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)

Chester, Bp.
London, Bp.

Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Cranworth, L.
Ebury, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Leigh, L.
Lyveden, L.
Monson, L.
Overstone, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Suffield, L.
Taunton, L.
Vernon, L.
Wentworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archp.
Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Abercorn, M.
Exeter, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Bradford, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cardigan, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Cawdor, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Denbigh, E.
Devon, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Home, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.

De Vesci, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Templetown, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Oxford, Bp.
Peterborough, Bp.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Bagot, L.
Boston, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L.
Castlemaine, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Crofton, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Feversham, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Hylton, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Lyttelton, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Redesdale, L.
Saltoun, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Strathnairn, L.
Thurlow, L.
Walsingham, L.

Resolved in the *negative*; and Bill to be read 2ª on *this Day Three Months.*

HYDE PARK.—QUESTION.

Lord EBURY inquired, upon whose responsibility the structures now in process of erection at Stanhope Street Gate were being built; and whether the further progress of the works could be stayed until an expression of some competent opinion could be obtained in regard to them? He wished to express his earnest hope that those very unsightly buildings would be altered in some manner, for otherwise they would become a permanent eyesore in one of the finest promenades of the metropolis.

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM replied, that in consequence of the proposed widening of Park Lane, it had been deemed advisable to add another story to the structures referred to. As to the architecture reliance had been placed on the well-known skill of Mr. Pennethorne. The contracts had been completed, and the

Lord Denman

works were so far advanced that it was impossible now to stay them.

Lord EBURY asked, whether instructions had been given for erecting hoardings round the buildings?

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM said, he was unable to answer that question.

Earl STANHOPE said, he did not rise to complain of the structures at Stanhope Gate, but there was another point to which he desired to direct the noble Duke's attention. The noble Lord the first Commissioner of Works was reported to have stated in "another place" that a portion of the iron railing in Hyde Park would be completed in October next, but that the remainder of the work would not be finished till July, 1868. It appeared to him that such a long delay was quite unnecessary. He begged to ask the noble Duke when the railings would be completed?

Viscount HARDINGE said, he could not agree with the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope) that the structures to which he had alluded were not to be complained of. In his opinion they were hideous, and he only wondered that an architect of such skill as Mr. Pennethorne had erected them.

Earl STANHOPE observed that he had expressed no approbation of the structure.

The Earl of HARROWBY said, that as Lord John Manners was such an admirer of the Gothic style, and had such an antipathy to the Italian, perhaps he had selected the worst specimen possible of the latter in order to bring it in disrepute.

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM said, that as the work referred to by the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope) was not in his department, he could not answer his question just then.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Eleven o'Clock till To-morrow,
Eleven o'Clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, July 25, 1867.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—George Dixon, esquire, *for* Birmingham.

Select Committee — *Report* — On Malt Tax [No. 470]; on Fire Protection [No. 471].

Supply—*considered in Committee*—Army Estimates.

Resolutions [July 22] *reported.*

Public Bills—*Resolutions in Committee*—Fortifications and Works; Courts of Law (Fees); Customs Revenue.

First Reading—Courts of Law (Salaries and Expenses)* [282].

Second Reading—Army Reserve* [148]; Militia Reserve* [149]; Indemnity* [280]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [281]; Office of Judge in the Admiralty, Divorce, and Probate Courts* [203], *discharged;* Merchant Shipping* [274]; Trusts (Scotland)* [266].

Committee — Poor Law Board, &c. (*re-comm.*) [271]; Admiralty Courts (Ireland)* [209]; Customs Duties (Isle of Man)* [253]; Weights and Measures (Dublin)* [263]; Dublin Metropolitan Police* [246]; Tancred's Charities* (*re-comm.*) [207] [r.p.]; Court of Chancery Officers* [235] [r.p.]; Guarantee of Government Officers* [223].

Report—Poor Law Board, &c.* (*re-comm.*) [271]; Admiralty Courts (Ireland)* [209]; Customs Duties (Isle of Man)* [253]; Weights and Measures (Dublin)* [263]; Dublin Metropolitan Police* [246]; Guarantee of Government Officers* [223 & 283].

Considered as amended — Canongate Annuity Tax (Edinburgh)* [210]; Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal* [245].

Third Reading—Galashiels Jurisdiction* [234]; Morro Velho Marriages* [265].

Withdrawn—Burials (Ireland)* [109].

EXPIRING LAWS.—QUESTION.

Mr. WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether any Bills will be brought forward during the present Session to continue the following Acts, which will expire before the end of the year 1867—namely, the Extradition Treaties Act Amendment Act, the Dockyard Extensions Act, the Locomotives on Roads Act, the Survey of Great Britain Act, and the Episcopal and Capitular Estates Management Act?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the Expiring Laws Bill would be introduced in the course of the night, and it would contain all the information which the hon. Member desired to have.

THE OATHS COMMISSIONERS.

QUESTION.

Mr. WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether any Bill founded on the Report of the Oaths Commissioners, or on the subject of Oaths generally, will be brought forward this year?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, the Report of the Commissioners was one upon which the Government would not be able to found a Bill. At all events there would be no Bill brought in this Session.

INDIA—THE INDIAN BUDGET.

QUESTION.

Mr. WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, On what day he will be able to give his Financial Statement on the Indian Revenues, &c. ?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he could not answer the Question to-night but he hoped to be able to answer it on Monday.

ARMY—THE SNIDER RIFLE.

QUESTION.

Major WALKER asked the Secretary of State for War, What number of rifles have been converted on the Snider principle up to the present date ; what number remain to be converted ; and, at what daily rate is such conversion now proceeding ?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that 216,223 rifles had at present been converted, and 133,777 remained to be converted. 350,000 would be converted by the end of March next, and they were going on at the rate of about 1,100 per day.

CATTLE PLAGUE.—QUESTION.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Council, Whether, with reference to a serious outbreak of Cattle Plague, which occurred in Essex last week, his attention has been drawn to the fact, as stated in a daily paper, that Cattle from Antwerp were landed at Harwich in the morning and inspected at night before they were sent up to the Metropolitan Market ; and, if so, whether Orders have been issued that the inspection of all imported Cattle should for the future take place in the daytime ?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that the outbreak was not so serious as was generally supposed. The only attacks during the present month in Essex were one beast, on the 12th of July, in East Ham Level, and six, on the 21st of July, in Barking Level. It was true that a great number of cattle were slaughtered by the owners on their own responsibility; only seventeen were slaughtered by order of the local authority. As to the cattle coming from Antwerp to Harwich, two calves and some sheep were brought over by the *Ravensbourne* ; they were examined between eight and nine o'clock, and the certificate was granted twelve hours after landing.

Lord EUSTACE CECIL : By twilight then ?

Mr. READ asked, whether the inspection took place after the twelve hours' quarantine; they were landed at half-past nine o'clock.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that the intention of the Order in Council was that the cattle should rest twelve hours before inspection, and that intention was acted on in Harwich, until it was learned that in London the practice was somewhat different, and that there the time of inspection was included within the twelve hours. The inspection began at eight o'clock in the evening and terminated at nine o'clock and the certificate was given at half-past nine o'clock ; so that the inspection terminated at the expiration of twelve hours after the landing of the cattle.

Mr. BRIGHT wished to know whether any other maladies, to which cattle were subject, were reported to the noble Lord's department ? He asked this question on the ground that there was a general supposition, as some hon. Members well knew, that many cases were said to be of cattle plague which were not so, that the price of meat in the country was unnecessarily sustained under this delusion, and in this way practically protection was established under the pretence of keeping out cattle which were diseased.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that cases of other diseases were reported, but not as cattle plague. They had reports of numerous cases of *pleuro pneumonia,* for instance. Wherever the inspector made an inspection and gave a certificate of cattle plague, whether it was cattle plague or not, they were bound to treat it as such, in accordance with an Act passed by the late Government in 1866, which made the certificate of the local inspector conclusive as to the occurrence of that cattle disease. The hon. Member for Birmingham was mistaken in his notion concerning a rise in the price of meat ; during the worst time of the cattle plague the rise in the price of meat was scarcely perceptible, and during a portion of the time it actually fell in price.

Mr. LIDDELL asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, whether it be true that, under the authority of the Privy Council, liberty has been recently given to the port of Sunderland to tranship cattle imported thither from abroad, and send them by sea to other ports; whether the cattle transhipment regulations of the port of Sunderland apply to all other ports of import in the United Kingdom; and, if not, why not; and if such cattle transhipment regulations be general throughout the Kingdom; what precautions the Government are prepared to take, by enactment or otherwise, to prevent the spread of cattle diseases imported from abroad?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU replied, that an Order in Council was passed on 16th July, which permitted the landing of foreign cattle in an island at Sunderland, the only communication between the island and the main land being by means of a bridge, and, of course, no cattle were permitted to pass over it. Under that Order the cattle have to rest for twelve hours on that island, and were then inspected, and might be shipped to other ports, where they must be taken direct to the slaughter-house. The Order only applied to Sunderland, because various local particulars prevented its application to other towns. Several requisitions had come from other ports, which were under consideration, and would be treated on their own merits. The Government so framed their orders that foreign cattle and home cattle should never meet together, except at the place where they were slaughtered.

DISTRICT PROTHONOTARIES LANCASTER BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. GORST said, he would beg to ask the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether it is his intention to propose any Amendments to the District Prothonotaries Lancaster Bill; and, if so, when Notice of such Amendments will be given?

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he had no Amendments to propose in this Bill, though he believed the Attorney General, who had charge of the measure, intended to propose some.

BLEACHING, DYEING, AND PRINTWORKS ACTS.—QUESTION.

MR. WILBRAHAM EGERTON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he intends to carry out the recommendations of the Committee on the Factory Act Extension Bill, that a Royal Commission should issue to inquire into the operation of the Bleaching, Dyeing, and Printworks Acts?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY replied, that he had made inquiries, and he was not sure that it would be necessary to issue a Royal Commission, but it would probably be necessary to have some inquiry made by competent authority.

THE CARRIERS ACT.—QUESTION.

MR. WILBRAHAM EGERTON said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, Whether he intends to introduce a Bill next Session to amend the Carriers Act?

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, that the Royal Commission on Railways had reported that the enumeration of articles in the Carriers Act required revision; representations which had been from time to time made to the Board of Trade fully bore out that conclusion. This point must therefore must be considered in framing any general measure. Whether this would be done next Session was more than he could at present say. Legislation in reference to railway matters was not a very easy or a very hopeful task.

NAVY—THE COASTGUARD.—QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE,

MR. CORRY stated, that service in the Coastguard did not count for time in respect of promotion, except in the case of one annual promotion on the special recommendation of the Controller General of the Coastguard, and, consequently, did not qualify Captains on the Reserved List to take the benefit of the recent Order in Council. With this exception, it was necessary that Commanders should serve one entire year in one or more of Her Majesty's ships employed on active service before being entitled to promotion.

NAVY—PUNISHMENT OF CADETS.
QUESTION.

MR. BASS said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he has made further inquiry respecting the mode of punishment of Cadets on board the *Britannia?* It was alleged from a great many quarters that excessive cruelty was practised on board that ship; and it was stated by gentlemen acquainted with the practice, and who had given their names, that when a Cadet was punished his legs and arms were tied to ringbolts so that he could not move, and that he was flogged by a birch broom which had been previously steeped in water to make it more pliant; that fifteen cuts were inflicted with it on the back, and that the doctors invariably attended. He wished to know whether the First Lord had made further inquiries on the matter, and if he retained the opinion he formerly expressed?

MR. CORRY said, in consequence of the statement of the hon. Member he had thought it necessary to make minute inquiry on the subject of the punishments on board the *Britannia*, and the result was a complete denial of any cruelty whatever. The allegation of a birch-broom instead of a rod being used was denied. It was a birch-rod precisely similar, though rather smaller, than that used at Westminster school. The other charges, also, were denied. [Mr. BASS: The arms are not tied to ringbolts?] Certainly not. But it is hardly necessary that I should go further into the case, as the Admiralty, having taken the whole subject into consideration, have thought it advisable that the punishment of flogging on board the *Britannia* should be discontinued. An order to that effect was issued by the Board of Admiralty on the 8th of last month.

FRANCE—THE FISHERY CONVENTION.

QUESTION.

MR. SHAW-LEFEVRE said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, Whether the Fishery Convention with France, the terms of which were agreed to by an International Commission in January last, has been concluded; and, if not, what are the reasons for the delay?

MR. STEPHEN CAVE said, the Convention was signed, he believed, on Thursday last. The ratifications had not yet been exchanged. His hon. Friend who put the Question and who bore so active and prominent a part in these negotiations knew how careful, he might say punctilious, the French Commissioners were in framing the various articles. This caution was exercised to a still greater extent by the legal Advisers of the French Government to whom the text of the Convention was referred. This led to frequent communications between the two Governments, and was almost the sole cause of the delay. There had not been an alteration or a difference of opinion as to any point of the smallest importance. The French in a most liberal spirit allowed us to act in reference to the most important arrangements as if the Treaty had been ratified. There was therefore less need for haste; and as it was impossible to print the Bill without the text of the Convention as finally agreed upon, and there was some question with the Scotch Fishery Board as to the repeal of certain Acts, it was thought on the whole better at this late period of the Session to postpone legislation to another year.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS BILL.

QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE GREY asked, Whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not think it would be expedient to postpone this Bill till another Session? Very extensive alterations had been made in it, and it certainly required full consideration.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that he was under the impression when he made the statement to the House the other day as to the probable conduct of public business, that no considerable, or, indeed, any opposition, would be offered to this Bill by right hon. or hon. Gentlemen opposite. If, however, he was to understand that any very considerable opposition was to be offered to the Bill, that would very much influence him in the decision at which he had arrived in regard to this Bill, as the time of the House was necessarily limited. He would consider the matter and give the right hon. Gentleman an answer to-morrow or Monday.

SIR GEORGE GREY said, he did not mean to imply that he should oppose the Bill; but he thought it would require very full consideration, and the subject was not pressing.

INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR asked the hon. and learned Member for Richmond, Whether, considering the lateness of the Session, and that opposition might be anticipated to this Bill, it was his intention to persevere with it?

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, that having undertaken the charge of this Bill, he should be extremely unwilling not to proceed with it this Session unless he found it absolutely impossible to do so. For his own part, if any or all of the Amendments of which notice had been given were carried, he should be disposed readily to acquiesce in the decision of the House, and proceed with the Bill. He could not undertake to withdraw the Bill. He desired to put a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer on another subject. He had given notice of his intention to move an Address to Her Majesty, praying for inquiry into several subjects connected with the administration of justice, in order to see whether, by the means mentioned in that notice, or by other means, the better administration of justice might be promoted. He should be glad to hear whether or not it would be consistent with the right hon. Gentleman's views that Her Majesty should be advised to issue a Commission in the sense of his Notice of Motion? If the right hon. Gentleman were not able to give an affirmative answer to that question, he (Sir Roundell Palmer) would be compelled to bring forward his Motion.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER replied, that he would give the subject his attention, and return an answer on a future evening to the hon. and learned Gentleman.

CHRISTCHURCH ORDINANCES BILL.

QUESTION.

In reply to Viscount Galway,

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER said, that he had no reason to believe that the House of Lords had altered this Bill in any material sense.

MEETINGS IN ROYAL PARKS BILL.

QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER wished to know what course the Government intended to take with regard to the Meetings in the Parks Bill? He hoped it was not intended to proceed with it; but if it was determined to do so, it would be convenient to know on what day it would be taken; and also when the amended Bill would be laid on the table and sent to Members?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the amended Bill ought to have been in the hands of hon. Members that day, but it would certainly be in their possession to-morrow. It was a Bill which the Government intended to proceed with, and hon. Gentlemen would have due notice. He could not say whether it would come on on Monday or not, but it should be at a convenient hour.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL.

QUESTION.

Mr. READ asked, When it was proposed to take this Bill, and whether there would be a Morning Sitting for it?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, the Contagious Diseases Animals Bill, which had come down from the Lords, would be taken probably at a Morning Sitting, of which due notice would be given.

TANCRED'S CHARITIES.—QUESTION.

Mr. DENT asked, Whether it was the intention of the Government to proceed with this Bill, seeing that it had been postponed so often?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he hoped to go on with the Bill; it had been postponed once on account of the illness of the hon. Member for Reading; a second time on account of the absence of the hon. Member for Scarborough who put the Question; a third time, in consequence of the unavoidable absence of the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire; and a fourth time, in consequence of the absence of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University, pending his re-election.

PRIVATE EXECUTIONS BILL.

QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with this Bill? He had had an Amendment on the Paper since the beginning of the Session, and had been here night after night watching the Bill, and he was afraid it might be brought on at one or two o'clock in the morning, when the state of his health would hardly allow him to be present.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that out of consideration to the health of the hon. Member, he would not proceed with the Bill this Session.

INDEMNITY BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. HADFIELD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether there was any intention on the part of the Government to introduce an Indemnity Bill this year? The House had been given to understand last year that the Indemnity Bill then introduced would be the last that was required, and he wished to know whether any steps had been taken to prevent the recurrence of the necessity for introducing such a Bill during the present Session?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, the legal Advisers of the Home Office had told him that it was necessary to have an Indemnity Bill again this Session, with a view to the protection of a limited number of persons holding civil and military offices or in the Queen's household, who might be liable to penalties under the Act *Geo.* III.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

QUESTION.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH asked, Whether this Bill was printed; and, if so, when it would be placed in the hands of hon. Members?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, that the Bill would be in the hands of Members tomorrow morning.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMY OF RESERVE—MILITIA BALLOT.

RESOLUTION.

Lord ELCHO said, he hoped that the House would deem the great importance of any question relating to the military organization of the Army of Reserve a sufficient excuse for the remarks he was about to submit to them upon the subject, and for his taking the liberty of drawing their attention to some points which, in his humble opinion, should not be lost sight of in dealing with this important question. Not very long since the attention of Parliament had been directed to the question of the organization of the army in consequence of some very unfortunate occurrences. After the successful termination of the war in 1815 the nation fell as it were into a state of apathy and self-sufficiency with regard to its military establishments. The result was that in the year 1835 those establishments were reduced to such an extent that, if he were not misinformed, in the whole of Great Britain not more than twelve guns fully horsed and manned could have been got together on an emergency. In 1845, in moving the Address, he had, with the ingenuousness of youth, expressed a hope that, with the existing commercial relations between the nations of Europe, the recurrence of the calamity of war would be rare if not impossible. Europe was, however, soon aroused from its state of fancied security. The Exhibition of 1851, instead of inaugurating an era of peace, had been followed by a succession of wars. In the Paris Exhibition of the present year the most successful display on the part of England was in the department devoted to improved weapons for the destruction of human life. In another way the spirit of this country had been exhibited by the formation of a body of 180,000 Volunteers, and the interest that was taken in military organization. They had now under consideration the fruits of the labours of the Commission appointed to inquire into the questions of the Army Reserve and the recruiting of the army. In a work published recently in France, entitled "The French Army in 1867," which, though anonymous, was known to be written by General Trochu, there was a passage to this effect:—

> "That it is peace, properly utilized, which forms good armies, and it is war, especially when prolonged, which disorganizes them."

And the same writer further says—

> "For a government to be caught by war in a state of making preparations is one of the greatest of—almost crimes—a Government can commit; and it is only equalled by an army when war has broken out, being caught in the act of concentration."

He was afraid that if we were asked whether our army was prepared for war the answer would be unsatisfactory. The question was, had we unity of action in our departments and that simplicity of organization which was absolutely essential to the proper conduct of operations in the field? With regard to the unity of action in the different departments, he need only refer to the simple fact that in a time of peace a regiment could not be brought to Hounslow—a distance of only one day's journey — and fed satisfactorily by the Commissariat. It was difficult for the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War or anybody else to find out who was the party on whom the blame rested. He was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman say, when speaking on this subject, that that branch of the service at all events required to be looked into and better organized. Then, again, as to the Medical Department, although there were on an average during the last fortnight 3,000 military men, composed of all branches of the army, besides

Volunteers, encamped at Wimbledon; and although a requisition for medical stores had been sent in some fourteen days previously to the meeting, they were left without medical stores for several days. A great step towards our improvement was to be aware of our deficiency. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War had now before the House two Bills for the purpose of remedying, to a certain extent, those deficiencies, which would effect great improvements in the organization of the various military departments, and which had been prepared in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Report of the Commission appointed to take the subject into consideration. In looking at that Report, however, it appeared to him that many of the points upon which suggestions had been made by the Commission were such as should never have come before them at all. Such matters, for instance, as questions relating to barrack damages, the washing of sheets, fatigue dress, teaching the soldiers the use of the spade and mattock, and various trades, and diminishing the amount of drill, should have been dealt with by the military authorities on their own responsibility, or left to regimental discipline. With regard to the questions of the fatigue dress and the use of the mattock and spade, he desired to say a word or two. When fatigue parties had been sent to work at Wimbledon, it was felt that it was so great a hardship upon the men that they should have to pay 12*s.* for a fatigue dress in which to perform a part of their ordinary work, that a dress was supplied to them for the purpose. His right hon. Friend had thought it right to recommend an increase of 2*d.* a day to the pay of the soldiers instead of giving them a fatigue dress, but he would suggest whether it was not possible to sanction the use of a dress less expensive than those at present employed. If that were done officers would be less inclined than they oftentimes now were to relieve the soldiers from a portion of their duty in this respect. He wished also to say a few words with respect to drill. As a civilian he did not presume to offer any dictation upon military matters. In what he was going to say he was only giving expression to the views of many military men. We ought not to have a system by which the soldier who had completed his first period of service was compelled to perform the same amount of drill as a soldier who had been in the service but a short time. There was something wrong in the system under which a soldier of ten years' service had to go through precisely the same drill as a soldier of only one year's service. It was further thought that rather than make the drill a punishment they should endeavour to give a soldier an interest in it. Many military men were of opinion that drill should not in any case be used as a punishment. They believed that the time of the soldier might with advantage be more employed than it was at present, in working at some trade and less at drill. Soldiers ought, no doubt, to have as much drill as was necessary to their efficiency; but that efficiency might still be attained if we departed to some extent from our present system. He had heard it asserted that to our system of drill the steadiness of our soldiers in time of battle and while under fire was attributable. He believed that that steadiness was, to a great extent, due to the English temperament. Three Bills—the Enlistment Bill, the Army Reserve Bill, and the Militia Bill—had emanated from this Commission, and had been brought in by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (General Peel). He desired to speak with the utmost possible deference and respect of anything that came from the right hon. Gentleman. He felt sure he did but express the feeling of Members generally when he said that no man had done more for the administration of the Department over which he had presided than had the right hon. Gentleman. He had shown, during his term of office, no shirking from responsibility and no slavery to red tape. It was to the right hon. Gentleman, too, that we were indebted for our Volunteer force, our rifled cannon, and the speedy arming our forces with breech-loaders. He felt, therefore, great diffidence in criticizing anything which emanated from the right hon. Gentleman. The Enlistment Bill had passed the House almost in silence, the attention of hon. Members being chiefly devoted at the time to the consideration of a measure which had occupied the greater portion of the Session. By the Enlistment Bill the period of enlistment had increased from ten to twelve years. Certainly the evidence given before the Commission was in favour of the change, though Earl de Grey had expressed himself unfavourably towards it. The noble Earl had said that it was a difficult question to determine what constituted an old soldier. The question had been very carefully gone into. In the Peninsula, under the Duke of Wellington, it was found that on the average a man who had been in the service for five years was regarded as an old soldier—nay, more, that a man who had been under fire during two years was entitled to claim the same character. There were many experienced men, not only in this country but also abroad, who thought it was a mistake to endeavour to keep the men too long in the ranks, and that it would be better to shorten the period of enlistment, and, at the same time, to hold out every possible inducement to the men by teaching them trades, which would enable them to return to civil life, to form a portion of the reserved force, possibly making service in the Reserve a condition to their retirement. But the Enlistment Bill had passed the House, and he could only express a hope that it would be found to work successfully. The remaining two Bills, the Army Reserve Bill and the Militia Bill, would come on for discussion that evening. The object of one of these Bills was to enable men whose service in the army had not expired to commute the unexpired portion by service in the Reserve, and that of the other was by increased bounties to induce men in entering the Militia to engage to transfer to the Line in the event of a war breaking out. The right hon. Gentleman himself had confessed, with regard to one of those measures, that it would not have a very large or speedy operation. Lord Dalhousie, who had acted as Chairman of the Commission, expressed himself as follows with regard to these Bills—

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he felt bound to rise to Order. He wished to know whether it was competent for the noble Lord to enter prematurely on the discussion of Bills, the second reading of which was on the Paper for that evening? As a proof of the inexpediency of the course pursued by his noble Friend, he might remark that his noble Friend had been arguing upon a portion of the scheme, in reference to the Army Reserve, which had not been brought, and would not be brought, before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER said, that by the Rules of the House the noble Lord was precluded from discussing, on a Motion for going into Committee of Supply, Bills which had been placed on the Paper for consideration at a later period of the evening. He would, moreover, remind the noble Lord that he was also precluded from quoting anything which had been said in the other House of Parliament during the present Session in reference to these particular measures.

Lord ELCHO said, he desired to know whether he was not entitled to refer to these Bills, seeing that it was intended to go into Committee of Supply for the purpose of taking a Vote to give them effect?

Mr. SPEAKER said, that the right time for discussing the question would be when the Votes, to which the noble Lord referred, came under the consideration of the Committee.

Lord ELCHO said, that if he could not refer to the Bills on the Paper, he might refer to what he considered ought to be the sound principle which ought to guide us in our military organization in connection with an Army of Reserve. It should be based on some broad foundation; but he had neither heard nor seen any measure that was likely to be adopted by the Government that would effect that object. His belief was that our present laws were sufficient for that purpose if the Government had only the courage to enforce them with certain modifications. He concurred in the opinion expressed by the Royal Commission that our Militia force was the basis of an Army of Reserve. Their Report said—

> "It is to our Militia we must look for the solid constitutional Reserve of the country, and we would earnestly recommend that more attention should be given to its organization, that its numbers should be maintained up to the full legal quota."

He was glad to find that the subject was shortly to be brought under the notice of both Houses of Parliament. When he gave notice of his present Motion, it was received with some laughter, but he had not been discouraged in proceeding with it, because he was convinced that it was only by having recourse to the ballot that the Militia could be kept in a proper state as the basis of our home defence. It was notorious that the numbers of Militia were not maintained at their proper quota, and this evil could not be remedied without the introduction of the ballot. It could not be said the ballot was a hardship. It was the duty of the citizen to give personal service to the State when necessity required it of him, and the ballot lessened his liability. It consisted in an act of registration which carried with it a chance of escaping service. The obligation to serve was founded on the ancient institutions of the country, and the ballot, rightly understood, was a means for reducing the severity of the obligation. He would not trouble the House with historical references to the train bands and other forces which had been organized from time to time as supplements to the Royal army. He would refer to a pamphlet published by Mr. Mitchell from the pen of Colonel Reilly, of the Artillery, entitled *Notes on The Military Forces of the Kingdom.* It appeared that the author had found in the library at Aldershot a document which was drawn up by the Minister of War in 1798, for the use of Mr. Pitt's Government which purported to set forth the system that should be adopted in order to put the country in a thorough state of defence. That document, however, was founded upon another drawn up in the time of Queen Elizabeth, and having reference to the expected invasion by the Spanish Armada. This was found in the State Paper Office. It was most minute in its details, and contained an order from the Secretary of State, which said—

> "Her Majesty willeth that all the forces under your charge be ready to march, with all their furniture at an hour's warning."

So particular was the order given on that occasion that the very number of horse shoes and nails which each company was to carry were specified. This general conclusion might be come to from the record, that out of a population of 3,000,000 a body of 177,000 men was ready to meet the invader had he landed on English soil. Such was the example set the country by their ancestors, and, looking at our present population, he thought it at least strange that the Militia could not be kept at its legal strength, and that something more comprehensive than was proposed had not been suggested. In favour of the propriety of again having recourse to the ballot, they had the early precedent of Queen Elizabeth; then again that of George III.; and again the proposal in 1852 by Earl Russell to resort to it without allowing a substitute. The principle of personal service was essentially to be considered in reference to the re-organization of the army. It was objected to on various grounds. But what were the objections? It was said that it was harsh and unequal in operation, that it would interfere with trade and industry, that by the system of substitutes the rich escaped service, that to a man of moderate means procuring a substitute was a heavy fine, and that it was un-English. He denied that the ballot was un-English, since it had existed from time immemorial; it formed the foundation of our present Militia, and could now be enforced in time of war. With regard to the other objections, even presuming there was no way of modifying the severity of the duty which fell on those unfortunate in the ballot, why should it not be performed as punctually as any other public duty to the State — as the serving on juries or the paying of taxes? But he believed the operation of the ballot might be so ordered as to make the duty fall very lightly on the citizen. At present, the whole population between eighteen and forty-five were liable to bear arms. That term might well in time of peace be reduced from nineteen or twenty to twenty-two or twenty-three, who should serve for two or three years, which would keep the Militia at its present standard. Substitutes might be done away with, and efficiency as a Volunteer should be the only legitimate ground of excuse from liability to serve as a Militiaman. Service in the Militia would interfere much less with trade if they would alter the present system of drill by adopting that which was practised in Canada, and which had been found to work so satisfactorily there—namely, drilling the men in squads and in companies in their respective localities for two-thirds of the period for which they were called out, and the remaining third of the time in regiments in camp, and under canvas, just as the Volunteers were drilled. This arrangement would permit service in regiments under canvas for one-third of the time, and the advantage which would accrue from that was acknowledged by all. The system which he had sketched would have the effect of filling the ranks of the Militia, and of doing away with the competition now going on between the army and Militia. It would have the effect of increasing the Volunteer force likewise, because many persons, to avoid the ballot would go into the Volunteer force which at the present moment, as they all knew, was held together by a rope of sand, and the whole of which might disappear at fourteen days' notice. Another effect would be that the difficulty of obtaining officers would be overcome, especially with regard to the Volunteers, because officers would prefer joining that force to running the chance of being balloted for. He believed that in the long run such a system would be more economical, because by mere money payments they could not compete with the labour market. These were the considerations which he thought justified him in calling the attention of the House to the question of the ballot. When he gave notice of that Motion some hon. Members laughed, but he had persevered under the conviction that sooner or later they would have to face the question of the necessity of the ballot as the basis of their Army of Reserve. Another reason which made him persevere was this. He well recollected that when the Volunteer movement was first started those who entered into it were spoken of as amiable, weak-minded enthusiasts. Lord Palmerston himself joked about the rifle fever. But those persons persevered with the Volunteer movement. What was the result? They now had 180,000 men in arms. If they had not that force, the very first thing they would have to do would be to apply the ballot. They persevered with the Volunteer movement. Why? Because they had faith in the spirit of their countrymen; they had not been disappointed. He had the same conviction now. It only wanted courage to deal with the question. The spirit which actuated the Volunteers existed in the whole population. Men would willingly submit to the duty if put before them. It would be a hardship which would be of a very slight character with the modifications to which he had referred. It was their bounden duty, by the ancient usage and practice of this country, to give their personal service to the Sovereign. By that means alone could they hope to have their defences and their reserves in the state in which they ought to be. He only asked that a man should run the chance of being balloted for the Militia or should prove that he served in the Volunteers. He held that that was no hardship. The majority of their 180,000 Volunteers were made up of artizans. If there was any hardship in the case, upon them it must fall heaviest. Yet those artizans willingly served in the Volunteer ranks, and he did not see why other Englishmen ought not to be called upon to do as they had done. He might ask why the Volunteers alone were to undergo — if it were one—that hardship, why they alone were to bear on their shoulders a burden which others would not touch with their finger, why they alone were to take upon themselves the obligations of citizenship when, according to the ancient law and custom of the realm, those obligations devolved upon all. He relied on the spirit of his countrymen. He believed that if his right hon. Friend would meditate on the matter during the Recess, and would have the courage to bring forward such a proposal, he would meet with a proper response on the part of the people of the country.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "inasmuch as it is the ancient and undoubted prerogative of the Crown to require the Military service of its liege subjects, and inasmuch as liability to personal Service, within the limits of the United Kingdom, has always been and still is the principle on which the Militia Force is founded, it is desirable, in framing any scheme or the establishment of an Army of Reserve and for the more complete and economical organization of the Military capabilities and defensive power of the Nation, to consider how far this ancient principle should be practically enforced, and how it can be best applied with least inconvenience to the people:

"That it is further desirable, with a view to the more full and deliberate consideration of this important subject, that the Army Reserve and Militia Reserve Bills should be withdrawn for the present Session of Parliament,"—(*Lord Elcho,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. SPEAKER, having read the noble Lord's Motion as far as the words "inconvenience to the people," said, he must stop there, because the next Resolution of the noble Lord called on the House to express an opinion, and, indeed, to arrive at a decision, on Bills before they had been discussed or read the second time in that House.

Question proposed accordingly.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that at the commencement of his speech his noble Friend alluded to the apathy which existed, and which, perhaps naturally to a great extent, succeeded the great efforts made by this country during the Peninsular War. He likewise referred to what occurred in respect to army organization during and subsequently to the Crimean War, and to the efforts that had been made by successive Governments to dispel it. Himself a severe critic he considered the munitions of war exhibited at Paris to be highly creditable to the efforts of the country, as evincing the great attention and improvements of late devoted to and introduced into that branch of the public service. He also mentioned an unfortunate circumstance which happened the other day as a proof that they ought to be better prepared for all the events of war, and as showing—in which he (Sir John Pakington) concurred—that the time had come when some reform should be introduced into certain parts of our military administration. The noble Lord then proceeded to advert to the Report of the Recruiting Commission, and seemed by his remarks to imply a censure upon the Commission.

LORD ELCHO said, he must disclaim having implied any censure upon the Commission. He had said he thought it hardly necessary that that subject should have been referred to a Commission.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, that whether or not the military authorities ought to have dealt with the points in question without a Commission was another matter. The military authorities had not done so, and he must think the Commissioners did well in reporting as they had done, and in giving the country the benefit of their opinions. The noble Lord would admit that every one of the points to which he referred was immediately and directly connected with the object of the Commission—namely, how to improve recruiting in the army. Every point had a direct bearing on the end they had chiefly in view—namely, how they were to make the army more attractive to the public, and induce men readily to enter the service of the Queen as soldiers. The noble Lord had, in his remarks, naturally fallen into some mistakes, as anyone was likely to do who commented on a supposed statement before it had been made. Having proceeded to what appeared from his notice to be the main object of his Motion, the noble Lord—he confessed, to his no small surprise—conveyed to the House his opinion that the time had arrived when they could not rest content with voluntary enlistment for the Militia, and that the ballot ought once more to be resorted to. He was entirely unable to agree with his noble Friend in that view. He thought the facts of the case were totally against the view of his noble Friend. The Militia, which had fallen very much into neglect, was revived about fifteen years ago. The remarkable difference in that revival, as compared with preceding times, was that from 1852 this country had relied mainly on the voluntary principle for recruiting the ranks of the Militia. Had that system failed? He did not think the noble Lord had shown that it had. The noble Lord referred to the Militia having been short of their numbers. He (Sir John Pakington) did not believe that the Militia were short of their numbers. The Militia establishment at present was only three-fourths of the whole quota which was at present sanctioned by Parliament. He believed that up to the amount of those three-fourths—that was to say, up to the whole amount that they now required for the Militia as they stood—they were full. It appeared to him that the facts connected with the Volunteer force to which his noble Friend had referred, were themselves an answer to his argument as to the necessity of the ballot for the Militia. As soon as it was made known that the military service of the country required aid the nation rose, and we had a new army of 180,000 men raised on the Volunteer principle. That fact furnished in itself an answer to the statement of his noble Friend, that we were unable to keep up our Army of Reserve without resorting to the ballot. He must also remind his noble Friend that the ballot was not altogether done away with, but only suspended. It was at the present moment the law of this country. In 1852, the Government determined to make an attempt—which attempt had been singularly successful—to establish the Militia on the voluntary principle; but the ballot had not in consequence been abandoned. In 1860, an Act of Parliament had been passed placing the ballot on a new footing. At that moment, should any national emergency render it necessary that it should be resorted to for the purpose of enlarging the Militia force, men could be raised, by means of the ballot, in the course of from five to seven weeks. That was, he thought, a complete answer to the suggestion which had been made by his noble Friend. Under the circumstances, looking at the Volunteer force, at the success which had attended the efforts made to establish the Militia on the voluntary principle, and at the fact that if the ballot were required it might be called into action in a few weeks, he trusted the House would be of opinion that his noble Friend had not made out a case for so important a deviation from the principles on which the Army of Reserve was based as that which he proposed.

MAJOR WALKER said, he agreed with the right hon. Baronet that if any necessity for it really arose, the ballot could be resorted to by the Executive, and would be cheerfully submitted to by the people. He did not agree with the noble Lord that the Militia was as inefficient as it was generally assumed to be, but if it was, its inefficiency could be readily accounted for and easily removed. The present system was nominally established in 1852; but it took a great deal more than an Act of Parliament to perfect a military organization, and the necessary care and trouble had never yet been bestowed upon the Militia. And why? In 1854 the Crimean War broke out, and was followed by the Indian Mutiny. These two occurrences lasted till 1859; and during the interval the interests of the Militia were very properly postponed to those of the regular army. One important fact had, however, been proved by what happened at the restoration of tranquillity; and that was the perfect facility with which the Militia on disembodiment, was re-absorbed into civil occupations. In a few weeks the whole of the force was disbanded without any cost to the country beyond a gratuity of six months' pay to the junior officers. At the close of the Indian Mutiny in 1859, it might have been hoped that efforts would have been made to establish the force on a permanent peace footing. Some steps were taken in the matter. A Royal Commission was appointed, and two of the suggestions which it made were acted upon. But in 1860 came the Volunteer movement, and from that time up to the present day all public interest in the Militia had ceased to exist. It ceased to be the subject of discussion in that House or in the press, and became buried in neglect and discouragement. He did not seek to impute blame on that account to any Government or party. If the Government were apathetic in the matter, their apathy was shared in by the House and the public. No active steps were taken to foster the Militia system, and so much reduced was the force in consequence of the men volunteering for the Line, that in 1859 the total muster for training was, he believed, under 40,000. Such, however, were the recuperative powers of the force, that in 1864 there were upwards of 100,000 men out for training, and if left to itself, and if it were allowed to recruit to the full legal strength, it would before long number 124,000 men. In 1864 measures were adopted—into the general expediency of which he would not enter—for reducing the strength of the force by a quarter in order to admit of a longer period of training for the remainder. That accounted for its limited number at present. He came next to its efficiency, in which respect it was, he admitted, imperfect—though not so much so as had been represented—but why was that the case? The Militia Commission which sat in 1859 recommended that the period of training for a Militia soldier should be a minimum of twenty-eight days every year. That recommendation was not, however, adopted. The period of training determined upon was twenty-one days, and it was only last year that the time was extended to twenty-seven days. The drill, therefore, in the case of the Militia was not so complete as it ought to be, because it had pleased Parliament in its wisdom to curtail the time which competent authorities had declared to be necessary for the purpose. Then again—and the point was a most important one—the Commission recommended that the Militia recruit should go through a course of preliminary drill for twenty-eight days. That recommendation was not adopted in its entirety. The year after the Report the recruit was allowed to train for twenty-one days, the time being reduced the following year to fourteen, and the next to seven days. It was only this year that the time had again been extended to fourteen days. Another defect arose from the difficulty of procuring officers; and that difficulty, instead of diminishing, was steadily increasing; no attempt had been made to remedy it. The abolition of the rank of ensign was no remedy. Another recommendation of the Commission was—and it was one of vital consequence—that the expensive and demoralizing system of keeping the men on billets should as far as possible be done away with. If it were proposed to apply that system to a highly disciplined regular regiment, what a chorus of protests and remonstances it would call forth; yet here were a number of poor lads, who were necessarily subjected to very little control, quartered at the lowest beer-houses and gin-shops in the country. Formerly it might have been said that if the system was nasty, it was at least cheap, for the price paid for lodgings was only three-halfpence per night. It was now, however, 4*d.* a night, and so was really dear as a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence. It was a vicious system, and not only vicious, but expensive. The system was besides attended by great waste of time, for the men were frequently quartered at long distances from the place at which they had to muster. He mentioned these points to show that if the Militia force was, as some suppose, inefficient, that inefficiency was not inseparable from it, but admitted of easy and simple remedy. What was required for the Militia was not revolution, but reform. Although there might appear to be a certain amount of truth in the statement that recruiting for the Militia was injurious to recruiting for the Line, men of high military authority—including Colonel Paythorne, Inspector General of Militia, did not deem that to be actually the case. It was true that recruits for both services were drawn from the same class, but they no more clashed with each other in that respect, than the officering of the yeomanry interfered with the officering of the cavalry, because the officers of both were derived from a similar source. The result of the reduction in 1864 of the establishment of the Militia was that the recruiting of that force to the extent of 20,000 or 25,000 men per annum was suspended for two years. If the recruiting for the Militia interfered with the recruiting for the army, the consequence would have been that during those two years numbers of the men usually recruited in each year for the Militia would have looked for service in the Line. But during those two years the fact of the deficiency of recruits for the army began to force itself on the attention of the country. If the Government would devote themselves not to revolutionize but to reform the system of reserve, they would find that it was easier than might be generally supposed to make the Militia an economical, efficient, and perfectly sufficient Army of Reserve.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, that the temptations to which Militiamen were exposed by being billeted in country towns had been well described, but it was not easy to find a remedy for the evil. If it were proposed to build barracks for the Militia in every county to be used only for a single month in the year, it was a question whether the counties would be willing to undertake the expense. He feared the only remedy was to erect barracks. The question then was how far the House would be willing to undertake the expense of doing that. It was marvellous how the Militiamen were brought to any sort of discipline after being subjected to the demoralizing influences of the low beer-houses in which they had been billeted, and he hoped the House would adopt some means of checking the evil. The remedy seemed to be to delocalize the force.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, that he, on the contrary, traced the inefficiency of the Militia to the want of a still more decidedly local character. It would be easy to obtain any number of men if proper means were taken. The pay of 3*s.* or 3*s.* 2*d.* a day during training was sufficient to tempt any number of men into the force. But the kind of men who joined the Militia were mostly the dregs of the towns and the counties, and had no proper local connection with the officers. If measures were devised to induce agricultural labourers and the more respectable inhabitants of towns to join the Militia, the force would then get more officers. It was the want of connection between the officers and men which rendered the Militia not properly efficient. The comforts of the officers were not studied so much as they ought to be. In the course of the present Session money had been voted to provide billiard-tables for the officers of the Army. But nothing of the kind was done for the officers of the Militia, who could not have a mess-room, unless they built it themselves; and who did not receive an allowance for travelling expenses from their actual residences to the places of training. These and other circumstances prevented gentlemen from joining the Militia as officers. With regard to barracks and billets, he thought that much might be done in these matters to increase the efficiency of the men. It would also be a great boon to them if their rations were raised from three-quarters of a pound to one pound of meat. He trusted that while the Secretary for War considered the question of the pay of the men, he would also take into consideration the case of the officers, and propose some measure next Session to increase their comforts.

Viscount GALWAY said, he would confirm the observations of the hon. Gentleman who last spoke as to the difficulty of getting, not men, but officers for the Militia. A relative of his—a Militia officer—told him there was no difficulty in getting men, but that it was impossible to obtain officers. It was not likely that gentlemen would put themselves to great inconvenience to serve in the Militia unless some attention was paid to their comfort and some increase made to their pay.

Mr. BATHURST said, no gentleman whose private means were not very large could afford to be connected with the Militia. He hoped the Government would take into their consideration measures by which the convenience of Militia officers would be more effectually consulted.

MR. MORRISON said, he agreed that it would be an absurdity to build barracks for the purpose of housing the Militia during the short period of their drill; but the experiment might be tried of placing one or two regiments under canvas, so as to get rid of the billeting system.

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, he gave the noble Lord every credit for the great ability, energy, and perseverance he had displayed in connection with the Volunteer movement; but he thought his present Motion was quite inconsistent with voluntary enlistment. A proposal that every citizen should become a soldier was purely a military question, and if the noble Lord's suggestion meant anything it meant that conscription ought to be introduced into this country at the earliest possible day. All would be surprised to hear that that force of 180,000 men might disappear at a fortnight's notice. He could not conceive what the Volunteers would be when men were forced to become Volunteers to avoid the ballot. The price of labour had risen with the price of land and of every other commodity. If the army was not able to be recruited under present arrangements the difficulty would have to be met, not by compelling men to enter the military service but by raising the rate of pay. The difficulties at present experienced by the recruiting serjeant were difficulties that might be overcome by the exercise of a wise liberality. It was only a question of supply and demand. So long as the Government were outbid by the other employers of labour they must expect to feel the want of men. If stronger inducements were held out there would be no lack of persons willing to enter the Queen's service. The noble Lord recommended the Secretary of State for War to pursue the same course on this subject which had been taken by Lord John Russell; but he forgot that the course then adopted cost the Government their places. A similar result would no doubt follow if the noble Lord's suggestions were pursued.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

PETTY SESSIONS CLERKS IN IRELAND. QUESTION.

GENERAL DUNNE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, What portion of the amount received for Licenses for Dogs in that country had been applied to the administration of the Act, and how the sum of £8,660 9*s.* 2*d.*, the difference between the sum received, £35,379 16*s.*, and £26,719 6*s.* 10*d.* paid over to counties, had been applied. He also wanted to know whether there was any objection to produce a Return of the remuneration assigned to each Petty Session clerk in Ireland?

LORD NAAS said, he should be happy to lay the Returns on the table, and to give every information as to the mode in which the sum of £8,660 had been expended. The sum paid to clerks of Petty Sessions was something like £4,500, but this was only to be considered as an experimental arrangement by which the Government were not pledged for future years. The whole Question would be considered during the Recess.

TIPPERARY AND WATERFORD ELECTIONS.—RESOLUTION.

MAJOR JERVIS said, he rose to call attention to certain transactions which took place at the recent elections for the counties of Waterford and Tipperary, and to move a Resolution on the subject. At the beginning of the Session, two remarkable Petitions complaining of undue Elections had been brought before the House, but the Members petitioned against were seated. It appeared, therefore, to be recognized that in Ireland there might be any amount of riot, turmoil, and intimidation, and yet that the election would be held perfectly valid. He thought the time had come when in Ireland, as well as in England, men should be enabled to give their votes at an election without subjecting themselves to bad usage, and incurring the danger of being murdered. Every one who knew the country would admit the marvellous improvement that had occurred there within the last sixty years, and he must say that he could see no reason why election times should form so prominent an exception to the order and tranquillity that generally prevailed. In the first place, he desired to draw attention to the conduct of a portion of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy. It appeared that at the election for Tipperary the Roman Catholic clergy took one view and the landlords took another. The Roman Catholic clergy had, like other men, a perfect right at an election to exercise their social and political rights; they might meet together and agree to support a particular candidate. But they certainly ought, like any other body of clergy, to set an example of conducting the election in an orderly and peaceable manner. The Archbishop of Cashel had, it appeared, called together a meeting of his clergy to select a candidate at the last election for Tipperary. The meeting took place. A candidate was named. It was unanimously resolved to support him. The Archbishop then addressed his clergy, telling them they were to speak to their congregations both politically and as priests. As priests they were to point out to their congregations that they had a Christian duty to perform, and if they did not perform it there were certain penalties, both in this world and in the next, which they would have to undergo. Politically they were to address their parishioners in the churches and point out why they should vote for a particular candidate. What was the result? It was thus described by a witness, a Roman Catholic gentleman of some influence, to the Committee—

> "That last resolution was passed on the 13th of October?—I believe so. On Sunday the 14th of October, did you attend Temple Derry Chapel?—Yes, I did. Were you there at mass?—I was. Was that on Sunday, the 14th?—It was the Sunday previous to the election. Who was the officiating clergyman on this occasion?—The Rev. Hugh Gleeson. Did he on that occasion say anything about the approaching election; if so, what?—He spoke a good deal about it, and contrasted the qualities of the two candidates, and concluded by saying that any person voting for Mr. Waldron ought to be ducked in the river. Where was this said?—In the chapel. In the presence of the congregation?—Yes. It was part of the service?—Before mass was over. Had he his vestments on?—Yes, he had."

Mr. Robert Pratt heard a priest who had a whip in his hand in addressing his flock at Horsmore say, "A man who has gone to Thurles shall never come back alive." Mr. Thomas Butler, a magistrate in the commission of the peace for the county of Tipperary, and residing in the neighbourhood of Golden, gave the following evidence:—

> "You are a Roman Catholic?—Yes. What is the name of the officiating clergyman there; were you at the Golden Chapel on the 14th of October?—I was at the Golden Chapel the Sunday before the last election for Tipperary. Do you know the Rev. Thomas O'Connell?—Yes. Was he the officiating clergyman at mass when you attended that day?—He was. Do you remember after mass the Rev. Mr. O'Connell addressing the congrgation?—Yes. Where was he standing when he addressed the congregation after mass?—On the altar steps in the chapel. How was he dressed at the time?—He was in a black soutane and a cap. Was it the cap worn by the clergymen of that church in the performance of their duty?—Yes, occasionally. Will you be good enough to state to me the substance of what you remember of that address to the congregation after mass?—It was principally in abuse of the neighbouring proprietors and supporters of Mr. Waldron, at the coming election. Will you tell us what he said, the words as well you remember, in reference to the election? He was aware that some parties in the neighbourhood had been canvassing for Mr. Waldron, and that they received promises from some of the electors to support him at the coming election; he then told the people that they were in no way bound to those promises, and that even if they had taken their solemn oaths to support Mr. Waldron they were bound to break them. Do you remember anything further that he said?—He told them that in voting for Mr. Waldron they would be voting against their conscience, their country, and their creed."

Was that the way to teach men to appreciate properly the position they would hold in future with regard to the political concerns of great Britain? He did not wish to say a word against the Roman Catholic clergy; doubtless there were good and bad among them, as there were in every other body of men. Many of them were men of experience and great learning—but what he wished to point out was that the effect of such conduct as that to which he referred was to excite the people of Ireland to act improperly at elections. Such exhortations as those he had quoted bore their fruit, as they were certain to do, in scenes of tumult and disaster. The evidence given before the Committee showed conclusively the extent of the rioting at the time of the election. Mr. Robert Shaw gave the following evidence:—

> "You are a constable in the constabulary force in Ireland?—I am head constable. You remember the 20th of October, the polling day at Thurles?—I do. Were you there on duty on that day?—I was. How many men had you with you?—I had about thirty men at the front gate of the Court House. In the discharge of your duty, did you endeavour to make way for the persons to get to the polling-booth?—I did everything I could, as well as the men who were with me; I had only to keep the passage at the gate open. Did you find that an easy duty to perform?—We could not perform it except through the assistance of the dragoons; they rode up and down and dispersed the people. Were any of the men under your charge struck?—There were a good many of them; I was struck myself. In addition to these voters and the police you describe as being struck, do you remember any gentlemen of position?—I saw Mr. Gore Jones struck, a resident magistrate. The stipendiary magistrate?—Yes. You saw him struck?—Yes, I saw an old gentleman struck and knocked down, and I heard him say that he was Mr. Lanigan; they say that he had his eye knocked out. Did you see any person struck?—Yes, several. With what were they struck?—They were struck with stones and mud, and rotten eggs in some cases. Do you remember any of the men under your charge in particular in the

Clare police; they are under your charge?—Yes. Do you remember anything in reference to them? —Many of them were badly cut in the head with stones and sticks, and they were obliged to be taken off duty. They were not able to continue their duty?—No."

If this sort of thing had taken place in England the Member returned would have been unseated. Why should there be a different rule for Ireland? Mr. William Spaight, residing at Derry Castle, and possessing considerable property in Tipperary, made the following statement:—

"Do you remember the last election in Tipperary?—I do. About how far is Derry Castle from Nenagh?—About nine Irish miles. How did you travel from Derry to Nenagh on that day?—I drove in my own carriage. Do you know where the chapel of Portroe is?—Yes. As you were coming towards the chapel of Portroe, passing the quarries along the road, did anything strike you as remarkable?—It struck me that all the people were absent from their work, and all the quarries idle. When you got near Portroe Chapel did anything particularly attract your attention there?—I saw the people going up in twos and threes to the chapel, and collecting there; a great mob of the people were collected there and in the chapel yard. And when you got up there, did you see anything remarkable taking place or going on?—I did not go there; I went away from it; I avoided the village on purpose. Do you remember at any time seeing the curate of the parish of Portroe that morning?—Yes. Whereabouts did you see him; do you know his name?—I heard it was Gleeson; I am not sure. You know he was one of the curates of Portroe parish?—I believe he was. Whereabouts did you see this gentleman?—He was with a crowd of people at Baskerville's public house, half way from my place to Nenagh. What were the crowd of people doing; did you see this gentleman do anything?—I did. Will you describe it? As I came up, I was not looking particularly at him; I was astounded at seeing him lift a great big stick 'wheeling;' he twisted the stick over his head, and commenced jumping in a most extraordinary manner; I thought he was mad; he is a very active fellow; he was jumping the height of the table off the ground; he commenced hallooing for White, and hooting at me; I did not notice him till that began; I thought the man was demented. Did you see anything else going on at Baskerville's publichouse?—Yes, the front rank wheeled upon me; but there were two clergymen with jugs giving out whiskey to two regular lines in the rear, and they never stopped; they continued loading up the rear rank people with the whiskey; they never stopped; they went on giving the whiskey out of the jug; they gave it in glassses."

First the Roman Catholic clergy preached to the mob, and then they gave them whiskey; no doubt greatly to the increase of the subsequent disorder. Mr. Wood, an inspector of constabulary stationed at Dundrum, said that during the election there was a large force of cavalry and infantry, but not a large force of constabulary. He stated that Mr. Lowe was cut by the side of the nose by a missile, that Mr. Horne was also cut in the face by a stone, that Mr. Maguire, Mr. Baker, Mr. Arundel, Mr. Leech, and Mr. Smith were also injured by stones, and he himself and some of his men were much cut by stones. Colonel Purefoy was only saved from being murdered by another man being murdered in his stead. He would not weary the House by reading through page after page of similar evidence. The same scenes took place at the Waterford Election, in which case the agents of one of the candidates had to apply to the magistrates for assistance in order to enable the voters to come to the poll. A body of voters who had been collected and were being marched to the booth under the protection of an escort of dragoons were, by a clever strategy, attacked in the mountains, the cars smashed, and the heads of those who rode in them broken. At Dungarvan the military had to force the bridge leading into the town, amidst a perfect "hail of stones," the missiles being not what were called "two-year-olds," but large enough to break a man's skull, while the bludgeons were heavy enough to kill a man at a blow. He had brought these cases forward because he thought it was a serious thing in the present day, when they were about to bring in a Bill to lower the franchise in Ireland, if they had no guarantee that this sort of thing would not be heard of in future. He found no fault with the Roman Catholic clergy for endeavouring to carry oot their own political ideas in the best way in their power; but he found fault with them for having put all order at defiance, and for having led these riots in the most open manner. It was utterly impossible that an election could be carried on properly under such circumstances. The House had been asked to assent to indignant resolutions against the military, because some loss of life occurred in these frays. He should be glad when the practice of calling out troops in Ireland could be discontinued, and order maintained by the constabulary alone. But he was anxious that, in cases like those to which he had alluded, where the voters were prevented from getting to the poll, the election should be declared null and void. When the Irish Reform Bill came before the House next Session he should move that some steps should be taken to render the Irish people free to exercise their votes without the aid of the military. He should do so because it was natural to the Irish disposition to get up a row if possible, and the fact that a body of men were being escorted by soldiers was sufficient to excite that disposition.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "whilst this House regrets that it should be necessary to employ military escorts for ensuring the safety of Voters at Elections in Ireland, it is of opinion that the nature of the intimidation exercised at the recent Elections in the Counties of Waterford and Tipperary not only renders in such cases such a protection essential, but is further of opinion this House should pass a measure which will enable the Voter to freely and fully exercise the franchise in such a manner as he desires, without exposing himself to personal risk,"—(*Major Jervis,*)

—instead thereof.

MR. ESMONDE said, that he disputed the accuracy of the account given of the proceedings at Waterford. The fact was that the Conservative party had used the military as mere election agents to bring in voters against their will to vote for the Conservative candidate. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had opened a question of great constitutional importance, although he did not mean to do so. [Major JERVIS: Yes, he did.] The hon. and gallant Gentleman had alluded to cavalcades of voters coming in, escorted by dragoons. Now, what were the facts? The election took place on the 29th. On the previous day, whilst standing in the streets of Waterford, he (Mr. Esmonde), at three o'clock in the afternoon, heard the clash of arms and the trotting of horses. On looking round to see the cause he found that a body of tenants, who were coerced to support the Conservative candidate, were being escorted by dragoons and the resident magistrates. The men were escorted to an hotel, where they were kept until the next day; in consequence of their arrival not only was the ordinary business of the hotel suspended, but a circular was sent round to the frequenters of the billiard-room to say that it would be closed for that evening—a fact which created no slight sensation. A Liberal friend of his, who kept a china shop at Waterford, told him that 150 mugs had been ordered of him for the purpose of supplying drink. He should probably raise a question on another occasion as to whether those who employed the troops in escorting the voters on the day previous to the election to the hotel hired by the Conservative candidate, where they were illegally supplied with drink during the night, and on the day of the election itself escorting them from thence to the poll—were not guilty of conduct tending to bring the Prerogative of Her Majesty into collision with the privileges of Parliament. As to the attack made upon the soldiers it was favoured by those who were being escorted to the poll against their will. The voters wished a riot to be got up in order that they might be scattered and not compelled to vote, and amongst the assailants were servants and relatives of the "independent electors," who had recourse to this stratagem to relieve their friends from distress. The sitting Member did not think it at all necessary to call witnesses before the Committee, being of opinion that no case had been made out against him in Ireland. The law was that if an affidavit were made that violence was apprehended at an election so as to prevent a true return the poll could be adjourned until such a day as it was deemed probable the people would cease to be turbulent. If the election referred to was so interfered with as to make it probable the result would be altered through riot, the poll could have been adjourned. The reason it was not so adjourned was because an application should have been made, and an affidavit sworn which could not be sworn. In his own election in 1852, voters who had been collected together under the escort of the military, for the purpose of being brought in to vote for his opponent against their wish, actually sent word to some of his friends to stop them, and, if possible, to do so near a wood, so that they might not be recaptured when they had succeeded in making their escape. The fact was, that these riots as they are called, are stratagems used in self-defence by the voters themselves. As the hon. and gallant Member had intimated his intention of bringing forward the subject at greater length next Session, he would not now go further into the case; but he promised the House that when the time came he would be quite prepared to meet the hon. Member whenever he chose to renew the subject.

MR. ARKWRIGHT said, that as one of the Waterford Committee he rose to refute an erroneous impression which appeared to prevail. Without discussing the question as to whether undue influence on one side is excuse for violence on the other, he maintained that if a man voted from motives of gratitude to a good landlord that man had as much right to protection as he who voted from motives of political partizanship. With regard to the allegations made, he desired distinctly to deny that any evidence was given of undue influence on the part of the landlords, of unnecessary action on the part of the military, or of collusion between the mob and the tenants. Hon. Members might have private information; but the case should be decided on sworn evidence before the Committee. If that private information did exist, why was it not produced at the proper time?

MR. BLAKE said, he could corroborate everything the hon. Member for the county of Waterford (Mr. Esmonde) had said from his personal experience of the last election for that county. It afforded a lamentable but striking instance of the tyranny of landlords, and the slavish position of the tenants. He had seen on the day before the polling long lines of cars filled with tenants of noble Lords and others of the landed Conservative gentry in the neighbourhood of the city of Waterford, escorted by large bodies of dragoons with drawn sabres, looking more like convicts on their way to transportation than men going to exercise the franchise, brought in to register their votes against their conscience, their wishes, and, as they believed, their interests. Numbers of those unfortunate people had expressed to him their bitter regret that they dared not vote for Mr. De la Poer, the popular candidate, instead of the Tory one, Captain Talbot, and he had heard many of them pray to God that the man they were compelled to vote for would be defeated. Now, he characterized that as a melancholy and disgraceful state of things. It was enough to make these hapless victims of landlord coercion disaffected to see the Queen's troops employed to drag them to vote, contrary to what they wished. ["No, no!"] He repeated it, and he challenged contradiction; if the landlords had not the use of the troops to carry out their behests one of two thing would have happened—either that the tenants of the Conservative landlords would have voted as they wished for the Liberal candidate, or refrained from voting against, as they believed, the interests of their country. He did not make these observations on account of attaching much importance to political agitation; it had never done any good for Ireland, and probably never would; neither had he the slightest feeling against the landlords because they were Conservatives. He hated tyranny whatever side it came from, and would denounce Whig landlords just as readily if they deserved it. But gross tyranny had in the case they were dealing with been perpetrated by men professing Tory principles, and he therefore condemned their proceedings irrespective altogether of their politics.

LORD NAAS said, that the hon. Member seemed to imagine that an unusual course was taken with regard to the military upon this occasion. The military were sent to the Waterford Election in consequence of a sworn information having been laid before the Government to the effect that their presence was necessary for the preservation of the peace. As no Government in Ireland would feel justified in refusing such a demand, the military were sent and placed at the disposal of the local authorities. He believed they were employed with and exercised the greatest discretion. The statement that they were used to coerce voters was totally without foundation. They conducted voters to the poll, and protected them from assault. When at the poll those electors were left to vote at discretion, without interference on the part of the military or magistrates. All that the military did was to prevent the voters from being maltreated. He regretted that the presence of the military was too often necessary on such occasions. But so long as large mobs, armed with bludgeons were employed to coerce voters in the interest of a candidate, it would be impossible for any Government, in the interests of peace, to refuse to take the course which every Government had hitherto been obliged to take. If the Government refused to interfere there would be riot and bloodshed to an enormous extent. From his own knowledge he could state that it was principally owing to the presence of the military, not only in the South but in the North of Ireland, that scenes of violence did not more frequently occur. If the people of Ireland would conduct their elections in the same manner as the people of this country they would find military interference quite unnecessary. The people of Ireland had the matter in their own hands.

MR. BLAKE said, that he had not intended to attach the least blame to the Government. They certainly could not have acted otherwise than they did.

MR. MORRISON said, he regretted that other Members of the Tipperary Election Committee besides himself were not present. They had waited for the question to come on so many times in vain that they had tired of continued postponement. If it had been the first time an Election Committee had had to interpret the wording of a new Act of Parliament, he, as a member of the Committee, would have given his decision in favour of rendering the election void. There were five polling-places where the disturbance was so great that the voters could not easily pass to the poll. But that Committee, like other tribunals, was bound by the general practice of courts of co-ordinate authority, and on looking back at the almost invariable practice of preceding Committees, it appeared to him that there was nothing in the late Tipperary election which rendered the disorder that prevailed there of a graver character than that which prevailed at other elections which had not been declared void. In the few extracts from the evidence which had been quoted by the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich he had brought forward cases some of which were afterwards satisfactorily disproved. There was one case of a priest who had made use of a whip, and who came before the Committee and explained the circumstances satisfactorily to his mind. A number of cars had been employed to bring up voters to the poll. The boys, who were not voters, having got upon the cars, that gentleman took a switch and used it in a paternal spirit towards them. The boys in question were not over forty years old, which was the age, it seemed, of some "boys" in Ireland. But small matters like these did not affect the general merits of the question. It would have been necessary, before declaring the election void, to have had it satisfactorily proved to the minds of the Committee that there had been a greater state of riot than had prevailed at previous elections. No doubt, many passages might be quoted from the evidence for the Petitioners to show that there had been a riot of a very serious nature; but the general tenour of the evidence from first to last went to substantiate the fact that that was an unusually quiet election for Ireland. There was a special reason why an unusual amount of irritation should have arisen. The Conservative candidate had originally come in by the votes of the Liberal party, and at a subsequent time he announced himself as a supporter of Lord Derby. He therefore thought the Government were justified in making unusual preparations for maintaining the peace of the county. Various kinds of witnesses were examined, some of whom were ardent partizans on either side. Without wishing to impugn their veracity, in a question of that sort every tribunal would prefer to take as the measure of what really happened the evidence of those witnesses who were there in an official capacity, and who could not be suspected of any leaning to either candidate. Stipendiary magistrates and inspectors and sub-inspectors of the constabulary were called before the Committee. Those witnesses, though they disagreed as to the amount of disturbance which prevailed, agreed that there had not been at all an unusual amount of disturbance for an Irish election. Some of them seemed to think there had been a much smaller amount than they were accustomed to see at Irish elections. Another fact which left a deep impression on his mind was that, although at each of the five polling-places such a large crowd had assembled as rendered it difficult for persons to pass through the streets, the voters that supported Mr. Waldron who were attacked were those who were brought up under military escort. Other gentlemen, who were known to be supporters of Mr. Waldron, deposed that they had no difficulty in getting to the poll except such as naturally arose from the large crowds in the streets. Among these latter were two clergymen who must therefore have been well known to the people. Moreover, the Petitioners failed to show that any considerable number of electors were unable to record their votes owing to the existence of these riots. Again, the Legislature had provided by a special Act of Parliament for the contingency of riots at Irish elections. In that case, and also at Waterford, no application was made to adjourn the poll. If the aggrieved person did not avail himself of the remedy specially afforded by the law, that fact must be assumed to weigh somewhat in the balance against him. As to the conduct of the Roman Catholic clergy, the whole of the evidence had left on his mind the impression that they had interfered with the course of the election in a manner which could not be approved; but there did not seem to have been exercised such an amount of undue spiritual influence as was sufficient to vitiate the election. They abstained from alluding at the altar to the election, though several had addressed their flocks from the chapel yards. Sometimes politics were introduced in the pulpit of English Protestant churches. Though he should be glad to see the Roman Catholic clergy adopt a different course on the occasion of elections, there was nothing done in that instance to cause the election to be declared null and void. He thanked the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich for bringing the matter forward. He thought it hard on our soldiers to employ them in that kind of way. If any force was to be employed on those occasions, it should be the constabulary, not the soldiers. He had listened with indignation to the charges brought against the troops, who appeared to have behaved with the most admirable temper. There was nothing to justify the accusations made, either against them, or the constabulary, or the stipendiary magistrates. Being perfectly impartial between the two sides, the impression left on his mind was that if they could obtain by ballot, or in some other way, a free expression of the opinion of the electors in Tipperary as to whether they would prefer to retain or lose the elective franchise, they would prefer to be disfranchised. It was pitiable to see men vacillating between the persuasion of the priests, on the one hand, and that of the landlords, on the other. The best way of dealing with the question of Irish elections would be to show that riotous proceedings would not pay. How that was to be done he hardly knew ; perhaps some Amendment might be made in the Irish election law. As things now stood, the Election Committees of that House were found adopting what, to the eye of common sense, and to those who did not understand how they were bound by precedent, seemed to be a very strange course of proceeding.

Colonel HOGG said, that as a Member of the Tipperary Committee he wished to say that he had felt compelled to differ in opinion from the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, and also from the other Members of the Committee. He had thought the rioting was of such a character that the election ought to have been declared null and void, and he had therefore felt that the only course open to him was to record his vote singly against that of the Committee. The hon. Gentleman said riots were common at Irish elections; but he had not been governed by the precedents set by former Committees. A lawyer got up and told the Committee on which he sat of the precedent of the Waterford Election. But he had deemed himself bound not to look at that, but to be guided by the evidence adduced before him. Speaking from memory—for he had not the necessary documents by him—he believed it had been shown that more than thirty voters had been seriously injured while proceeding to record their votes. There were about twenty more who declared solemnly that they would have voted for Mr. Waldron if they had been allowed to reach the polling-place, but that they were afraid of their lives to record their votes for that gentleman. Many others would, he thought, have given similar evidence had they felt that they could freely speak their minds. His hon. Friend had said that where there were no soldiers no attack was made upon the voters. But two men—one of them, as well as he could recollect, named Givans—had attempted to go up to the polling-place alone. They were attacked by a mob of twenty or thirty people and prevented from voting. In another instance five or six men were seized and shut up in a room, from which they could not get away until the troops came to escort them. Some witnesses stated that in attempting to reach the polling-booth they had only been able to advance three-quarters of a mile in an hour and a-half, there being thirty barricades in the way. He was sorry that both elections had not been declared void, as it would have given respectable electors a chance of going to the poll without having their heads broken. Could an election be regarded as having been fairly conducted under those circumstances ? He had no wish to say anything disrespectful of the members of any religious persuasion ; but he was strongly impressed with the belief that the Roman Catholic clergy who had selected a candidate—although their interference might not have amounted to what was called undue influence — had sailed very near the wind. Judging from his experience of this, his first Election Committee, he was sorry the House had not thought fit to adopt the system of voting papers, by means of which quiet and respectable men would be enabled to tender their votes without running the risk of injury. On account of the violence which frequently occurred at Irish elections, it was, unfortunately, necessary to employ soldiers ; but all could bear testimony that their conduct, under the greatest provocation, was uniformly temperate and forbearing. He had not much experience of Irish elections, but he once happened to be the unpopular candidate at an election in that country, and although many of the Roman Catholic party, as well as of the Protestants, were in his favour, he was glad to receive the assistance of a certain number of soldiers to enable those who intended to vote for him to go to the poll.

MR. WHALLEY said, the hon. Member for Plymouth (Mr. Morrison) had raised a new issue. This was a most important Committee, where great constitutional interests were at stake, and yet the hon. Member for Plymouth, being a young Member, was put upon it. He had avowed the principle that one Committee was to be governed by the decisions, and, it might be, by the errors of another. The speeches delivered by the Roman Catholic priests from the altar during or after mass were at the bottom of the disturbances that had taken place. Voters were coerced to vote against their will, and Members were sent to that House and kept there for the purpose of defending the interests of the Romish priesthood. If the Roman Catholic voters were not free agents, what were their special claims to protection? Coercion was no strange thing in England. But the peculiarity of the Roman Catholic coerced voters was that they were coerced to return Members who voted not for the interests of the Empire, but for the interests of their own Church. Dr. Cullen had issued a missive desiring the Roman Catholics to return only those men who would vote for the interests of their Church; and those interests were known to be antagonistic to the principle of civil and religious liberty in every country in Europe. There was coercion by the priests as well as by the landowners, and it was the duty of the Government to investigate the whole matter. He had frequently brought before the House the way in which priestly influence was exercised, and he had lately called the Attorney General's attention to the fact that a Roman Catholic bishop had challenged the right of Her Majesty to occupy the Throne of this country. His efforts had hitherto been without effect. He had discharged his duty by again endeavouring to force the matter upon the attention of the House. He thanked the hon. and gallant Member for Harwich for bringing forward the question — and charged the Government with gross neglect of duty, because they had not taken notice of the matter.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £63,250, Increase of Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Men of the Militia.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: I have to propose a Vote of £63,250 to defray the charge for the Increase of Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Men of the Militia. The Resolution I propose comprises the remaining portions of the Supplemental Estimate voted for the increase of the pay of the army at an earlier period of the Session. It embraces four points. First, the addition of 2*d.* a day to the non-commissioned officers of the permanent Staff of the Militia, which will amount to £14,000. Secondly, the addition of 2*d.* a day to the pay of the men called up to preliminary drill, amounting to £1,250. Thirdly, an addition of 2*d.* a day to the men called up for annual training, amounting to £18,000. These items are rendered necessary by the increase of the pay of the army, to which the House has consented, and, considering the increase in the price of provisions and of labour, I trust the Committee will not object to extend the same increase of pay to the militia force. The fourth point embraced by the Resolution relates to the larger and more important subject of the creation of an Army of Reserve for this country. It is now my duty to explain the nature of this very important proposal. But I must, in the first instance, express my very great regret on all grounds that the present statement is not made by my right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Huntingdon (General Peel). With one exception, the plan I am about to state is entirely that of my right hon. and gallant Friend. The peculiar circumstances of the present Session have prevented this plan from being opened fully to the House and this Vote from being asked for at a much earlier period. Early in the month of March, before my right hon. and gallant Friend left the office in which I became his successor, he brought under the consideration of the House the Army Estimates for the year. In the course of the clear and able speech by which he introduced them, he explained the general nature of his plan for forming an Army of Reserve, and laid before the House an outline of the mode in which he proposed to carry out that important object. His statement was so clear and so complete that it would be presumption on my part to go over the same ground, had it not been for the long interval of time since elapsed. I will not dwell upon the causes which have led to a very general opinion that some Army of Reserve in this country has become necessary; that it behoves Parliament to provide the means of national defence, and the power of carrying on war in the event of any emergency arising, with greater rapidity than we have hitherto been able to do. The extraordinary revolution of late years in our naval power is one cause which evidently points to the necessity of taking fresh steps for the increase of our military power. In the event of any emergency arising, it would be difficult, if not impossible, from the limited number of our regular army, and the manner in which that army is dispersed throughout our immense dominions, in all quarters of the globe, to collect more than some 40,000 or 50,000 men in this country. This subject occupied the attention of the Royal Commission appointed to consider the best means of recruiting for the army. In the Report of that Commission I find this passage—

> "Recent events, however, have taught us that we must not rely in future on having time for preparation. Wars will be sudden in their commencement and short in their duration, and woe to that country which is unprepared to defend itself against any contingency that may arise, or combination that may be formed against it! The first duty of those who preside over the administration of the army is to look to its constitution."

That is a very striking passage, the force, truth, and justice of which, no one will dispute. What is our position at this moment with regard to anything like a military Reserve? For the general purposes of war we have at this moment no Reserve at all. We have not a battalion of which we can speak as constituting a Reserve for the general purposes of war. For the purpose of home defence, I admit we have a very important Reserve. We have our militia force, now standing at 90,000 men, but the full *quota* of which, as I shall presently explain, would be one fourth more. That would make the militia Reserve 120,000. Then we have the results of that striking Volunteer movement which has excited so much attention and admiration in the country during the last few years. The Volunteer force amounts to 180,000. We may therefore consider that, for the purposes of home defence, we have in militia and Volunteers a force of 300,000 men. And I do not for myself feel a moment's doubt if any great emergency arose—if the country were threatened with any attempt at invasion—the same spirit which created that force of 180,000 Volunteers would enable us with great rapidity to double or treble that number of men. In support of that opinion I need only refer to the fact that when there was a similar apprehension in 1803, when we had so much smaller a population, the force of Volunteers amounted to between 400,000 and 500,000. In addition to the force of the militia and Volunteers we have, also, what I may call a special Reserve consisting of the enrolled pensioners, and a Reserve force created by Act of Parliament passed at the close of 1859, by Mr. Sydney Herbert, then Secretary of State for War. Our pensioner force was created by a succession of Acts of Parliament about twenty years ago, commencing with power to enrol 10,000 pensioners. Subsequently it was extended to 20,000, and then to 30,000. The law with regard to the enrolment of pensioners as it now stands gives us power to enroll 30,000; but up to this time that power has never been fully exercised. The number at this moment is 14,000, so that after the long period these Acts have been in operation we have not half the amount of force authorized by these Acts of Parliament. With regard to the other portion of the Reserve, that created in 1859, after the retirement of Lord Derby's Government, when Mr. Sydney Herbert succeeded my right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Huntingdon as Secretary of State for War, power was taken by the Act of Parliament to enrol men who had served the whole period of ten years for which they had enlisted in a Reserve force not to exceed 20,000 men. Therefore, the whole Reserve force authorized by these Acts of Parliament would amount to 50,000. But the Act of 1859 has been very unproductive of results, about 4,000 only having been enrolled under that Act. So that these three sources of military strength, which combined should have given 50,000 have, in fact, only given us 19,000 or 20,000 men. These forces, both the pensioners and the Army of Reserve created by Mr. Sidney Herbert, were limited to service at home. In neither case could they be employed for any service out of the country. I would again call attention to an important passage in the Report of the Recruiting Commission. They say—

> "Under these circumstances we are not prepared to propose any plan as one that may be relied on to secure a large Army of Reserve; the object sought may, however, be accomplished to a small extent by increasing the enrolled pensioner force, which at present amounts to 14,000 men. To these might be added all men who decline to renew their engagements after their first period of service on such terms as might secure their service for a deferred pension. We would further suggest that all men permitted to purchase their discharge—with special exceptions, to be sanctioned by the Secretary of State for War—should be compelled to serve for five years with the above forces. All these sources of supply combined would, however, form but a small Reserve force, and we are of opinion that it is to our militia we must look for the solid and constitutional Reserve of the country, and we would earnestly recommend that more attention should be given to its organization, that its numbers should be maintained up to the full legal quota, and that, so far as is possible, the period for drilling the recruits should be more extended."

As to the recommendation that men should purchase their discharge subject to the duty of serving in the Reserve, I am not able to state to the Committee any plan; but I think it is well worthy of consideration, and the War Office is now considering it. It was after due consideration of the Report of the Commission, and after due consideration of the circumstances to which I have called the attention of the Committee, that my right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Huntingdon, prepared the plan which he wished to bring forward on this subject. That plan consisted of two portions. The first portion of it, founded upon the recommendations in the Report to which I have referred, relies upon the militia force for providing a considerable portion of the Reserve for the general purposes of war. The militia force now stands at 90,000 men, but by the present plan it is to be raised to its full quota of 120,000 men, of whom 30,000 are to be men enlisted and enrolled as militiamen upon the condition that they shall be ready at any moment in the event of war, or of war being imminent, to take service in the regular army. As an inducement to men to enlist in the militia upon these conditions, they are to receive a Government bounty of £12, or £2 8*s.* a year in the place of £6, or £1 5*s.* a year they now receive for five years' service. In connection with that proposal, by the plan of my right hon. and gallant Friend, soldiers who by the New Enlistment Act have enlisted for twelve years are to be permitted, after serving two-thirds of that period, to commute the rest of their service by serving two years in the Army of Reserve for every one year of the term of their original enlistment unexpired. The plan further proposed that these men so commuting the remainder of their term of service in the regular army shall be added to the different regiments of militia in whatever locality they desired to be placed and should serve and drill with those regiments. This is the only point on which the proposal which I now venture to make to the Committee on behalf of the Government differs from that of my right hon. and gallant Friend. After consulting with many military men, I was induced to believe that it would be better that these men should not serve in the militia regiments, that they should be attached to the Army of Reserve, and that they should drill with the pensioners and others of the Reserve force which I have adverted to as being formed under the Act of 1859. I was unwilling to make any alterations in the plan of my right hon. and gallant Friend without first obtaining his consent to such a course. I made this change, having consulted him upon it under the full impression that he had concurred in its propriety, but I am afraid, from what I have since heard, that I was mistaken, and that he does not concur in the proposed alteration; I am, however, induced to support this alteration in the plan in consequence of the general opinion among military men, that considerable practical difficulties exist to those who have commuted their term of service being permitted to serve with the militia. The militia is a county force, whereas the soldiers serve under the Crown; and it would require a very extensive change in our military laws to give the militia officers a proper power over their men. I am not aware whether up to the present time my right hon. and gallant Friend has ever stated how many men he expected to raise by this portion of his plan. The plan I propose to the Committee is this—that the first Reserve shall consist of 30,000 militiamen, who, in consideration of the double bounty, will be ready at any moment during their period of service to join the regular army, and to serve wherever they might be required. The second portion of the first Reserve will consist of the men willing to commute a period of their enlistment, and, following the Act of Mr. Sydney Herbert, these men I propose to limit to 20,000. It is very doubtful whether for a considerable time we shall succeed in getting 20,000 men in this way. The Act of Mr. Sydney Herbert entirely failed, because it contemplated raising 10,000 men, and up to this time we have only 4,000. We must bear in mind, however, that the plan I have now to submit differs from that of Mr. Sydney Herbert in two or three important particulars. In the first place the plan of Mr. Sydney Herbert proposed to enlist men in this Army of Reserve only after the expiration of the whole period of their original enlistment, whereas in the present plan it is proposed to allow the men one-third of the term of their service in the regular army. Secondly, under Mr. Sydney Herbert's plan, the Army of Reserve was not to serve out of the kingdom; whereas that I am laying before the Committee those forming it will be liable to serve in any part of the world. The second portion of the Army of Reserve is to consist of 30,000 men, composed of pensioners and others enrolled under existing Acts, with any soldiers who have served the whole of their first period of enlistment, and who may be willing to enter the Army of Reserve, or who may be willing to commute the third of the period of their second term of enlistment for the sake of the pension for service in the regular army. We shall thus obtain an Army of Reserve numbering 80,000 men, of whom 50,000 will be available for service in any part of the world, and 30,000 for home service. Then, as to the cost of this Army of Reserve. The most costly as well as the most important part of the plan will be the double bounty to the 30,000 men proposed to be added to the militia. The militia bounty will average 24*s.* a year for five years; therefore that item will amout to £36,000. As it is contemplated to add those men to the Army of Reserve, it is fair to calculate that the whole amount of bounty due to those men will amount to £72,000. The pay of 30,000 will come to £70,875, so that the two sums together—the bounty and pay—will amount to £142,875. I should propose to pay those who get into the Reserve by commuting their period of service in the army the same double bounty, 48*s.* a year, as we propose to give to the Reserve portion of the militia force. I think it necessary to explain this because Mr. Sydney Herbert's Reserve force, under the Act of 1859, was paid at a higher rate. Mr. Sydney Herbert's proposal was to give to militiamen who entered the Army of Reserve £4 per annum as bounty, besides the regular pay given to the pensioners during the time they were serving. It appears to me, however, that £4 bounty for every year is a very large amount. It makes the force a very expensive one, and I am disposed to think that we may find £2 8*s.* per man quite sufficient to secure the service of these men, especially when we consider the boon held out to them of being released from one-third of the period which they have undertaken to serve in the regular army. Assuming that we find 20,000 willing to enter the Reserve force from the army on these terms the bounty will amount to £48,000, and the pay of these men for twelve days' training to £24,900. This portion of the force will therefore cost £72,900, and the total cost of the two portions of this first Reserve composed of the 30,000 militiamen and the 20,000 commuted men will amount to £215,775. This calculation, however, will not include the cost of their clothing, which I may, I think, fairly and safely assume at £15,000, so that the whole of this Reserve force would in round figures cost us £230,000. I have thus endeavoured to explain the nature of the proposal, and, in case the Committee approve it, the Bills which we have prepared on the subject will be proceeded with. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the Vote for £63,250, Increase of Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Men of the Militia.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I wish, Sir, to make a few remarks upon this estimate, and upon the speech delivered by the right hon. Baronet. I must say, in the first place, that I think the proposal to increase by 2*d.* a day the pay of the militia ought not to pass without some consideration. Neither I nor any other Member on this side of the House made any objection when it was proposed to make an increase to the pay of the regular army, but I cannot see on what grounds it is proposed to extend that increase to the militia. The two services are differently situated. There is a great difficulty in obtaining recruits for the army, but we have frequently been assured that the same difficulty is not experienced in the case of the militia. The pay of the militia is very much superior to the pay of the Line for the short time during which they are in training. The militiaman not only receives 13*d.* a day during that period, but he receives also 24*s.* as bounty, as well as a pair of boots and other articles of clothing, which at the close of the training he is allowed to take away with him. An hon. Member has on these grounds estimated the pay of the militiaman during the period of training at no less than 3*s.* 2*d.* a day. The same objection does not apply to the permanent Staff, because they are employed all the year round, and are, therefore, fairly entitled to the same benefits as those which are to be conferred on non-commissioned officers in the regular service. With regard to the proposal to create different species of Reserve force I have little to say. I doubt, however, whether it is worth our while to call this an Army of Reserve. The right hon. Gentleman, in speaking to-night, alluded to the causes which had led the public to turn their attention, during the last year or two, to the subject of a Reserve Army. No doubt the war of last year, and events which have recently occurred, have called our attention very forcibly to the subject. Still, the force which it is proposed to create cannot be named in the same day with the Reserve force of Prussia and other Continental nations, and the danger is, by bestowing such a name upon this force, the country may be led to believe that we are actually in possession of such an Army of Reserve. I cannot understand, after the explanations we have had, how the first class Army of Reserve can ever approach the estimated number of 20,000 men. As far as I can understand, the Reserve is to be formed from the difference between our foreign or colonial establishments and our peace establishments. We have about 50 regiments serving at home, and the difference would in the case of each regiment amount to 150 men. I do not, therefore, see how the number can exceed 50 times 150, or 7,500 men. This seems to me to be especially the case, considering what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon said — namely, that it was not intended to exact from the men entering the Reserve a double period of service; but only to require them to serve the number of years in the Reserve they would have done in the Line. The number cannot, therefore, as far as I can see, exceed 7,500 men, unless some means, which I confess I am unacquainted with, are taken to induce them to remain in the Army of Reserve after they are entitled to claim their discharge. If my calculation about the first class of the Army of Reserve be at all correct, I cannot see how the numbers of the second class are to exceed those of the first. The proposals with regard to the Reserve of militia are very good as far as they go. But it must be remembered that these 30,000 men which it is proposed to draft into the regular army in time of war can scarcely be called an Army of Reserve, because immediately war breaks out they will be absorbed, and from that time will disappear. Thus, they would not be a Reserve which should, properly speaking, be a last resort, but they would be a first resort, partaking scarcely more of the nature of a Reserve than the regular army itself. Although the right hon. Gentleman (Sir John Pakington) proposes to raise the Militia to the full quota of 120,000, he should remember that the present strength of 90,000 is only intended to serve for times of peace. The effect of his proposal in time of danger will be to take 30,000 men suddenly from the militia. We shall not only be obliged to employ all our energies in order to keep up the force of the regular army, but shall also have to set new machinery to work in order to recover the 30,000 men draughted from the militia to the Line. I admit that it is by no means a bad proposal, that these 30,000 men should be within reach. They would, no doubt, be very useful. Still, to call them a Reserve is a misnomer. I regret that the right hon. Gentleman had not before this put us in possession of the figures with regard to cost and numbers which he read to us. I understood that he had promised to do so, and if he laid them on the table we should have been able to discuss them now with more chance of ascertaining their accuracy, and generally with more advantage to the public service. I trust he will lay them on the table now, so that we may examine them before we again discuss the question, because it is impossible rightly to estimate figures as they fall from a speaker's lips. My present impression is, that if the first class of Reserve is really to amount to anything at all, it will be practically a shortening of the term of service in the army. But if the term of service in the army is to be shortened, a greater number of recruits will be required, and recruiting expenses and bounties will be increased in proportion. In this way I think the right hon. Gentleman will be found out in his calculations; but I would suggest that this matter should be postponed. The safety of the country will not be imperilled by postponement. This is a question which may, with great propriety, be left for a Parliament elected by a new constituency, which there is reason for believing will take a different view of military matters from that prevalent among the existing constituency. The reformed Parliament will probably take a much broader view of such questions than the present Parliament does. There appears to be less reason for pressing the matter forward during this Session when we consider that, as the militia has been already out for training, it is impossible to carry out the really substantial part of the plan before next year.

GENERAL PEEL: The noble Marquess objects to the additional 2*d.* a day being extended to the militia; I, on the contrary have always endeavoured to make no distinction between the militia and the army in the amount of pay. In fact, if any difference be made between them, it should be in favour of the militia, who during the time of their training do more drill and more hard work than any other troops in the same period. There are no persons who have an opportunity of so readily comparing the difference between the pay of the army and the wages earned by labourers as the militia, who come fresh to the service from their ordinary work and pay; therefore I should say, if there was any necessity of raising the rate of pay in order to keep up the number, that it existed specially in their case. As to the Army of Reserve, I admit that the plan sketched out by the Secretary of State for War, so far as it goes, is mine, and that I am bound by it. It is said that the plan of an Army of Reserve is founded entirely on the Report of the Royal Commissioners on recruiting. It is true that one of the references to that Commission was the formation of an Army of Reserve. I will not read the strong remarks of the Commission on the necessity of an Army of Reserve. But they did not lay down any plan. When that Commission reported, I felt it to be my duty, in conjunction with the Commander-in-Chief, to consider the best means of forming an Army of Reserve. The noble Lord (Lord Elcho) has overlooked the fact that, by the plan before the Committee, there are two Armies of Reserve—one for foreign service, and the other for home defence. The noble Lord has complained of the Enlistment Bill, which has already passed this House, requiring twelve years' service. He also complains of the two other Bills which are to come before the House, the objects of which are, if possible, to relieve any hardship that might be inflicted by the first. But I consider the plan now proposed as one of the most beneficial measures for the soldier that has been brought forward for a considerable period. Though apparently small in itself it involves great principles: first, that a man shall be able to commute a portion of his service in the Line for the Army of Reserve; and, secondly, that when a war takes place the man who so enlists in the first Reserve will only be called on to serve during the time of that war, without being necessarily a soldier all his life. My right hon. Friend is wrong when he supposes that I intended that those who wished to commute the remaining period of their services in the Line for a period in the first Reserve should serve a double portion. The original proposal was that a man who volunteered after serving two-thirds of his first engagement, should only be called on to serve the remainder of his time in the first Reserve, and that the man during the second period of his service should not be called on to serve two years for one with the pensioners to entitle him to his pension. The Royal Commission recommended that when a man had purchased his discharge he should be called upon to serve a certain time in the Army of Reserve; but if a man buys his discharge at the full price, what right have you to ask him to serve in the Army of Reserve? What I suggested was that if a man wished to purchase his discharge he should be permitted to pay a portion of the price only on condition of his serving a certain time in the Reserve. That, I think, would have been a great boon to the army. If the man had five years more to serve, I would tell him he might purchase his discharge at a certain rate. We should have a commuted price for the purchase of discharges—an arrangement which would, I believe, prove very beneficial. It is said that by the proposal of a first Army of Reserve we shall get very few men indeed; but I regarded it as tending to make the army popular, by offering a boon to the soldier, as well as securing an advantage to the State. I should be happy to see our best soldiers remaining in the army; but surely when a man can find other employment, and is willing to commute the remainder of his service in the Line for service in the Reserve, if a war broke out he is as available as any man in the service. Suppose we did not allow him to commute his service in the Line, and he had only three or four more years to serve, when those three or four years expired he would take his discharge just at the moment when we wanted him. My argument is intended to show that when a man who has served two-thirds of his period comes home he should have the opportunity of commuting the remainder of it. That would be a much better system than enlisting men compulsorily to serve a certain number of years in the Line, and afterwards to enter the Reserve. I cannot agree with what has fallen from my noble Friend (Lord Elcho) in respect to the difficulty of filling up the militia. If a war broke out we could always call up a portion of the first Reserve, and fill up the Reserve by volunteers from the militia. In case of war we might be called upon to fill up our regiments of the Line. There will be economy in that, because I propose to reduce the regiments of the Line to 600 men each, provided we have an Army of Reserve, by means of which, in the event of war, we could at once bring them up to a war standard. In future wars the hostilities would be over before we could raise our second battalions. My right hon. Friend proposes to attach the first Reserve to the pensioners; but I propose to attach them to the militia. This plan I would wish the militia officers to consider seriously. I am desirous that a closer connection should be formed between the militia and the Line. My impression is that the men commuting the remainder of their first period of service in the Line for service in the first Reserve would be just the kind of men that the militia would be glad to receive. What would be the result of attaching them to the pensioners? You will have the first Reserve divided between the pensioners and the militia. Their duty with the pensioners will give them no right to pensions, while the second Reserve will have to serve two years instead of one in order to obtain pensions. If you attach the discharged soldiers to the pensioners you must have a great addition to the Staff Officers of the pensioners. We had much better place the pensioners under the Horse Guards at once. To give the money, which these additional Staff Officers would cost, to the militia would, I think, be a far better arrangement. The Army Reserve was not formed without the greatest consideration. The Commander-in-Chief and myself went most deeply into the question. You cannot compare our army organization with that of any other army in the world. In time of peace it has to perform duties which no other army is called on to perform. Other countries raise their troops by conscription, whereas ours are raised by voluntary enlistment. France and other States have in regard to their armies a power of expansion which is unlimited, whereas in our case there is comparatively no power of expansion; and if we went to war to morrow we should be obliged to have recourse to large bounties. It has been said "Look at America, which raised a million of men in a very short time, and why could we not do something similar?" But I should like to know what it has cost America to raise that million of men; it has been stated that she had to pay upwards of £110,000,000 in bounty money. And look at the difference between the old experienced class of soldiers and the raw levies obtained by bounties. I do not say that my proposal will give the best possible Army of Reserve. It is only an experiment and the expense of trying it will be moderate. If we do not pass this Bill, which enables soldiers to commute the remainder of their service in the Line for service in the proposed Army of Reserve, we shall be obliged to discharge them altogether, because the strength of the regiments coming home is to be reduced to 600. I hope the Committee will not adopt the recommendation of the noble Marquess and postpone for another year the creation of what I believe will be the most efficient Army of Reserve which we could establish.

GENERAL DUNNE said, the adoption of the proposed plan would involve a bounty of £5 per man to such militiamen as chose to accept it, and for that bounty the Government expected to obtain 30,000 trained men ready to march into the ranks at once on an emergency. These men, on accepting the bounty, were to engage to serve for five years, anywhere the Government required, either at home or abroad, and the success of the measure depended on the numbers that would accept the proffered bounty. It was possible that many would do so—perhaps many under the idea that they would never be called out; but it must be remembered that at this moment the militia force was deficient in numbers. According to the last Returns the number of men wanted to complete the regiments in England and Scotland was 27,000. In Ireland they could not tell the numbers wanting, because at the outbreak of Fenianism it was thought proper to stop recruiting there. As to the other part of the plan—that of commuting the service of men who had not served their first period—he would be very unwilling to abridge the term of twelve years to any great extent. They all knew that in the Peninsular war, after being six or seven years in the field, our soldiers were so good that the Duke of Wellington said he could do anything with them. Therefore he did not concur in the theory that mere boys enlisted at eighteen, or seventeen, or sixteen years of age, were the best soldiers after merely two years' service. We could have no troops so good as those who had been eight or ten years in the service. As to attaching the men, who were allowed to commute their service, to the pensioners, he could not conceive anything more objectionable. The pensioners might be of value in a fort or in the defence of towns; but they were generally men discharged for being incapable of active service, and many of them could not march three miles. But the intended force for a Reserve, consisting of men from the Line who had commuted their service, might, however, do a great deal of good to the militia if they joined them together. They were men probably not much older than the militiamen themselves, but they were more fully instructed. He trusted the project of attaching these men to the pensioners would be re-considered.

MR. O'REILLY said, that with every respect for the versatile attainments of the present Secretary for War, he must express his regret at the retirement from that office of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon, whose plan was simple, and involved no addition to the Staff and no increase of officers. The Secretary for War said he had adopted the proposals of his predecessor, adding, as if it were a matter of no importance, that he had made one slight change by attach the new Army of Reserve to the first Army of Reserve instead of the militia. That, however, was a very shadowy proposal. When inquiry was on one occasion made of the late Lord Herbert as to the numbers of our Army Reserve, and a Return on the subject was produced, it was found that they only amounted to 1,500, and that they never had been drilled. That another Army of Reserve should be added to that Army of Reserve for the purposes of drill appeared to him to be a somewhat visionary scheme. What was really meant was that a separate organization with a separate Staff and officers for the new Army of Reserve was to be established. This was proved by the fact that in the Bill was a proviso for the creation of whatever officers might be deemed desirable. That was a serious objection to the change. But there was another of still greater weight, which was that it would tend to widen rather than to diminish the connection between the militia and the Line — a connection which was recommended by Lord Strathnairn and other witnesses of the highest authority before the Commission, and which the plan of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was calculated to promote. He thought that the proposals of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon were fully authorized by the evidence given before the Committee, and that one of their principal advantages was that there would have been established a connection between the Line and the militia. Now, however, it was proposed not to engraft this Army of Reserve on one of the old organizations, but to establish another organization, and for what purpose he could not conceive, unless it was for the purpose of making more Staff officers. He expressed his approval of the proposals of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Huntingdon when they were first explained, and he saw no reason to change his opinion after consideration; but he considered that they had been so entirely perverted from their original purpose by the alterations introduced by the present Secretary of War and by the changes contemplated by the Bill, that he deemed them no longer deserving of support. He therefore concurred in the suggestion of the noble Lord that the consideration of the matter should be deferred to another year. The point evidently aimed at by those who framed the Bill was to set up a separate and distinct organization, not only for those who retired from the army, but for those who retired from the militia, and to a considerable extent to remove the militia Reserve from the militia. He wished to know whether the statement of the right hon. Baronet was correct that the present Army of Reserve amounted to 4,000. He rather thought, according to a Return made last Session, it was only 1,500. The

Secretary at War had stated that in the event of invasion it would be impossible to collect more than 40,000 men; but on referring to the effective state of the Army, it would be found that on the 1st of May last year there were no fewer than 85,000 troops of all arms in the United Kingdom.

MAJOR DICKSON said, he had listened to the statement of the right hon. Baronet with feelings of the greatest possible disappointment. His proposal would not give an Army of Reserve that would at all benefit the country. It was absolutely necessary to have an Army of Reserve strong in numbers, in efficiency, in discipline, and, above all, with a perfect system of regimental discipline. Instead of this a scheme was proposed surrounded with difficulties and complications. It multiplied organizations, and he could not, therefore, go so far as the noble Lord the Member for Lancashire, when he said that it would do no harm, but would do no good. He was afraid the scheme of the Government would only stand in the way of an efficient system. There would be 50,000 men of the militia and pensioners liable to general service, but he could see no reason why the Government should not at once propose to turn the militia into an Army of Reserve. Thus the unnecessary multiplying of organizations would be avoided, and they would have an Army of Reserve which would be well fitted to co-operate with the regular army, or replace it at need. He hoped the Government would withdraw the proposal with the view of preparing some scheme which would, in the event of an European war, enable us to maintain our national dignity.

MAJOR WALKER said, he wished to remove a misapprehension which seemed to prevail with reference to the pay of the private militia soldier. It had been calculated, including bounty and clothing, to amount to 3*s.* 2*d.* a day. That statement was founded on the evidence of Colonel Pipon; but he believed it was inaccurate. It proceeded on the supposition that the militiaman served only twenty-one instead of forty-two days the first year, and twenty-seven days in every other year. He received, in fact, only 1*s.* 1*d.* for his daily duty; but when he was discharged did his liabilities end there? Far from it; he returned to his home, liable to be called out at a month's notice—to have to leave his family and his civil employment, and to be subject to all the rigour of the Mutiny Act. It was for this that he received his annual bounty, and he did not think that 24*s.* was an excessive retaining fee.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH said, he considered the authority of the noble Lord the late Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) a very sufficient authority for the statement he had made with reference to the pay of the militia. The principal point was whether the Army of Reserve should be attached to the pensioners or to the militia. If the pensioners were dissolved and added to the militia they would be a very valuable auxiliary in teaching to that force the good habits of the soldier; it would also be a great saving to the public. The Report of the Recruiting Commission disapproved of the practice of giving bounties, and recommended that they should not be increased. He had seen sufficient of the way in which bounties were dispensed to induce him to object to the system. If they were to be given, they should be given in a way to benefit the soldier himself and his family, not to be spent in drink. Another item in the Vote, the proposed addition of 2*d.* per day to the Staff serjeants, had reference to the pay of the permanent Staff of the militia. No body of men in the service did more work for the money they received, or were more thoroughly deserving of any encouragement the House could afford them. But, while he gladly welcomed this addition to their pay, he would also like to see their duties increased. He wished to see the recruiting done to a great extent by the Staff of the militia during the ten months of the year when they remained idle. He agreed with the hon. Member opposite that the addition of 2*d.* a day to the pay of the militia was unnecessary, unless the service of the militia regiments was assimilated to that of the Line, when, of course, the pay should be the same as that of the Line. He hoped that the case of militia quartermasters would be taken into consideration. Their retiring pensions were most inadequate, and they received no lodging-money when their regiments were disembodied.

LORD EDWARD CLINTON said, that the more the question was discussed, the more he was convinced that it should be postponed for another year. The militia had never been able to keep up the Line, even when it numbered 250,000 men. In this year 15,000 men would leave the ranks, next year 23,000, and in 1869, 19,000 men. They should look for their

Reserve to the men who had served twelve years, and by adding them to the existing Reserve force they would soon obtain a Reserve force of 100,000 men, if proper inducements were offered. He would give as much as 6*d.* a day, and though that, no doubt, was a large sum, the country might recoup itself by reducing the regular army to the extent of 5, or at most 10 per cent. He did not think that short terms of service would answer for our army in consequence of the great distances our men had to be sent.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that he supported the suggestion that the measure should be postponed for a year. He was one of those old-fashioned politicians who regarded a standing army as a standing injury. Nature itself pointed out that a standing army was unsuited to our case for we had not the faculty of organizing one. It seemed to him that sufficient prominence had not been given to the Volunteer force, which he thought generally did not receive from the Government the encouragement it deserved.

Lord ELCHO said, he did not feel at all disposed to enter upon a discussion as to whether or not a standing army was a standing injury. He might, however, as a humble member of the Volunteer force, say that he differed very greatly from the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley), and that he felt grateful for the encouragement extended to that body both by the country and by the House. He had risen because, at an earlier period of the evening, he had been debarred from discussing the question raised by this Vote and by the two Bills on the Paper—a discussion on which he had entered because he had been under the impression that the whole subject was to be debated on going into Committee of Supply. Had he then been allowed to proceed, he had intended to suggest, as his noble Friend the Member for North Lancashire (the Marquess of Hartington) had done, that the subject should be postponed for another year. With his noble Friend, he believed that the scheme was not calculated to obtain for us an efficient Army of Reserve, while the country and the House might be betrayed into a delusive reliance upon a force which would in reality not be deserving the name bestowed upon it. The Commission on Recruiting stated in their Report that we could not at the present moment bring together more than 40,000 of our regular army. Our militia, which might perhaps be 120,000 strong, and which if the Act were enforced might be stronger by 60,000 men, would only give us 90,000, and our pensioners, who might be 30,000 strong, only half that number. In addition to that, our Army of Reserve, which had been a "standing" joke, would produce 2,500 men. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Queen's County (General Dunne) had said moreover that we must eliminate the body of pensioners altogether from our calculations. Now, what was the state in which we were to be placed according to the Army Reserve scheme as proposed by the Government? We were to have a first Army of Reserve, which it was hoped would number 20,000 men. His noble Friend the Member for North Lancashire, however had made a calculation showing that we could not rely upon more than fifty times 150, or 7,500 men. By the Reserve system we were to have 30,000 of the militia ready to be transferred at any moment into the Line. But he could not help thinking that, like the Irishman's blanket, we were cutting off the bottom what we added to the top, because by so doing we should at once reduce the strength of the militia by the 30,000 men who were to join the army. How was the plan to be carried out? It was proposed to get men to enlist on those terms by giving them double bounties, spreading over their pay what was equal to £12. During the Crimean war we had a system of feeding the army from the militia. In one year 10,000 men enlisted for the militia, and in another 8,000, and these men each received a bounty of £6 on enlistment. Did any man doubt that in case of war breaking out we should be able by offering a bounty of £12 to get the 30,000 men whom it was now proposed to place at disposal for service in the army? He did not think that this Army Reserve scheme as it at present stood deserved the consideration of the House. His right hon. and gallant Friend (General Peel) the father of the original scheme had found it so disfigured since it had passed into the hands of the right hon. Baronet that he now disowned it. He had felt in proposing the Motion which had come under discussion at an earlier period of the evening that he was leading a forlorn hope; but he believed that the only permanent basis upon which we could rely was a modified form of conscription. Lord Dalhousie had expressed a similar opinion on more than one occasion, and had, moreover, said, that if any Government were bold enough to put the compulsory system into operation, they would, in his belief, find themselves supported by the voice of the country. He could not help feeling that the scheme proposed was one which was utterly inefficient for the purpose for which it was intended, and he would, therefore, join his noble Friend (the Marquess of Hartington) in expressing a hope that it would not be pressed this Session.

SIR HARRY VERNEY said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman (Sir John Pakington) would give his best attention to the whole subject, so as to put the country in a state of security against any emergency. He had always objected to the reduction of the Indian Army, which was one of the best in the world. He thought it would be well, considering the great Empire we had on the other side of the world, to maintain a separate army there, thus obviating the necessity of keeping up so large an army at home, and saving the great expense of sending regiments across the sea. With regard to providing for discharged soldiers, nothing was more painful than to see soldiers who had served for many years discharged with a small pension. It would be much better to instruct them in some trade and so save them from penury. He did not know whether there were any arrears of prize money yet undistributed, but the delay and mismanagement that had taken place in this department were much to be regretted. A system of military apprenticeship would be very advantageous, there being no reason why boys should not be trained for the army as well as for the navy. The increase of pay would give give general satisfaction, and everything should be done to bring a superior class of men into the army. Soldiers should not be mere machines, but should be taught so as to understand the object of every manœuvre. The way foreign armies were rendered so efficient was by giving instruction to the men. He trusted that by next year the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared with a scheme which would meet with the general support of the House, and would provide against any emergency that might arise on the continent.

GENERAL PEEL said, he hoped this matter would not be postponed, for his principle had always been to take the best he could get. There was nothing to prevent the plan he had proposed from being adopted when the Bill got into Committee, and he earnestly trusted that the Government would not consent to a postponement for another year.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he could not accede to the suggestion of his noble Friend (Lord Elcho) and other Members to abandon the Bills which he had introduced with the view of carrying out this plan. Some hon. Members seemed to look on the plan as insufficient; but this was a strange reason for folding our hands and doing nothing. The prevalent opinion seemed to be that by securing the services of one-fourth of our whole militia force, and making them available for the general purposes of war, we should to, that extent, secure a very efficient Reserve. With regard to the proposal that a certain proportion of the army should be permitted to commute a portion of their service for service in the Reserve, and the question whether the drilling and training was to be in one way or another, these were matters of detail which could be settled in Committee. In common with his right hon. and gallant Friend (General Peel) he had little doubt it would then be easy to come to an agreement. He thought his noble Friend (Lord Elcho) had considerably under-rated the force that might be derived from commuted men, for he believed a considerable force might be thus obtained. The deficiency of our present resources being acknowledged, it could not be advisable to defer the matter. The regulations in which the important details of the scheme were to be arranged would be laid on the table. He hoped, therefore, the Vote would be passed.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £20,000, Additional Pay to the Army Reserve Force.

(3.) £50,000, Increase of Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Privates, Royal Marine Corps.

MR. CORRY said, that he would have to trouble the Committee with only a few words in proposing this Vote, which was rendered necessary by the increase in the pay of the army, which had been sanctioned by the House. It had always been the practice to assimilate the pay of the Marines to that of the army, and he had only to explain that it was impossible to provide for the cost of their increased pay in the original Estimates, because it was dependent upon the sanction of the House to the increased pay of the army, which had only recently been obtained.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that the increased pay of the army was granted in consequence of the recommendation of the Recruiting Committee to that effect. He did not offer the smallest objection to that increase, as it was proposed on the responsibility of the Government, and he doubted whether they could have done otherwise, with the recommendation of the Recruiting Commission before them. He wished, however, to know whether an increase of pay to the Royal Marines was required on account of any difficulty in recruiting, or whether it was only proposed because a similar Vote had been agreed to for the army?

Mr. OTWAY said, he thought that the Vote now proposed was the natural consequence of the Vote just agreed to for increasing the pay of the army. The men who served with the Marines were the seamen of the navy, who might think they also had a claim. He wished to know whether it was proposed to make any augmentation to the pay of the seamen of the fleet? He presumed that the Marines would receive arrears from the day on which the proposal was originally made. There were very few Members of the Government better acquainted with the working of their office than the right hon Gentleman (Mr. Corry), and he wished to know whether it was proposed to pay the arrears in a lump sum, or spread over different periods of time? The increase was not a bit more than the Marines were entitled to.

Mr. CORRY said, that the Marines were a very popular force, and, speaking generally, there was no difficulty in keeping up the force to the number voted. If, however, they did not receive an augmentation corresponding to that given to the army it would not only lose its popularity, but great offence would be given, and a difficulty in obtaining recruits would be the probable consequence. The Marines were a branch of the army, and it would not be possible to withhold from them the advantage given to the rest of the army. There was, however, no reason why, because the House increased the pay of the Marines, they should also increase the pay of the seamen of the fleet. The wages of seamen had been increased at various times of late years, and they were content with their pay. The increase would date from the 1st of April. He thought it would be advisable to pay the arrears, not in a lump sum, but by instalments, but that would depend on what had been done in the case of the army.

Vote *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

FORTIFICATIONS AND WORKS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON moved—

> "That towards providing a further sum for defraying the Expenses of the construction of Works for the Defence of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, a sum not exceeding £800,000 be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, and that the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized and empowered to raise the said sum by Annuities, for a term not exceeding thirty years, and that such Annuities shall be charged upon and be payable out of the said Consolidated Fund; that the said Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorized to direct the payment to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, out of the said Consolidated Fund, of the sum of £800, for the Management of the Contributions to be received by the said Governor and Company in respect of the said Annuities."

He said, that £150,000 of the £800,000 would be devoted to the placing of iron shields on fortifications, a work which would be completed by the expenditure from time to time of £450,000. The balance of £650,000 to be devoted to general works, was similar to the amount which had been devoted annually for some time past.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON said, he entirely approved of the object for which this Vote was asked. He did not know whether it was the intention of the late Government to have proposed this increase for the iron shields, but both himself and his predecessor at the War Office had been of opinion that this expenditure should be incurred.

Lord ELCHO said, he had heard that the iron shields or sheathing proposed to be used at Portsmouth were to be applied on a worse principle than the iron which was used for the same purpose at Cronstadt.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that the schields in this country would be applied in a different way, but it did not follow that they would prove inferior.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he thought that £450,000 was a large sum to expend for such a purpose, more especially as they were not likely to prove stable, it being well known that salt water would corrode and eat away iron. He had some doubt as to whether the proper course to pursue was to pay for these fortifications by means of a loan, which involved the necessity of borrowing for works of a temporary character, while at the same time we were paying off a loan. He thought it would be better to pay the cost if possible, out of the revenue of the country. They might just as well pay for the sheathing of the ironclads by means of a loan.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, that he had placed on the Paper a Motion for next Tuesday which would open up the whole question of our fortifications. He attached no blame with respect to the plans of fortification — which seemed to him to be altogether faulty in principle and utterly useless—to the Government, because they were the plans of the late Government. He had had great experience in the matter of fortification plates. Many good judges considered the plates used as quite inferior and erroneous in principle. He thought the best principle had not been adopted with regard to the subject of fortifications It was his intention next Tuesday to move a Resolution to suspend the further proceeding with the fortifications until some competent authority had fully considered the whole subject.

Mr. OTWAY said, that though it was too late to discuss the general question of fortifications he believed that the greater part of them would turn out useless. Round forts with lines had been constructed which it was impossible for the defensive force of this country to man. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he had any information of the sinking of the foundations of two forts, one at Spithead and the other in the Medway?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON had no reason to doubt the efficiency of our system of fortifications, on which the best talent in the country had been engaged. He had received no information as to the sinking of the foundations of a fort in the Medway, but one of the five forts which it had been intended to erect at Spithead had been abandoned owing to that cause. A second fort had been commenced on Ryde Sand; and he was informed a few days ago that the foundation was defective and that it would be wise to abandon it. Three other forts were being erected on the White Horse Sand, No Man's Land, and the Spit, and there was no reason to doubt their stability. The iron shield was likely to be permanent.

1. *Resolved*, That, towards providing a further sum for defraying the Expenses of the construction of Works for the Defence of the Royal Dockyards and Arsenals, and of the Ports of Dover and Portland, a sum not exceeding £800,000, be charged upon the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom; and that the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorised and empowered to raise the said sum by Annuities, for a term not exceeding thirty years, and that such Annuities shall be charged upon and be payable out of the said Consolidated Fund.

2. *Resolved*, That the said Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury be authorised to direct the payment to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England, out of the said Consolidated Fund, of the sum of £800, for the Management of the Contributions to be received by the said Governor and Company in respect of the said Annuities.

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

POOR LAW BOARD, &c., (*re-committed*) BILL. [Bill 271.]

(*Mr. Sclater Booth, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.*)

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Statute 10 & 11 *Vict.* c. 169, s. 28 repealed. The Poor Law Board made permanent.)

Mr. AYRTON said, he had to move an Amendment with the view of renewing the Poor Law Board for five years only. He had on a previous occasion stated his objections to the Board being made permanent, and hoped that, to avoid a long discussion, the Amendment would be agreed to.

Amendment proposed, in line 8, to leave out the words "from and after the passing of this Act."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

Mr. HARVEY LEWIS said, there was great objection in the metropolis to the Board being made permanent, and it was impossible to discuss the proposal properly at this period of the Session.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said he was sorry he could not agree to the proposal of the hon. and learned Member. The Poor Law Board had existed for a period of twenty years upon its present footing. It had been continued by various Acts of Parliament, and the time had come when the House was in a position to decide whether it should not be placed on a permanent footing. The Bill of 1846 placed the establishment on the footing which it held at present, and the clause which limited the duration of the Board to a period of five years was evidently added with the intention of being repealed if the experiment succeeded. There had been only two or three Petitions presented against the proposal to make the Board permanent. Considering the great powers which the House had intrusted to the Poor Law Board at the beginning of this Session, it would be rather inconsistent if they were now to say that it ought not to have a longer existence than five years. That period would not afford sufficient time for testing the operation of the Act. This department should be placed on the same footing as the rest.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he trusted that the Secretary to the Poor Law Board would re-consider his decision. He spoke the views of a great many Members who had the strongest objection to make the Board perpetual; there was no other department in the country which exercised such powers as the Poor Law Board. He hoped the Government would confine their demands this year to a Continuance Bill with a view to some measure of consolidation next year. There were no fewer than sixteen or eighteen Acts of Parliament, one after the other, enlarging, contracting, and altering in various ways, the powers of the Board. It was exceedingly difficulty to say what the powers of the Board really were.

Mr. THOMAS CHAMBERS said, that the fact that Parliament had in the beginning of the Session intrusted the Board with new powers was no reason whatever for making it permanent; rather the contrary. As those powers were new, extensive, and invidious, and as there was likely to be great difference of opinion as to their exercise, it was only proper that a limited existence should be given to the Board. No possible inconvenience could arise from a course which Parliament for twenty years had thought right to adopt.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the hon. and learned Member seemed to forget what the Poor Law Board had been constantly doing in the country. If the Board was at one time unpopular, it was because it was not represented in the House, and had not the same opportunity of defending its acts which it afterwards obtained. A Committee over which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Villiers) presided, sat for three years on the subject, and they came to a unanimous resolution that the continuance of the central authority was essential, and that it would increase its efficiency if placed on a permanent footing. As for the statement that no notice had been given of what was to be done, in the beginning of this Session due notice had been given that the Poor Law Board would be made perpetual. The Board had great powers before; but when the House had so much confidence in it as to give it further powers this Session it seemed to him very extraordinary that it should be placed on a different footing from any other department in the State, and should be held in suspense for a period sometimes of three years, sometimes of five. Was the Board to suppose that it was distrusted by the House? If so it would be prevented from acting with the firmness and decision to be desired. He was perfectly convinced that the time had come when the House might fairly trust the Board. The Poor Law Board was placed in a most invidious position by being treated differently from other departments of the State.

Mr. LIDDELL said, that whenever he found metropolitan Members rising to oppose a measure, as they did upon that occasion, he could not help entertaining a strong suspicion that it was one which would promote the welfare of the country at large. He believed that the time had come when the central machine which regulated the whole administration of the Poor Law of the country should possess the prestige of permanence. A Board which was continued from year to year at the will of Parliament could not command that respect which it ought to possess. If the House were unwilling to make it absolutely perpetual, at least something approaching to permanence ought to be conferred on the central authority.

Mr. COWEN said, he could not agree with his hon. Friend who had just spoken. He presented the other day a Petition from the Poor Law Guardians of the borough which he represented, complaining bitterly of the law and of the manner in which they were treated, and especially directing the attention of the House to the propriety of discontinuing the power of the Board rather than giving it permanence. Every Act of Parliament had had for its object to increase the power of the Board and diminish that of the Guardians, so that he apprehended that by-and-by it would be found impossible to get persons of respectability to undertake that office. He trusted there would be no prolongation of the Board beyond the term of five years.

Mr. LOCKE said, he thought five years a species of permanency which many people would be delighted to obtain, and a term quite sufficiently long to fix. Unfortunately, the metropolitan Members did not always act together; if they did, no doubt this country would be very much better governed than it was. The country districts, he believed, were in favour of a permanent Board, but the metropolitan ratepayers felt they could take care of their own interests, and did not want this perpetual direction. He should give his support to the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, he thought the House and the country were greatly indebted to the right hon. Gentleman at the head of the Poor Law Board for the improvements that had been made in the administration. So far from feeling that it lowered the position of the Guardians to have the advice and assistance of the members of the Poor Law Board, he had always, as a Guardian, felt it a great advantage. He should give his most cordial support to the permanent continuance of the Board. He should be very sorry if, by imposing the limit of five years, the notion should be encouraged that its powers were still to be of a temporary nature.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS was astonished that this proposal should have come from the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton), and should have been supported by the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Locke). Both his hon. Friends were Members of the Select Committee, and if this subject had not been discussed at length there, it was because there seemed at once to be something like unanimity in favour of the Board being made permanent. It was certainly the effect of the evidence—that for the due and uniform administration of the law for the relief of the poor a Central Board was necessary, and that with a view to its greater efficiency it should be made permanent. The Committee had been impartially chosen, it had made a patient inquiry, and he did not know that there was any ground for doubting its judgment. The objections that had been urged to the Poor Law Board applied equally to it when subject to periodical renewal, as they would, when rendered permanent. These arose from certain powers with which it was vested, and especially those of issuing General Orders, of which the Committee had approved, though some people thought them unconstitutional. The House really never had any thought of abolishing the Board. The apprehension of being put an end to on the expiration of two, three, and five years, if it did not demoralize, alarmed, and intimidated, and had a very prejudicial effect upon those connected with the department. As the time for renewal approached, they were threatened with attack by local boards—not by those that were best managed, but by those that were irregular in their proceedings, and least careful in their attention to the poor. The best regulated unions, and those, generally, that treated the poor with the most real humanity, were those that acted most in harmony with the Board. It was evident it would be inconvenient to any department to be liable to be threatened with this kind of hostility if it would not make concessions that they believed to be unwise, or, waive its regulations; and so long as a department was responsible to the House of Commons there was no use in subjecting it to this kind of terrorism, which could only be prejudicial in its effect. It must cripple its usefulness if, under such circumstances, the Minister at its head was always to be advised in the department to keep quiet, and to abstain from initiating needed reforms. When he first entered the House there was a strong prejudice against the Board of Trade, and nearly as great with some people then as there is now against the Poor Law Board; and if it had been renewed periodically its usefulness would have been comparatively limited, and its importance under-rated. If the Poor Law Board required to be reformed, there was no reason why its constitution should not be amended when it had been made permanent; on the contrary, it would be an additional reason for its revision; but it was inconsistent to be constantly renewing the Board without the least intention to abolish it ultimately.

Remaining clauses *considered*:—some amended.

After long time, House *resumed*.

Bill *reported*, as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

COURTS OF LAW, &C. (SALARIES AND EXPENSES) BILL.

Bill "to remove certain Charges from the Consolidated Fund," *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 282.]

OFFICES AND OATHS BILL—[Bill 272.]

Lords' Amendment *considered.*

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, July 26, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee — *Second Report*—On Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Wexford Grand Jury * (258); Tyne Pilotage Act (1865) Amendment * (157); Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) * (254).

Committee—Railway Companies (262); Railway Companies (Scotland) * (263); Naval Knights of Windsor * (252).

Report — Railways (Scotland)* (162); Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) * (221); Naval Knights of Windsor * (252).

Third Reading—Vaccination * (239), and *passed.*

STATUE OF MR. CANNING.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Lord CAMPBELL: My Lords, in rising to move the Address of which I have given notice, to restore to its original position, or one not more remote from both Houses of Parliament, the statue of the late Mr. Canning, I am anxious at the outset to disclaim all reflection upon Mr. William Cowper, as having been responsible for this extraordinary measure. Nothing in his career, and nothing in his character could lead me to view him as its author. Neither do I wish to cast reproach on Lord John Manners, who succeeded him in the office of Woods and Works, and who a short time ago—as I see by the report of *Hansard*—described the removal of the statue as temporary in its nature, when, in the other House of Parliament, requested to explain it. Having taken much pains to inquire into the origin of a proceeding so invidious, I am led to the belief—although it may be an erroneous one—that the removal of the statue entered into the ideas of the late Sir Charles Barry as to the further changes which were requisite in order to give full effect to the architectural arrangements by which we are surrounded. It would be unbecoming and uncalled for to hold up to obloquy a man whose talents we have lost; but Sir Charles Barry is alleged, and possibly with truth, to have had remarkable impressions with regard to the best mode of placing colossal statues. He appears to have held that they ought to be as far as possible beyond the range of vision, on the same principle, perhaps, which led him to conclude that windows ought to exclude the light, and that legislative halls should be impossible to hear in. My Lords, the quickest way of bringing what has taken place before your Lordships, would be, perhaps, to cite a question which many noble Lords and others out of doors have put to me since the Notice stood upon the Paper. They have said, "Where is the statue gone to?" When the frequenters of this House enquire, "Where is the statue gone to?" it is safe to infer that the new site is not altogether equal to the old one. I will just remind the House of what passed among your Lordships a few weeks ago upon the subject. A noble Baron (Lord Lyveden) pointed to the sudden disappearance of the statue from the place in which it had been for forty years—a place in which it caught the eye of everyone who went to Parliament or from it, and which, as the noble Lord explained, had been chosen in order that the figure of Mr. Canning might appear to command and contemplate the scene in which his triumphs had been gained and in which his genius had exulted. The noble Lord inquired on what grounds so violent and strange a course had been adopted, and was told by the First Lord of the Treasury that the removal was essential to a project the late Government had formed for the improvement of the open space behind the statue; that certain maps would be put in the Library, and that the judgment of the House ought to be suspended. The judgment of the House has been suspended. The project of improving the open space has been substantially completed; and every Member of the House who ever came to Westminster is now in a condition to decide how far the pretext given for the removal of the statue was a valid one. It is now clear to every passer-by that the removal is essentially uncalled for. The new thoroughfare might have been made; the green transformed into a pavement, with a footpath over it; the trees destroyed: all these changes, good or bad, might have been perpetrated, while the statue stood in its original position. A stone path now leads from the old site to the new one; but as it serves no kind of purpose, except that of taking the pedestrian from where the statue was to where it is, by bringing it to the former site, the function of the path is superseded, and no argument can be raised against the restoration from any possible obstruction it would lead to. But if the statue is not replaced on the exact spot from which it was taken, it may at least be fixed on the alignment on which it was visible before, and which had so much to do with any grandeur or propriety attaching to it. My Lords, I need not touch on the indignity to Mr. Canning involved in the privation of an honour formerly bestowed upon him; but I may remind the House, perhaps, of a circumstance which does in some degree enhance it. Mr. Canning died a few months after he had reached the power for which his past career so eminently fitted him. A mourning nation was compelled to heap upon his tomb the marks of gratitude with which they were not able to illustrate his existence. A peerage was conferred upon his family; his remains were buried in the Abbey; and his statue was so placed as to make him live for ever in the memory of Parliament. Such gifts are too sacred to be tampered with. But let me say a word on the injustice to the original subscribers at whose expense the monument was formed. I am indebted to the researches of Mr. Milnes Gaskell, and a noble Marquess (the Marquess of Clanricarde) for the fact that the site was given by the Crown, who therefore acted for the public. The statue was conferred upon the public by the friends of Mr. Canning. According to the new arrangement the public would be forced to take away what it accorded, and to retain what it acquired. A kind of fraud would be accomplished, unless, indeed, the original subscribers thought proper to defeat it by withdrawing the statue, since they had lost the site; and if they came to this conclusion no doubt many capitals on either side of the Atlantic would be prepared at once to welcome and to honour it. But the principle involved goes a good deal beyond the proceeding I have brought before your Lordships. If one Government, on some fantastic theory of taste, may move the statue from a thoroughfare which every one passes, to a thoroughfare which no one passes, on his way to Westminster, another Government may take it to Storey's Gate, another to the Palace, another further to the West, until it reaches Hampton Court, and becomes an object rather for the enlightened foreigner to seek than for the Members of the two Houses to have habitually presented to them. So, too, the well-known statue of Mr. Pitt may be removed from its majestic situation on the southern side of Hanover Square, and put into the midst of the enclosure. Even the figure of Achilles, consecrated by the ladies of Great Britain to a name yet more illustrious, might be removed from the neighbourhood of Apsley House and from the monument, combined with which it does so much to keep the Duke of Wellington amongst us. My Lords, the powers, virtues, and achievements of Mr. Canning do not bear upon the question. It is not proposed to devote new structures to his fame, or to confer new privileges on his descendants. It is only sought to guard the honour he obtained; and it devolves on those who have reduced it, to point out on what grounds it was extravagant, or by what events it has been forfeited. I have endeavoured to consider, not how much, but how little, could be said upon the subject. Topics will occur to every one, which others are entitled to approach: "non majoræ veto;" could I presume to add, my Lords, "sed et his placabilis celebræ est?"

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to give Directions that the Statue of Mr. Canning may be restored to its original Position or to a Site not more remote from the Houses of Parliament than that on which it used to stand.—(*The Lord Stratheden.*)

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE, as a near relative of the late Mr. Canning, wished to be allowed to say a few words upon the subject brought under their Lordships' notice. Though forty years had elapsed since Mr. Canning's death, his affectionate respect for the memory of that illustrious statesman had not undergone the slightest abatement, nor had anything happened to diminish the popular regret at the loss of that eloquent voice and commanding ability. It was not, however, his intention to allow any private feelings to sway his judgment in dealing with a subject of this nature. Whatever those feelings might be, they were satisfied by the recollection that whether the statues erected to Mr. Canning remained, or whether they perished with other perishable materials, it might be said of him, as a great historian had said of an illustrious man of old—

> "Quidquid ex illo amavimus, quidquid mirati sumus, manet, mansurum est, in animis hominum, in æternitate temporum, fama rerum."

Among the statesmen of modern times he knew no one to whom that eulogy might be more justly applied than to Mr. Canning. The statue in question, being a memorial of his merits as a Statesman, was erected, not by Parliament, for Parliament was not sitting at the time of Mr. Canning's decease, but by his numerous friends and admirers, who desired thus to perpetuate the memory of his public services. Permission was given either by the Crown or by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster—perhaps by both—to place the statue where till recently it stood, although it had been raised by public subscription; and that spot had been selected because it was near to the House where his fame had grown up, where his eloquence was so often heard, and where his public principles were best known. If there had been any necessity founded on reasons of public convenience, for its removal from this spot, Mr. Canning himself, if alive, would be the first to recognize this necessity. But it appeared from the speech of the noble Lord, who no doubt had carefully ascertained all the circumstances connected with the case, that no such necessity existed, and that the statue had been removed without sufficient reasons. He (Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe) could say nothing on this point, knowing no more than what had been stated to their Lordships. He had no right to attribute blame to any one, but if the statue had really been removed without sufficient reasons, he should hope that the Resolution proposed by the noble Lord would have the effect of securing its return to the original site or at least to a more conspicuous one than it now occupied. The practice had in all times been to place memorials of that kind near the places where the subjects of them had attained their distinction, and to place them so that the attention of the passer-by might be attracted to the memorial. They should at all events be placed in conspicuous positions, because, among the advantages which they produced, the sight of them might possibly inflame many youthful breasts to strive after the same eminence and achieve the same distinction in the service of their country. The position which the statue had occupied for many years was eminently calculated to answer all these purposes. It was now, however, thrown back upon a site where it could hardly attract any attention. It was, in fact, erected at some distance from the principal roadway, so that passers-by could not read the inscription, without going out of their way to inspect it. So completely was it in the shade, among the trees, that persons who had not considerable quickness of sight might easily pass by without observing that there was any statue there at all. To read the name on the pedestal would require an unusual exertion, and future statues might be so placed as completely to screen that memorial which had first occupied the ground. The circumstances of the case were undoubtedly such as to justify the noble Lord in bringing forward his Resolution, and therefore he confidently hoped that their Lordships would consider it with favour, and take their share in causing the statue to be restored to its old site, or at least put in another place where it would be equally conspicuous as at first.

Lord RAVENSWORTH rose to give his most cordial support to the Resolution, and he was glad that it was concurred in by the noble Lord who had just sat down, who was a near relative of the lamented statesman whose merits the statue commemorated. That statue was subscribed for by a number of the admirers of Mr. Canning and it was placed in the position it had so long occupied, because it was felt that it would best commemorate his great public services by being near the scene where he had reaped his laurels. It had recently been removed to a place where, buried among trees, it was very difficult to distinguish it at all. The practice had always been to erect statues near the spot where those whose memory they preserved had earned their distinction. Thus they found that a memorial to the lamented Sidney Herbert had appropriately been placed in front of the War Office, in which he so long laboured for the welfare of the soldier. In Trafalgar Square—a sort of out-of-door Westminster Abbey—were the statues of great Admirals and Generals who had distinguished themselves in their country's service; and when the statue of an ingenious and philanthropic doctor was lately placed there it was generally felt to be out of place in the company in which it was put, and was very properly removed to a site near St. George's Hospital—a much fitter position for Dr. Jenner. The statues in honour of the Duke of Wellington at Hyde Park and Constitution Hill had been placed upon those sites to remind the spectator that he was in the immediate vicinity of the house where that great Commander resided. In the same way the statues of illustrious Statesmen should be placed, if possible, near to the scene of their labours, and he believed it was in contemplation to erect statues to Lord Palmerston and to Sir Robert Peel in the neighbourhood of the Houses of Parliament. He trusted that the question now raised by the noble Lord opposite would receive the attention of the Government, and that the statue might be so placed that in coming to their Parliamentary duties all might see it and remember the great public services of Mr. Canning, and the loss which the country had sustained in his death. Their Lordships should remember that he was the illustrious father of a scarcely less illustrious son, and that both father and son might be said to have sacrificed their lives in the performance of their public duties.

LORD LYVEDEN said, he had been one of the first to complain of the alterations in the neighbourhood of Palace Yard, because he thought the whole of the arrangements were bad; but he did not know whether any imputation rested upon the present or upon the late Government. It behoved the public to watch narrowly the removal of statues: there should be a sacredness about them, and they ought not to be carried off for slight and trivial reasons. The statue of Canning had been appropriately placed near the House of Commons, on account of the foremost place he occupied in that Assembly; and now it was to be removed to a comparatively obscure position, in order that it might be grouped with others, including, as he understood, the statues of some railway engineers, while a site nearest the one that had been devoted to Canning's statue was to be occupied by one of Sir Robert Peel. He should never think of entering into a comparison of the merits of the two Statesmen in reference to such a question as this; but when the statue of Canning had occupied a site for forty years, and had been there saluted by every passer-by it seemed strange that it should be placed where it would not be seen by one in twenty of those who would have seen it if it had remained in its original position. The country had a right to ask why such a change was made. If these things were done with Statesmen now deceased, they might be done with any of their Lordships, for whom he supposed some of these places were reserved, when they came to have statues. Their Lordships might be fairly called upon to vote in favour of the Resolution unless the Government would undertake the re-consideration of the matter with a view to placing the statue of Mr. Canning in a position not inferior to that which it had so long occupied.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, he was sure the relatives of the late Mr. Canning must feel satisfied, from what had passed in the House that evening, that their Lordships and the whole country were really anxious that every possible respect should be paid to his memory. There was not the slightest reason to suppose that any disrespect to the memory of Mr. Canning was intended by the removal of his statue. That step had been taken by the late Government and he was sure it had not been taken without due consideration. They were the proper persons to explain what their views were. The present Government had only followed in the footsteps of the late Government, and it had never until that moment struck any one of them that the occurrence would cause any displeasure to Mr. Canning's relatives. He was quite ready to admit that there was something displeasing and invidious in the removal of any statue when it was once erected. He remembered that when the late Duke of Wellington was spoken to about the removal of the equestrian statue of himself at Hyde Park Corner he expressed the extremest displeasure at the idea, and declared that if it were removed he would not allow it to be erected in any other place. Such, no doubt, were the feelings of those to whom statues had been erected during their lives, and similar feelings pervaded the breasts of the near relatives of those who were dead. In a great measure this question must be looked upon as one of taste. Whether in this case the new position of the statue was more or less honourable than the old one, what other statues were to be grouped with it, and whether they were those of engineers or politicians, he could not say; but if the statue of Mr. Canning were restored to the position it once occupied it would still be at the end of the row. He had heard it said that one of the statues to be placed near that of Canning was to be that of his own son, and there could be no objection to such an arrangement if the position were properly chosen. Entertaining feelings of the profoundest admiration for the late Mr. Canning, he would recommend the noble Lord to withdraw the Motion, and to be satisfied with the assurance given to himself, the House, and the relatives of Mr. Canning, that the Government would take the matter into their consideration, with a full sense of the interest which their Lordships felt in the permanent position of the statue.

LORD CAMPBELL said, that the object of the House evidently was to bring about the restoration of the statue and he felt sure that the statue was more likely to be restored if the Address was carried, than if it was withdrawn. He should not therefore feel inclined to withdraw it.

LORD REDESDALE said, he hoped that a portion of St. Margaret's Churchyard from which the bodies had been removed and which was now enclosed, would be added to the street when the works were finished.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, he hoped that no further arrangements would be made without due notice being given to their Lordships. It might be well if the matter were considered by a Committee of this House, or of both Houses, for it was a public question as well as one of private feeling. He understood the statue of Canning was to be put back under a tree, on a different road from that it formerly stood in, that Sir Robert Peel's statue was to be placed opposite with the back to the Houses of Parliament, and that a statue of Lord Palmerston was to be put in a corner looking in a slanting direction towards Westminster Abbey. From the plans it appeared that the statues were grouped without any regard to congruity and taste. He had heard it stated that the removal of the statue of Mr. Canning was originally suggested by the late Sir Charles Barry, who believed that any fine statue placed in the immediate neighbourhood of the Houses of Parliament would have the effect of dwarfing his own work. Their Lordships would be glad to learn that the Government would take the matter into their consideration. He hoped that Her Majesty's Government would re-consider the matter.

EARL GRANVILLE said he hoped that, after the statement of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury), the Motion would not be pressed. He was not in a position to say to whom the plan for the removal of the statue was originally to be attributed, but he was perfectly certain that his right hon. Friend the late First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Cowper) entertained the same feelings of respect for the memory of Mr. Canning which had been so gracefully expressed by so many of their Lordships.

LORD CAMPBELL said, that whatever his own opinion, he could not hesitate to yield to the wishes of the noble Marquess, as the representative, in that House, of Mr. Canning, on the subject.

Motion, by Leave of the House, *withdrawn.*

RAILWAY COMPANIES BILL—(No. 262.)

(*The Duke of Richmond.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill."—(*The Duke of Richmond.*)

LORD REDESDALE *presented* a Petition, signed by a large number of Members of the Stock Exchange, praying that this Bill might be so amended that the rights of the bondholders and other creditors of railway companies might be duly protected. The noble Lord proceeded to say that as he could not address their Lordships in Committee, he wished to take that opportunity of making a few observations with reference to some of the provisions of the Bill. In the Bill as originally framed were clauses providing for the sale of insolvent railways under certain circumstances; but it was found that the difficulty of effecting such sales would be so great that the Select Committee struck out all those clauses. At the present moment, therefore, the Bill retained only the arrangement clauses, which enabled the directors to submit a scheme for relieving a railway company from its difficulties. If such scheme were assented to by a certain number of the shareholders and debenture-holders, the Court of Chancery might then sanction it; but as the provision for the sale of railways if the scheme should fail, had been omitted from the Bill, it appeared to him objectionable to retain these arrangement clauses. He intended, therefore, to move that they be struck out. In regard to arrangements, the present Bill went far beyond any measure which had yet received the sanction of Parliament. The importance of maintaining the credit of debentures secured on railways could hardly be over-rated. They were regarded as most valuable securities, and amounted at the present time to about £100,000,000. He believed the passing of this Bill would produce very serious consequences, because it would enable a company which fell into difficulties to obtain priority for the money they required over these securities, against the consent of the holders. In addition to his notice to omit Clauses 6 to 20, which related to arrangements, he intended to propose some minor Amendments. He thought that there ought to be a limitation as to the interest to be permanently allowed on debenture stock, and he proposed to move, as an addition to Clause 21, a proviso that whenever a company created any debenture stock bearing a higher interest than 5 per cent, it should fall to that rate at the end of seven years. He should not, as Chairman, take any part in the discussion of the Bill in Committee; but should he have occasion to make any further remarks, he would do so on the Report.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND said, it was certainly true that the Bill had come from the Select Committee in a very different form from that in which it was originally sent to it, but he thought the Committee came to a proper conclusion when they decided to strike out that part of the Bill which related to the sale of railways. They had not had sufficient evidence before them to warrant their proceeding with those clauses. He did not think, however, that the Committee by so doing had made the Bill useless. He could not concur with his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees that clauses from 6 to 20 ought to be expunged. He thought the adoption of the arrangement clauses would be very beneficial. His noble Friend objected to that portion of the Bill which allowed the creation of pre-preference stock. That, however, was a matter which had been much discussed before the Committee, and the Committee having decided that the clauses bearing upon it ought to remain in the Bill, he (the Duke of Richmond) was not disposed to agree to his noble Friend's proposal to strike them out. With regard to that part of the Bill which related to loan capital and debenture stock, giving the companies unlimited power to raise money at whatever percentage they might think fit, that matter was also much discussed in Committee, and the Committee felt that companies in such a position as to require those arrangements were in most cases—probably in all cases—the best judges of what they required, and that they ought to be left to borrow money in that manner which they thought best. If they could borrow money at 5 per cent they were not likely to pay 7 per cent for it. Their Lordships would not be justified in restricting them more than any other persons in such a matter. He should object, therefore, to his noble Friend's Amendment upon that point. With regard to the audit clause, he had some doubts as to how it would affect the companies, and as he had not seen the clause before, he would ask his noble Friend to withdraw it now, and to bring it up again on the Report.

LORD CAIRNS said, his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees appeared to think that the Bill would have a disastrous effect on public credit in the course it proposed with regard to debentures. There could be no doubt that when the Bill came up to this House from the House of Commons, providing as it did for the sale of railways that could not meet their engagements, very considerable alarm was felt by shareholders at the prospect of what might be a sacrifice of their property. After a great deal of consideration the Committee decided that, although some provision must be made for companies unable to meet their engagements, still it was impossible to pass clauses for that purpose until considerably more consideration had been given to the subject. The noble Lord had referred to the Petition from the Stock Exchange, and appeared to think that the members of that body were very anxious for the security of debentures; but he (Lord Cairns) thought the Stock Exchange were a body who cared very little indeed about debentures, or whether the credit of debentures was destroyed or not. The Stock Exchange simply said in their Petition that they viewed with alarm the clauses of the Bill which related to a compulsory sale of railways, as providing means for the destruction of the interests of the proprietors in railway property, and they begged to impress on their Lordships that such provisions were intended for the benefit of the debenture class of persons who had advanced the smallest portion of the capital, at the expense and sacrifice of the share class, who had advanced upwards of three-fourths of the capital. He did not think that supported the view taken by the noble Lord. The Stock Exchange would be satisfied as the winding-up clauses had been struck out.

Lord OVERSTONE said, he agreed to a great extent in the views of the noble Lord the Chairman of Committees. Much anxiety was felt out of doors with reference to the Bill. There was no parallel to the amount of the railway securities except the aggregate of the National Debt. The holders of the various classes of widely-differing securities with different rights attached to them were necessarily very jealous and suspicious of each other, being naturally anxious that the rights and claims of their own class should not be unjustly postponed to those of any other. Under these circumstances, it became the duty of their Lordships to look most cautiously and narrowly upon all propositions submitted for their consideration, involving the relative rights of different classes. Bondholders formed a very peculiar class, between £100,000,000 and £150,000,000 being invested in this form of security, and the arrangement clauses of the Bill may interfere very seriously with their rights. The proposition was that when a railway company was unable to satisfy the demands of its creditors a scheme should be submitted to the Court of Chancery, not for the purpose of winding-up the concern, or, as in the case of ordinary insolvency, of handing over the management to the creditors, but for the purpose of raising further capital to enable the company to extricate itself from its embarrassments and to continue its operations easily and prosperously. The money so to be raised was not for the advantage of the debenture-holders, but clearly for that of the original shareholders, who would reap all the benefits of the re-establishment of the company on a solvent basis, and ought, therefore, to raise the necessary funds from their own resources. There was nothing to justify their Lordships in subjecting the bondholder to any obligation whatever, without his direct personal consent. It might be said that the bondholder would be benefited to some extent by the arrangement, inasmuch as he would otherwise fail to receive his interest regularly. But, on the other hand, if the company could not pay its way the railway might be handed over, as in the case of ordinary property, to the creditors, allowing the debenture-holders and preference shareholders to make what they could of it. In such a case there might be some ground for saying that the minority of debenture-holders should be bound by the majority in deciding as to the working or ultimate disposal of the line, but not for urging that debenture-holders should be bound against their will to assent to any scheme for the benefit of ordinary shareholders. The position of the bondholder, and his right of priority over all other claimants is simple and distinct; at the same time, the question is one of momentous importance, and in legislating upon it care must be taken not to violate those primary principles of justice and right upon which all property in this country is founded. As long as confidence was unshaken, there was little difficulty in dealing with the debentures. The companies relied upon their being either renewed by the holders when the first period expired, or else upon finding other capitalists disposed to accept them. Under ordinary circumstances there were always persons willing to lend money, upon undoubted security, for short periods, at fixed rates of interest, without participating either in profits or losses. But the classes to whom he referred will read with close attention the debates upon this Bill, and if they find that the security upon which they have hitherto relied so confidently became the subject of doubt and discussion, distrust amounting to something like a panic will be created; the debentures as they fall due will not be renewed or taken up by other investors, and the consequence will be that companies, otherwise in easy circumstances, will be crippled. Therefore, whether their Lordships looked to the justice or the policy of the case, the right course was to bear in mind the true nature of the railway bond, and to take no step which would weaken the credit of it in public estimation.

The Duke of CLEVELAND admitted the great difficulties with which this question was surrounded, but maintained that it was absolutely necessary for the sake of the railway companies themselves, and of the holders of their securities, as well as of the public at large, that it should be dealt with by Parliament. He quite agreed that there ought to be some power which would prevent abuses, and give greater security to the shareholders. It appeared to him that the only security which they could have was that they should possess a proper knowledge of what was proposed to be done by the directors. No doubt the shareholders were primarily liable, and therefore it was but right that they should have accurate information of what was proposed to be done. With respect to the preference shareholders, generally speaking, they knew very little indeed of what was going on, and therefore it was nothing but right that no scheme should be adopted unless it had the assent of three-fourths of them. At the same time it was quite obvious that the effect might be that the holders of a few shares might possibly step in and prevent any arrangement from being carried out which was concurred in by the general body of shareholders. Nothing but the extreme difficulty of the case and the involved condition of several railways had induced him to accede to the pressure which had been put upon him and consent to the alteration in the Bill. The general credit of the country was very much shaken by the events which took place last year, and he would be the last man in the House to press forward a Bill which might affect credit still more; but the difficulties had reached such a height that it was absolutely impossible for the railways to go on without some general measure being passed for their guidance.

The Duke of MONTROSE said, that the Select Committee to which this measure had been referred, having discussed every clause in the Bill and had a division upon almost every one, it was a little hard to find that every clause was now attacked by some one who had been defeated in the Committee. The noble Lord the Chairman of Committees objected to one clause, the noble Lord opposite to another, and other noble Peers to other clauses. In point of fact, if all their objections prevailed, there would not be a single clause left in the Bill. With respect to the preference shareholders, he thought the Bill would be for their benefit, because three-fourths of them would never assent to any proposition putting a preference over them unless they found that, if they did not, there was very little chance of their getting a dividend at all. It might be therefore taken that the preference shareholders would only assent to that which was for their own benefit. This Bill was one to enable a railway in difficulties to go to the Court of Chancery, and, if possible, make same arrangement to enable it to go on. The noble Lord opposite was anxious that the power of sale over the rolling stock should remain in the hands of the creditors; but the effect of that would be that such a power might be pressed at an inconvenient time with the intention of bringing down the shares to a point far below their value, and then the very men who had assisted to bring about that state of affairs might step in, and out of the misfortunes of others make a very handsome fortune. At present the power of sale was not to lie for twelve months, which would carry them over the next Session, and then if it were found absolutely necessary that there should be a sale it ought to be arranged by an Act of Parliament. This matter had assumed greater importance since the decision of his noble and learned Friend (Lord Cairns), because it would never be worth the while of large debenture-holders to seize the rolling stock; it was only small holders that would be tempted to do so, and no railway which had the slightest regard for its own reputation would permit its rolling stock to be seized for the purpose of securing a small debt. As the Bill left the House of Commons all the property of the Company, real and personal, could be seized; but that clause had been altered, on the ground that to permit the rolling stock to be seized might greatly inconvenience the public. He did not think it a proper way of treating the Bill that all those who were in a minority in the Committee should now get up in this House and attack the clauses *seriatim*.

Lord REDESDALE said, that he did not refer to the question of the sale, because that power had been taken out of the Bill, but to the Petition, which stated that great alarm was felt in monetary circles with respect to the proposed interference with the rights of parties. The proposal to give power to sell the railway in no degree interfered with those rights.

Motion *agreed to;* House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Restriction on Execution against Personal Property of Company).

Lord CAIRNS moved, after page 14, line 1, to insert ("the term judgment includes decree, order, or rule"). As the Bill came up from the House of Commons it affected the rolling stock of the companies, but it was only protected against the execution of creditors who became such after the Act passed. He felt sure that no clause would be agreed to which interfered with the existing rights of creditors. If they agreed to the clause as it stood, they would take away for a year from creditors who had advanced goods to a railway upon the faith of having the ordinary remedy by judgment and execution, and would allow the railway company to sell the rolling stock. At the end of the year, therefore, the creditor might find the rolling stock in the hands of other parties without having any remedy whatever.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY opposed the Amendment. In the opinion of the Select Committee, if the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord was passed, the whole benefit, which it was expected would be derived from the clause by exempting the rolling stock, would be destroyed.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND said, he could not agree with the noble Lord as to the opinion of the Select Committee. The feeling of the Committee at first was that the words proposed or words to the same effect should be in the clause, but by some means or other the words were struck out, and when the mistake was discovered there was an indisposition to re-open the question. He thought it, however, a very strong measure that the rights, which persons who had sold goods to a company at present possessed, should be taken away.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Preparation and filing of Scheme Arrangement).

LORD OVERSTONE objected to the clause, and moved its omission. In his opinion it was most unjust that when railway companies were unable to cope with their difficulties they should have power to go to the Court of Chancery, and with its sanction create pre-preference securities.

On Question that the said clause stand part of the Bill? their Lordships *divided:* —Contents 35; Not-Contents 14: Majority 21.

CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Devonshire, D.
Marlborough, D.

Richmond, D.

Exeter, M.
Winchester, M.

Airlie, E.
De Grey, E.

Lord Cairns

Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*) [*Teller.*]
Home, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Manvers, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Spencer, E.

De Vesci, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Templetown, V.

Cairns, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Colonsay, L.
Denman, L.
Feversham, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Seaton, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Templemore, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Granville, E.
Lichfield, E.

Cloncurry, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Hatherton, L.
Monson, L.

Overstone, L. [*Teller.*]
Penrhyn, L.
Redesdale, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Southampton, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.

Amendment made: The Report thereof to be received on *Tuesday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended (No. 262).

AGRICULTURAL GANGS.

QUESTION.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD asked, Whether Her Majesty's Government intend to postpone Legislation upon the Subject of Public Agricultural Gangs until the Commission, lately re-appointed, has reported? The noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) had lately introduced a Bill on this subject, and showed the very great evils arising from public agricultural gangs in use in five or six counties only, and involving the employment of some 6,000 or 7,000 children. After the second reading of this Bill it was withdrawn, but some further explanation seemed to be required from the Government on the subject. It appeared to him that the question of agricultural gangs was capable of being dealt with apart from the general question of the employment of children in agriculture. In his opinion the subject was one which imperatively demanded immediate legislation. One of the Assistant-Commissioners, speaking of the system in its most favourable form, said—

> "The subjection of the gangworkers to one of their own class, however respectable he may be, as their only master and employer, places them in an anomalous position as labourers, deprives them entirely of those motives for good conduct or respectable behaviour which naturally accompany

> the relations beween the employer and the employed, and encourages a feeling of independence as regards the upper classes of society which shows itself in that rude and disorderly behaviour which characterizes the gangworkers in almost every parish where this system prevails."

This was the main objection to the system. The next point was that the children engaged by these public gangmasters were generally much younger than those employed in the ordinary course of agricultural labour. On this point the same Gentleman (Mr. Longe) said—

> "It would appear, moreover, to be the tendency of the common gang system to bring even younger children into field work than the private gang system. Wherever the two systems are found working together the younger children are always in the common gang. The faculty of making little children work is the peculiar art of the gangmaster, and the common objection of farmers to employing children themselves is the difficulty of getting any work out of them without a regular gangmaster."

Then the wages of the children of course suffered material reduction, part of their earnings going into the pockets of the person engaging them. Moreover, children of tender age—five, six, or seven years old—were sent to a distance from their homes and employed by a farmer who had no interest in them, and knew nothing about them. This was another of the evils attending the employment of children in public agricultural gangs. Now, without in any way raising the very difficult question of what was necessary in the way of legislation for regulating the employment of children in agricultural labour generally, he thought that one thing was necessary for the proper conduct of these public gangs—namely, that the person who had the control of them should have a licence from the magistrates in Petty Sessions. That licence might be granted upon a certificate of fitness to have children employed in gangs from either magistrates, Boards of Guardians, or other respectable persons living in the neighbourhood; and a condition might be imposed upon the gangmaster to the effect that he should not employ mixed gangs of boys and girls. But that the hour was so late, he would have made some remarks upon the serious subject of the employment of mixed gangs. The statements made on this point in the Report of the Children's Employment Commission must have startled all who read them. He felt strongly that, if it were possible, there ought to be immediate legislation with the view of checking the very great evils that had been brought to light. If it went merely to the extent he had suggested, it would do much to check these evils for a time, and until the whole subject of the employment of children in agriculture could be dealt with by the Legislature.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM said, the subject was one of very great interest, and deserving of some consideration. On the publication of the Report of the Children's Employment Commission a measure was introduced in that House by a noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury)—who took great interest in all questions affecting the welfare of the labouring classes—which would have met to some extent the difficulty and the evils of the gang system. That measure had been withdrawn, the noble Earl thinking that the questions involved in it could not be discussed with any probability of the Bill being passed this Session. This occurred at the end of last week, and it was then the question arose as to what course could be taken with regard to the public gangs working in certain districts. As soon as his attention had been called to the subject by the Notice given of this Question he conferred with the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and he was now able to state that the opinion of the Government was that, although the questions raised in the Report concerning public gangs were much intermixed with those affecting private gangs, and the whole question of the education and condition of the agricultural labouring classes was involved, yet there were two points connected with public agricultural gangs that could be dealt with. The Report showed that in a comparatively small district, in which, perhaps, 7,000 or 8,000 children were employed in public agricultural gangs, there was a state of things which was a crying evil, and almost a shame to the country, and which could not be permitted to pass unnoticed any longer. The Government were of opinion that, late as it was in the Session, it would be their duty to introduce a Bill which should go to the extent of requiring the masters of these gangs to take out licences from Petty Sessions and of prohibiting the employment of mixed gangs; and the Government hoped and believed that such a Bill might be passed this Session, while, in their opinion, it would materially reduce the evils of the gang system, it would not be a measure commensurate with the evils which had to be dealt with. The Government did not yet possess all the information necessary to enable them to deal with the whole question, which was not likely to be ripe for discussion for some time, but they thought they would not be warranted in delaying the attempt to legislate upon the two points he had named, and, therefore on an early day, a Bill would be laid upon the table of the House. Whether it could pass or not this Session depended very much upon the feeling of Parliament in both Houses. Members and noble Lords had been in possession of the Report of the Commission since the commencement of the year, and knew the extent to which the evils in question had already gone, and the probability there was that if they were left alone they would be greatly increased and intensified. He could not say more than that Government would attempt legislation this Session upon the points he had indicated.

THE EARL OF **HARROWBY** hoped that this House and the other House of Parliament, seeing that there was a great evil demanding an immediate remedy, would be inclined to pass the Government measure this Session.

COURTS OF LAW OFFICERS (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 254.)—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

THE **LORD CHANCELLOR** moved the second reading of this Bill, which was founded on the second Report of a Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Court of Chancery and the superior Courts of Common Law in Ireland. A Bill founded on the first Report, the Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill, had been passed this Session. This Bill, which, with one or two exceptions, carried out the recommendations of the Commission, was divided into two parts—the first relating to the appointment of officers and the consolidation of Courts, and the second to the superior Courts of Common Law; and he understood that the second part was likely to call forth Amendments to which he should not offer opposition.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at Eight o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, July 26, 1867.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Army (System of Retirement) [No. 482.]

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [July 25] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolutions reported*—Courts of Law [Fees]; Customs Revenue; Fortifications and Works.

Ordered—Courts of Law [Fees]*; Fortifications and Works*; Clerks to Justices in Counties*; Expiring Laws Continuance.*

First Reading—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses)* [285]; Clerks to Justices in Counties* [286]; Courts of Law Fees, &c.* [287]; Expiring Laws Continuance* [288]; Naval Stores (No. 2)* [289].

Committee—Public Health (Scotland)* (*re-comm.*) [251]; Indemnity* [280]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [281]; Consecration and Ordination Fees* [256]; Court of Chancery (Officers* [235] [R.P.]; Trusts (Scotland)* [266].

Report—Public Health (Scotland)* (*re-comm.*) [284]; Indemnity* [280]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [281]; Consecration and Ordination Fees* [256]; Trusts (Scotland)* [266].

Considered as amended—Customs Duties (Isle of Man)* [253]; Poor Law Board, &c.* [271]; Admiralty Court (Ireland)* [209].

Third Reading—Canongate Annuity Tax (Edinburgh)* [210]; Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal* [245]; Weights and Measures (Dublin)* [263]; Dublin Metropolitan Police* [246].

Withdrawn—Game Laws Amendment (Ireland)* [226]; Capital Punishments within Prisons* [24].

CHARTERED CATTLE MARKETS.

QUESTION.

MR. **LABOUCHERE** said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, how it is proposed to deal with the Lessees of ancient Chartered Cattle Markets which have been compulsorily closed by Orders of the Privy Council under Cattle Diseases Prevention Acts, who have lost the profit derivable from their markets, and yet have been and still are obliged to pay rents until the termination of their leases, calculated upon such profits?

LORD **ROBERT MONTAGU**: Except within a short distance of London, no markets are refused, unless on account of actual cattle plague. Within a day's march of London markets have not been allowed, because of the facility of walking animals out of London to the market. After August 1, however, regulations will come in force in the metropolis which are more strict and certain in their effect.

Cattle taken to the Metropolitan Market must be moved to it under the authority of a licence, which is numbered and marked according to the police division. There will then be a ledger account against each butcher, as having received so many passes from the market to the slaughter-house. These passes will record the number and mark of the licence under which the cattle came to the market. When, after slaughter, the butcher returns the passes to "the nearest police station," these passes will be credited against his name. For instance, A moves forty beasts to market under a licence marked with a certain mark. Then B gets a pass for thirty, and C a pass for ten of them, which passes are marked in a similar way. In this manner we shall be able to trace every animal which goes to market. Besides all this, after August 1, all foreign cattle will be branded on landing. There will, therefore, be very little danger in allowing markets near London after these regulations have come into force.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, that what he particularly wished to know was, what course was to be taken with respect to the money which had been already lost by the persons in question?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU supposed the hon. Gentleman referred to some compensation to be given to those persons; but he must remind him that the Government had no funds at their disposal for that purpose. If the House were willing to vote the necessary sum of money the Government would, of course, deem it to be their duty to administer it.

BROWN'S CHARITY BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Whether the Bill for Brown's Charity was introduced into the House of Commons at the instance of the Charity Commissioners; why the Bill was withdrawn from the House of Commons, and subsequently introduced in the House of Lords; and, whether, when so introduced into the House of Lords, it was stated to be a Government Bill, and placed directly under the charge of the President of the Council, as the Parliamentary representative of the Charity Commissioners?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU replied, that the Bill had been introduced at the request of the Charity Commissioners into that House, and had been withdrawn at their express request for the purpose of its being introduced into the House of Lords. There was, he might add, no Parliamentary representative of those Commissioners in the House of Lords. The Lord President of the Council was in no way connected with them, and they were aware of that fact. They had applied, in the first instance, to Lord Granville to introduce the Bill before the House of Lords, and he was informed that that noble Lord had asked the Lord President to take it up. It was not at all a Government Bill.

RELIGIOUS RIGHTS IN WORKHOUSES.
QUESTION.

SIR ROWLAND BLENNERHASSET said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Poor Law Board, Whether, considering that a Committee of this House, so far back as 1864, has made certain recommendations with the view of giving full effect to the obvious intention of the Legislature in regard to the religious rights of those inmates of workhouses and district schools who are not members of the Church of England, it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill embodying those recommendations early next Session?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, it was perfectly true that elaborate recommendations on the subject to which the hon. Baronet referred had been laid before Parliament as long ago as the spring of 1864, and had been under the consideration of three successive Presidents of the Poor Law Board. They were submitted formally to Parliament by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. C. P. Villiers), in 1865, and were withdrawn only because of the Dissolution which was at that time impending. In consequence of the change of Government last year nothing had been done with respect to them, but they formed part of the Bill which was brought in this year and was withdrawn with other clauses, simply because it had been found impossible to secure an opportunity of procuring for them that full discussion which their importance demanded. It was, however, the intention of his noble Friend at the head of the Poor Law Board to lay them again before Parliament, together with other recommendations made by the same Select Committee as soon as possible after the commencement of next Session.

ARMY—GOOD CONDUCT MEDALS.

QUESTION.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Why cavalry soldiers are obliged to serve for twenty-one years to entitle them to the Good Conduct Medal, while all other branches of the Service have only to serve eighteen years to qualify them for that distinction?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON replied, that the difference arose from the fact of the different periods of enlistment into cavalry and other branches of the service up to the time that the Enlistment Act of the present Session was passed. Hitherto the maximum enlistment for infantry was twenty-one years, and cavalry twenty-four years; and as the practice had been to give these medals three years before the termination of the period of service, the consequence had unavoidably been that the infantry soldier received the medal after eighteen years, and the cavalry after twenty-one years' service. From this time the service had been equalized, and of course the men of both branches of the service would receive their medals at the same period.

ECCLESIASTICAL APPOINTMENTS (WEST INDIES).—QUESTION.

Mr. REMINGTON MILLS said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any appointment necessary to be made in the West Indies under the Act 5 *Vict.*, s. 2, c. 4, previous to future legislation, will be made in furtherance of the abatement of the grant of £20,300 per annum out of the Consolidated Fund?

Mr. ADDERLEY said, the only objection the Government had to having their hands tied in making clerical appointments in the West Indies was, that they considered such a resolution would impede the making of appointments for the purpose of furthering the object of relieving the Consolidated Fund of this charge. They thought that such appointments might carry out the object they had in view more safely to the Church and private interests concerned, and more satisfactory to the Colonies, who had to revise their own clerical Acts which would expire this year; but all appointments made would be subject to the approval of the Colonies.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to Weights and Measures, Whether he has received complaints from Peterborough, Birkenhead, Maidstone, and other places complaining of the mode of enforcing the Law by the Police and otherwise, and especially in regard to the violation of the Act 5 & 6 *Will.* IV. c. 63, in applying the penalties to the payment of the Police Force; and, whether any and what protection is afforded to traders against being subjected to penalties by reason of the Standard Weights being in some cases inaccurate. He would also like to know whether the Returns for which he had given Notice that he would move on the subject would be granted?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that he had not himself received any such complaints, and he found that in 1866-67 there had been no such complaints as the hon. Member referred to in the particular towns he named; nor, so far as he knew, had there being any general complaint on the subject, though the employment of the police had, indeed, sometimes been urged as a grievance. With reference to the latter part of the Question, he had said earlier in the Session that there been a difficulty in carrying out the law, in consequence of the Standard Weights not having been correctly tested. He was afraid he should not be able grant the Returns asked for.

PROTHONOTARIES' FEE FUND.

QUESTION.

Mr. GORST said, he would beg to ask the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether the balance of the "Prothonotaries' Fee Fund Account," after deducting the expenses legally chargeable thereon, is not payable in aid of the Public Revenue, and does not form the ground of public accounting by the party receiving the same?

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, that at the present moment there was no such thing as a Prothonotaries' Fee Fund in the Duchy of Lancaster. The prothonotary's fees had hitherto been paid to that officer himself; but, however, there was a Bill before the House which would deal with the matter.

MOLDAVIA—PERSECUTION OF JEWS. QUESTION.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH, in reference to the persecution of Jews in Moldavia, said that it appeared that the unfortunate Jews had been expelled by the Moldavian authorities and transmitted across the Danube, he presumed, into Turkish territory. The Turkish authorities threw them back upon the shores of Moldavia, and in the struggle that took place, two of them were drowned and several injured. He wished to know, Whether the Foreign Secretary could give any information upon the subject?

LORD STANLEY said, that he was not prepared to state off-hand the circumstances, but he had no objection to lay all the papers relating to the subject upon the table of the House.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

IRELAND—DIETARY IN COUNTY PRISONS.—RESOLUTION.

MR. BLAKE, in calling the attention of the House to the insufficiency of the food given to the prisoners confined in the county prisons in Ireland, said, he would limit himself to a general statement of facts, as he expected they would be sufficient to induce the House to concur with him that a very impolitic, and, he would add, a certainly not humane course was being pursued towards persons incarcerated in the gaols in Ireland, as regarded the quantity of food given to them The dietary had been two or three times reduced in the last twenty years; but the worst feature about the system was, that since the reduction took place first, changes had been made in prison discipline which necessitated a larger quantity of food being given. They all knew that increased bodily exertion required additional nourishment; but another fact was not so well known—that separate confinement had also a most wearing effect on the body, and prisoners undergoing it required to be better fed than those in association. These laws were, however, practically ignored in the Irish county prisons. In England, with the change of discipline from association to separate, and from the treadmill to shot drill, came also the necessary augmentations in diet. In the Irish convict prisons also this was done; but in county gaols the central authority and board of superintendence, with one honourable exception, left the prisoners to battle with nature as best they could on inadequate sustenance. The consequence was that both men and women frequently left the Irish county prison in such a moral and physical state of prostration as to be unable to earn an honest livelihood. He would now state the dietaries in the Irish county prisons, and contrast it with the dietaries of the workhouse and the Mountjoy Convict Prison. The latter dietary was about the same as that generally in use in the English county prisons. County gaols (Ireland).—Breakfast—8 oz. meal in stirabout, ½-pint new milk; dinner—14 oz. bread and 1 pint of new milk; no supper. Workhouse (Waterford Union).—Breakfast — 7 oz. Indian meal, 1 oz. rice, ½-pint new milk; dinner—16 oz. bread, 1 pint vegetable soup, 2 oz. oatmeal; no supper. Mountjoy Convict Prison.—Breakfast—8 oz. oatmeal, ¾-pint milk; dinner—(five days) 16 oz. bread, ¾-pint milk; ditto—(two days) 12 oz. bread, 12 oz. beef; supper 8 oz. bread, ½-pint milk. The foregoing represented in solid food per week for each male adult: county prisons, 7½ lbs; workhouses 8¼ lbs.; Mountjoy Convict Prison, 12 lbs. He had also calculated the relative nourishing qualities of the food used in the Mountjoy and in county gaols, and found that two prisoners in Mountjoy or in an English county prison received as much food, both as regarded quantity and nourishment, as three prisoners in an Irish county gaol. If prisoners were to be detained in gaols, as they ought to be only for short periods, the diet would not be of so much consequence; but, offenders sentenced up to two years put in their time in county gaols, which he considered was also a great mistake. It might be urged that the prison physician had the power of giving prisoners in cold weather engaged in shot drill 1½ oz. of meal for breakfast and 2 oz. of bread at dinner over and above the regular allowance, but on inquiry he found this was very seldom done. Boards of superintendence did not look with favour on what they deemed indulgences, and those whose situations depended on their favour did not like to go against them. No doubt if a prisoner became broken down from insufficient nourishment, the physician could put him on hospital diet, but they all knew when a man, and especially one in close confinement, lost stamina, how very hard it was to build him up again. He could assure the House he was not one of those who would seek to prevent prisoners from receiving the full punishment their crimes deserved, and within legitimate bounds he would make a prison as little agreeable as it ought to be considering its object; but if no other consideration prevailed let our self-interest induce us not to allow a system to continue which to some extent was calculated to promote the continuance of crime instead of preventing it, as well also as to increase the burthen of the ratepayer by throwing on him for support either as a felon or a pauper those whom a false and cruel policy rendered incapable of maintaining themselves.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is the opinion of this House, that it is the duty of the Government to take steps to increase the dietary in the County Prisons in Ireland, especially for prisoners confined beyond two months," —(*Mr. Blake,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. BRADY said, the statement of his hon. Friend the Member for Waterford must entirely recommend itself to the attention of the noble Lord the Secretary for Ireland and of the House. It was fully borne out by the facts of the case, which were well known to all who were at all acquainted with the working of the present prison system in Ireland. The Reports of the Prison Inspectors in 1843 showed first, that animal food should in all cases form part of the food of prisoners employed at hard labour; secondly, that a considerable portion of the food of every prisoner should be solid; and, thirdly, that variety of food was necessary. Medical science showed that these conditions were absolutely necessary to maintain the health of the prisoners. The quality of the food supplied was no less essential. According to the county regulations, however, the unfortunate prisoners in Ireland received only 8 oz. of Indian meal for breakfast and 14 oz. of brown bread for dinner; and the prisoners were eighteen hours without receiving any food whatever. Such a system was cruel in the extreme. On looking over the statistics he found that the ordinary cost of maintaining a prisoner in the county prisons in Ireland was three-pence a day; their drink being either skimmed milk of a very inferior quality, or butter-milk, which was so sour as to be totally unfit for food. In the gaol at Gibraltar the prisoners had for breakfast 1 pint of cocoa and 12 oz. of bread; for dinner either fish, fresh meat without bone, or soup and bread; and for supper a pint of gruel and 9 oz. of bread. They had no right, in addition to the sentence of the law, so to reduce the vital energy of the prisoner by an insufficient diet as to render him, at the expiration of his imprisonment, incapable of performing the ordinary duties of life. That was to inflict a double punishment, which neither the law nor the lawmakers had ever contemplated. The sooner such a state of things was remedied the better.

Sir FREDERICK HEYGATE said, that the hon. Member for Waterford had done good service by bringing this subject under the notice of the House. Some two years ago his attention had been turned to the subject by the governor of the Londonderry Gaol, who was a most painstaking and well-informed man. He was strongly impressed with the insufficiency of the diet of prisoners in the county gaol. He found that in the case of prisoners confined for more than two months, where there was any tendency to scrofula or any constitutional disease, it was sure to develop itself. Nor was there any economy in the system; for the medical men were obliged to recommend that a considerable number of prisoners should be put on sick diet. The regulations in force dated from a period when the general food of the people was of a much inferior character to what now prevailed, and, like everything else, they ought to be revised. There could be no wish that the health of prisoners should permanently suffer from insufficient diet, and he had no doubt the attention of the noble Lord and the Government would be given to the subject.

Lord NAAS said, the question to which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford (Mr. Blake) had drawn attention was a very important one, and fairly entitled to consideration. The dietaries in the Irish county prisons were originally regulated by the Inspector General under the approval of the Court of Queen's Bench, but by an Act passed a few years ago the approval was removed from the Court of Queen's Bench and placed in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant for Ireland, and the Executive Government, and practically now the Government were the persons to whom the recommendations of the Inspectors General were referred on all questions affecting the dietary in the county prisons. The low state of the dietary in Irish county prisons as compared with other similar establishments, both gaols and workhouses, in this country, he fully admitted. It arose in this way. In 1849, when great distress existed in the country, there was an enormous increase of crime. In some counties it increased at the rate of 43 per cent, and in others at the rate of 150 per cent over the four preceding years. In that state of things the dietaries of the county prisons were so very much higher than the ordinary food within the reach of the labouring population of the country, that they formed an absolute temptation to many to commit crime in order to get into the gaols. The evil was so patent that considerable reduction was at once made in the prison dietary, only two meals a day being given. This system was tried for eight or nine months, when it was found necessary to reduce the scale still further in order to prevent persons from committing crimes for the purpose of obtaining the prison food. In 1850 soup was substituted for milk. In 1854 a third alteration was made, by which the dietary of juvenile offenders, which had not been affected by the previous alterations, was reduced. This alteration was made in order to prevent boys of between ten and sixteen years from committing offences in order to get transferred from the workhouse to the prison, and it was effectual for that purpose. The dietary had remained in that state to the present time. Since the year 1854, however, a considerable change had taken place in the ordinary dietary of the poor of Ireland, and he was therefore quite willing to admit that the whole question should be looked into most carefully. There were several reasons why the scale of the prison dietary in Ireland should be reviewed, the first of which was that within the last ten years a great change had taken place in the diet of the labouring population in Ireland, it having increased in quantity and improved in quality, with very beneficial effects upon the lower classes of that country. Although he was sorry to say animal food was by no means a common article of food among the poor of Ireland, yet bread of a good quality had been generally substituted for potatoes. Under these circumstances he was willing to admit that a prison dietary which would have been suitable to the lower class of prisoners fifteen years ago was unsuitable to them now. Another reason in favour of increasing the scale of prison diet was, that the number of vagrants had largely diminished, and therefore there was not so large a class which would be likely to commit offences for the sake of obtaining the prison diet. A still stronger reason for inquiring into the matter, however, was that the system of prison discipline in county gaols had been greatly altered of late. A system of discipline chiefly upon the separate principle, which could not be too highly commended, had been introduced, and as was proved by experience this rendered it necessary to improve the diet of prisoners in order to keep them in health. In a great number of the county prisons in Ireland they had got rid of the horrible system of association in gaols, which made them little better than colleges of crime. By the separate system, too, they were better enabled to employ the prisoners in their cells at trades and other occupations. It was found, however, that under this improved discipline it was necessary to increase the scale of diets in order to preserve the health of the prisoners. Under these circumstances it had, in his opinion, become necessary for the Government at once to take this question up, especially as the Inspectors of Irish Prisons, in their Report for 1866, had referred to the evils that now existed, and had recommended a change in the diet being effected. It would, however, be necessary, in the consideration of this question, to take care that they did not go too far and fall into the other extreme, and render the prison diet better than that of the unions. The rule they should follow would be to make the prison diet resemble, but not exceed the usual diet of the prisoners when at liberty. One great evil that existed in Ireland was that in every prison there was one uniform description and amount of prison diet for all prisoners, whatever might be the severity of their sentence. In his opinion, the diet should be smaller in quantity and lighter in quality in the case of short sentences than in the case of long sentences. A light diet would be a very proper mode of increasing the punishment of short sentences; but when prisoners were confined for long periods they required an additional allowance of food. Unfortunately that system did not exist in Ireland, where "a hard and fast line" prevailed for all cases. Some few years since a Select Committee of the House of Lords inquired very minutely into all matters connected with the prison discipline of county gaols, and especially into the question of diet. That Committee, finding that no uniformity of practice was adopted thoughout the gaols, in this country, and that great evils existed in consequence, recommended that some rule on the subject should be laid down for the guidance of the county gaols. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir George Grey), in consequence of the recommendation of that Committee, appointed a Commission to inquire further into the subject, and induced three eminent medical men to give their attention to the question of diet. In accordance with their Report a scale of diet was recommended by the Home Office, and had been adopted in a great number of the county gaols. He had been very anxious to introduce into Parliament this year a very extensive measure affecting the whole question of prison discipline in county prisons in Ireland. That measure had been prepared, with the exception of a few details, and he hoped to be able to lay it upon the table of the House before the end of the present Session in order that hon. Members might have an opportunity of considering it during the Recess. By that measure it was proposed to render not only the diet but the prison treatment uniform in all prisons in all cases where the sentences were similar. It was felt to be a great evil that, owing to the different systems in force in the various gaols, the Judge, in passing sentence upon a man, knew really very little about the mode in which that sentence would be carried out. Following the example set by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, he should endeavour to secure the services of two or three eminent medical men to inquire particularly into the question of prison diet, and he hoped next Session to be able to lay ample information upon the subject before the House. In the meantime, however, he must say that the statistics did not show that there was any loss of health on the part of the Irish prisoners on account of the present diet. It had been said that the prisoners lost weight during their imprisonment, but the contrary was rather the fact. He confessed that the case was one worthy of inquiry, and he would take care that that inquiry should be conducted by men of ability.

Sir GEORGE GREY said, he was glad to hear that the noble Lord intended to deal not only with the question of dietary, but also with that of discipline. He would suggest to the noble Lord the advisability of looking at the Act which was passed a few years ago for England, an Act which had undergone very careful scrutiny in a Committee consisting of men of great experience, and which, since the passing, had had a very beneficial effect. A similar result might be expected in the case of Ireland. He quite agreed with the noble Lord in the opinion that there should be different scales of diet for different classes of prisoners. It had, however, been established beyond dispute that men sentenced to long terms of imprisonment required a higher diet than that even to which they were accustomed when pursuing their ordinary avocations. This was rendered necessary by the depression which such imprisonment occasioned. He trusted that the legislation which the noble Lord contemplated would be such as would meet the objections which might, with some reason, be at present urged.

Mr. NEATE said, he was sorry to hear the noble Lord assert as a fact, and justify as a principle, the doctrine that whatever might be the misery which the Irish people suffered, they must be reduced to a still greater depth of misery in order to prevent their violating the laws of their country. Not only should the object of imprisonment be, to a certain extent, the reformation as well as the punishment of the individual, but they ought to take care that no inducement should be offered which could lead men to prefer being sent to gaol to entering a union. He greatly doubted whether the Irish system of pitching the diet at the lowest possible point above starvation, was the proper one. The diet ought to be adequate to maintain the vital powers and energies in full activity, and restore the prisoner to society on the termination of his punishment in a condition at least equal to his state upon entering prison. He was glad to hear the noble Lord's statement as to his future intentions.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

STATE OF IRELAND.

OBSERVATIONS.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that he had placed a Notice on the Paper, stating that he would call attention to the state of Ireland, and the legislation for that country proposed this Session by Her Majesty's Government. He should not, in the absence of so many Irish Members, propose a Resolution on the subject, as he had intended doing, because he did not think it right that Resolutions should be moved simply in order to be withdrawn. He wished, however, to call the attention of the House to the fact that no legislation had been effected by the Government to remove the discontent which existed in Ireland, and also to obtain some statement from Her Majesty's Government, and from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was really Her Majesty's Government, as to the policy which it was intended to pursue, and as to what would be done next Session. During the last eighteen months we had been compelled to suspend the Constitution of the country on account of an insurrection, the embers of which were even now not altogether extinguished. Upon every important measure brought forward during the present Session, tending to effect any improvement in the condition of Ireland or the Irish people, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had preserved what he might describe as a studied silence. When the Motion for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was brought forward the Chancellor of the Exchequer made no observations. On the two occasions when the Land question was submitted to the consideration of the House, no declaration of opinion was made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. When the hon. Member for Kilkenny introduced the question of the Irish Church for discussion the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed no opinion. And even when the subject of Irish education had been brought forward by the hon. Member for Brighton the Chancellor of the Exchequer was still silent. This had appeared to him the more extraordinary, because the right hon. Gentleman had not always been so reticent. The right hon. Gentleman, for instance, in addressing his constituents on the 13th of July last year, acknowledged that the state of Ireland was very unsatisfactory. The right hon. Gentleman on that occasion said—

> "I have no hesitation in expressing my own opinion, and I am sure it is also the opinion of my colleagues, that the condition of Ireland is not satisfactory to this country. When I observe, year after year, the vast emigration which takes place from Ireland I feel that it is impossible to conceal from myself the fact that we are experiencing a great social and political calamity. I acknowledge that under some conditions, and even under general conditions, emigration is the safety-valve of a people. But, Gentlemen, there is a difference between blood-letting and hæmorrhage. What I see in Ireland is not that scientific repletion which re-animates the health and gives vigour to the constitution, but a wasting away of nature, which, I think, ought to be staunched, and the political styptic which is required under the circumstances, it is the duty of Statesmen to discover."

In spite of this opinion nothing had been done up to the present moment. Had the promised "styptic" been discovered? He trusted that before the evening was over the right hon. Gentleman would make a satisfactory announcement to the House. It might be well for a moment to compare Ireland with Scotland. In Scotland they saw the people contented and happy. If the Scotch had any grievances to complain of they were either sentimental grievances, or at all events grievances not brought before the House. But the people of Ireland were discontented and disaffected, and during the last twenty years the grievances of Ireland had been continually before the House. What was the cause of this difference between Scotland and Ireland? The great questions connected with the Land, the Church, and Education had been long since settled in accordance with the feelings of the Scotch people, while those questions in Ireland had remained unsettled to this day, and were still most fruitful sources of discontent. There could be no doubt that the vicious Land system of Ireland had been the cause of a great deal of the crime, discontent, and disaffection which prevailed in that country, and the different illegal associations which had from time to time existed in IreLand, as well as Fenianism, were to be attributed to that cause. Fenianism, there could be no doubt, had been created and encouraged in America by the wholesale system of emigration produced by the land system in Ireland. Lord Dufferin denied that the Land system had been the cause of the emigration, but Lord Lifford admitted that the Land system had been the cause of the emigration. He was not going to suggest what alterations were required in the Land Laws of that country, because it must form the subject of discussion in another Session, but all he now said was that it was a question that must be dealt with by Her Majesty's Government in a comprehensive manner if they ever hoped to remove that discontent which prevailed in Ireland, and make the people of that country happy and contented with the Government under which they lived. Then there was the question of the Church. In Ireland there were two Churches—one, the Church of the State, alien to the people; the other, the Church of the people, alien to the State. The Church of the State was the Church of the ascendancy party in Ireland, and had never enlisted the affections or feelings of the Irish people; while towards the Roman Catholic Church, which was the ancient Church of the country, the Government had so acted by obnoxious laws against her Bishops and clergy as, if possible, to dis-associate them from the Government. It was not, therefore, to be expected that they should possess any other feeling than that of opposition to the existing Government of the country. Besides these two subjects there was the question of Education, which must be dealt with by the Government. It had been brought before the House this Session by private Members, and had been discussed, but in respect only of a mere fragment of the question as a whole. Some might think the system of Education now practised good, others might think it bad, but whatever the opinion of individuals it was certain that the system was not in accordance with the feelings of the people of Ireland. Therefore it was incumbent on the Government to examine as to the wants of Ireland in this respect, and supply a sufficient remedy. A Return had been moved for by the hon. Member for Armagh as to the number of Bills affecting Ireland which had been introduced to the House during this Session. With a single exception, not one of the Government Bills dealt with the main causes of Irish dissatisfaction. First came the Law Bills, and prominent among them was the Chancery Bill, which, after having been systematically opposed by the present Government, when in opposition, during three years, was now passed under the guidance of the Attorney General for Ireland. [Lord NAAS: I did not oppose it.] That was so. But the present Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, supported by hon. Members now on the Ministerial side of the House, defeated it for years. They had also passed a Bill for creating a Judgeship in the Irish Court of Admiralty, and another Bill for regulating the officers of the Law Courts in Ireland. Were these the promised styptic for emigration? Surely none of them could be regarded as remedies for the grievances of Ireland. And what else had they? They had the Bills introduced by the noble Lord the Chief Secretary (Lord Naas) and in referring to him he did not wish to speak disparagingly of the conduct of the Irish Executive. The Government of Ireland had never been conducted in a better manner than it was at present. The Lord Lieutenant (the Marquess of Abercorn) had discharged the duties of his high office with a dignity and grace which, if equalled, had never been surpassed; and the noble Lord the Chief Secretary had conducted the Irish business in this House with the greatest possible courtesy, and he deserved the thanks of the people of Ireland for the manner in which he had administered the affairs of Ireland during a season of great difficulty. Every one acquainted with Ireland knew the pressure which had been brought to bear upon the noble Lord, to induce him to resort to coercion and oppressive measures, such as martial law and flogging, to put down Fenianism. Instead however of adopting such a course he had allowed the majesty of the law to be asserted in the ordinary way, and by the ordinary tribunals, for which he deserved the best thanks of the House and the country. Here, however, his praise must end, for he asserted that it was not sufficient for a Ministry to discharge merely the duties of the Executive. The functions of a Government comprised something more than this, and no function could be neglected with more serious consequences than that of taking the initiative in legislation when that legislation was demanded by crying evils. The reference made to the Land question in Her Majesty's Speech from the Throne had not been forgotten. Nothing could have been more explicit than the promise made in that pregnant paragraph. But what had come of it? The Bill introduced by the noble Lord (Lord Naas), although it had not met with the full approval of Irish Members on the Opposition side, was not opposed by them. They hoped to mend it in its progress through the House and would all have voted for it. But short and simple as it was it was opposed by Irish Members sitting behind the noble Lord, and the other night the Order was discharged before the Bill had been read a second time. The few other Irish Bills were trifling in the extreme; they comprised two for building bridges, one for compounding the debts of Galway harbour, another to do the same service to the Limerick harbour, one or two for setting lunatic asylums in order; to these might be added the Habeas Corpus Suspension Bills, and there the catalogue ended. It might be said that the Government could not bring forward legislation of a comprehensive character for Ireland, because the House had been occupied with a much more important question—namely, the English Reform Bill. He did not think the state of Ireland a less important question than that of the Reform Bill, but the latter subject naturally attracted more of the attention of hon. Members. He admitted, however, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a more than ordinary arduous duty to discharge that Session. It must have been a great surprise to hon. Gentlemen opposite to find themselves suddenly transferred to the Ministerial side of the House—not through any triumph of their own principles, but through the dissensions among their opponents. The right hon. Gentleman had not only to prepare a Reform Bill, but a creed for his party, and to prevail upon his party to agree to it. That might be some excuse for inaction on Irish questions this past Session. But that formed no reason why the House should not be told what were the views of the Government on the affairs of Ireland, and what legislation was to be expected from them on the subject next Session. He knew that some persons thought legislation was not wanted for that country — that all Ireland wanted was to be let alone, when she would soon become the happiest land in the United Kingdom. But he did not believe that was the opinion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In the year 1844, in a debate in that House on Lord John Russell's Motion on the state of Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman spoke in a manner which showed that he deemed legislation necessary; and nothing had occurred since then to make him alter his views on that point. On that occasion the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "He wanted to see a public man come forward and say what the Irish question was. One said it was a physical question; another a spiritual. Now, it was the absence of the aristocracy, then the absence of railroads. Let them consider Ireland as they would any other country similarly situated, in their closets. Then they would see a teeming population, which, with reference to the cultivated soil, was denser to the square mile than that of China. That dense population, in extreme distress, inhabited an island where there was an Established Church, which was not their Church, and a territorial aristocracy the whole of whom lived in distant capitals. Thus they had a starving population, an absentee aristocracy, an alien Church. This was the Irish question. Well, then, what would hon. Gentlemen say if they were natives of a country in that position! They would say at once the 'remedy is revolution'—but the Irish tenants cannot have a revolution—and why? —because Ireland was connected with another and a more powerful country. Then what was the consequence? The connection with England thus became the cause of the present state of Ireland. If the connection with England prevented a revolution, and a revolution was the only remedy, England logically was in the odious position of being the cause of all the misery of Ireland. What then was the duty of an English minister? To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force. That was the Irish question in its integrity."

Such was the declared opinion of the right hon. Gentleman on the Irish question as given in the pages of *Hansard* for 1844, when he was not, as now, a Minister of the Crown. He asked, was the right hon. Gentleman prepared to give effect to that opinion? Did he still regard the Irish Established Church as "an alien Church." Would he deal with the case of Ireland in the spirit of "resolution," or leave that country in its present condition, the prey of faction and a cause of misery to the whole kingdom? There is still an "alien Church" in Ireland: regarded by the people as a badge of conquest, it is a standing source of discontent. Is that anomaly to continue for ever? There is still in Ireland an "absentee aristocracy." Is nothing to be done to check absenteeism? The Church question may be dealt with by legislation, but absenteeism is one of the evils of Ireland that cannot be reached by legislation. Her most gracious Majesty the Queen, of whom he desired to speak with the profoundest respect, might by her example produce a most beneficial effect in that country in reducing absenteeism. If the Royal Family would occasionally live in Ireland, if they had a residence there, as in Scotland, it would do more towards putting down discontent and disaffection than regiments of soldiers, and bodies of police. The instinctive loyalty of the Irish character would be quickened by the personal presence of the Sovereign, which the Irish people would feel as a compliment to them. The only way of checking absenteeism was by the example of the exalted Lady to whom he had referred, and that example would, he was sure, be followed by the aristocracy and landholders of Ireland. His chief object in rising this evening was to elicit from the Government some statement of their intentions with regard to Ireland. He was convinced that the Government could not devote their attention to a more important subject as affecting the welfare of the Empire than the Irish question; and if they would deal with it in the spirit which he had suggested — bringing the Land, Church, and Education questions in harmony with the feelings of the Irish people—they would make themselves beloved by the Irish people. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose genius he had always admired, and who had now as much power in this country as any Minister ever possessed, to favour them that evening with some notion of what course he intended to adopt next Session in regard to the Irish question; and he hoped his appeal would not be in vain, and that the response he would receive would be worthy of the occasion.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN felt that his hon. Friend had so well and so fully stated the position of the Irish question, that he should crave the indulgence of the House whilst he attempted to supplement his hon. Friend's statement by some few observations of his own. But then at the termination of a long Session, memorable as regarded its legislation towards the English people—barren, he regretted to say, as regarded his own country—he conceived it incumbent upon him, as the representative of a large and influential Irish constituency, to shortly review the situation, and in a calm and temperate spirit to suggest to the House considerations of interest to Ireland, founded on convictions long and honestly entertained. He (Sir Patrick O'Brien need scarcely say he felt the deepest pain at the necessity which had so long existed for bringing before that House (he might almost say in a moaning spirit) the state of Ireland. But he feared that for many years there had not existed a period when the future of that country should be viewed with greater apprehension. It was true that an insane attempt at insurrection had been suppressed; but the spirit which prompted it had been far from being extinguished, and how far the admittedly existing disaffection could be removed — how far the dangers arising from it might be avoided, ought to, and he felt was, the anxious desire of every Member in that House, be he Catholic or Protestant, be he Tory or Liberal. He would admit that they could not hope by legislation to suppress Fenianism, but at the same time he felt convinced that an enlightened policy, vigorously carried into action, would remove the sympathy which existed for it, and cut off the supply of its recruits which that sympathy furnished. To thoroughly suppress the Fenian conspiracy more was needed than mere legislation. There must arise in Ireland, what heretofore unhappily had not existed, a union of classes, of races, and of religions. Their estrangement destroyed all mutual confidence, rendered them as aliens to one another rather than as united citizens of a common country, and prevented that feeling of common interest, socially and politically, which could alone arise from a perfect fusion. In Ireland the profession of the religion of the State by the humblest of its members, as well, he regretted to say, as by those whom education ought to have taught better, carried with it the idea of some fancied social superiority. They seemed to consider that being a Protestant in Ireland conveyed as it were a kind of Dutch polish which did not appertain to their Catholic fellow-countrymen. English and Scotch Members in that House could form no notion how that idea prevailed in Ireland, or how political, but more especially religious, distinctions kept classes and races dissevered. It was from this point of view that he regarded the Irish Church; he was not there to assault its theology or its discipline, still less was he prepared to battle over its temporalities, but it was as being a barrier to that social union of all classes that he was opposed to its continuance. Of the clergy of the Establishment he would speak no words of depreciation. In the University which he had to thank for affording him an education he had known many of them, with some of them he had formed friendships, and to their intellectual and moral character he could bear willing testimony; but in a great question of that description individual character was of small importance. He looked at the Establishment as the great cause of the separation and isolation of Irish classes, and, call it a sentimental grievance if they would, it stood in the way of the future union and happiness of the people, and in that sense he felt that it ought not and could not be preserved. When a Fenian addressed an intended proselyte he spoke to him in a language which he understood — it was not of the ornate character which the great statesman Burke used in his famous letter "To a Noble Lord"—

> "His grants were from the aggregate and consolidated funds of judgments iniquitously legal—and from possessions voluntarily surrendered with the gibbet at their door."

But he conveyed the same idea; it was in words which were sown in a congenial soil, and he then pointed to his condition—a tenant, perhaps liable by no fault of his own, by no want of industry, but by, perhaps, the caprice of his landlord, arising from political, religious, or other motives, to be evicted from his holding, and this too in a country where his tenancy was his all—no manufactures to fall back upon—emigration or something worse his sole resource. In such a state of things was it surprising if the Irish people afforded a too willing ear to those who attempted to inveigle them into conspiracy? To avert such a state of things something should be done, and he trusted that the hon. Gentlemen opposite would relinquish old prejudices and voluntarily grant what otherwise must be effected by legislation. The landlords of Ireland had in their own hands the power of effecting great results. Were they to grant leases to their tenants, of course at fair and remunerative rents, they would thus afford that security to the tenant, the absence of which was the source of so much evil; and he (Sir Patrick O'Brien) felt assured that if such were the case, and should the tenant on his part fail to perform his legitimate obligations, there would be no sympathy for him amongst his neighbours. No doubt such a course might at first blush seem distasteful to the landlords of Ireland. They had been brought up with ideas of high ascendancy, and an exaggerated notion of their political rights; but he believed that many of them, he might say the majority, were men of kindliness and generosity, and would waive even old established prejudices when their doing so would plainly appear to tend to the peace and prosperity of their country. For his own part he believed he knew something of Irish politics, and he could confidently assert that Government, by adopting an enlightened and generous policy, would strengthen their political position in Ireland more than they could conceive. One other question he would shortly allude to. He (Sir Patrick O'Brien) gratefully acknowledged the obligation which he himself owed to the University for the education it afforded him, but at the same time he felt that the question for the Statesmen in that House to consider was not whether a secular or denominational system of education was the better, but rather which was the system the country demanded, which would they accept? Viewing then the all-important necessity of education, the crotchets of individuals as regarded particular systems should be disregarded. At that moment in Ireland the demand for denominational education was not confined to Catholics. The Protestant clergy were equally imperative in calling for religious education; and he for one felt that, when 4,000,000 people, through their recognized representatives, expressed their wishes upon the subject, no Government ought or could disregard them, or postpone their accomplishment in deference to the abstract opinion of a small section of the community, however enlightened or however influential. He had, at the commencement of his observations, expressed his conviction that religious differences were the curse of Ireland; and in reading, on the evening before, a speech of Mr. Shiel's, he had met a brilliant passage upon that subject, which he would ask the indulgence of the House to be permitted to read—

> "But we are prevented by our wretched religious distinctions from co-operating for a single object, by which the honour and substantial interests of our country can be promoted. Fatal, disastrous, detestable distinctions! Detestable, because they are not only repugnant to the genuine spirit of Christianity, and substitute for the charities of religion the rancorous antipathies of a sect, but because they practically reduce us to a colonial dependency, make the union a name, substitute for a real union a tie of parchment which an event might sunder; convert a nation into an appurtenance, make us the footstool of the Minister, the scorn of England, and the commiseration of the world."

Those were the opinions expressed over twenty years ago by one of Ireland's greatest orators. They were, unfortunately, as applicable at the present time as they were in 1844; and he felt that there would be some hope for the country should they find an echo in the breast of every Irishman.

SIR FREDERICK HEYGATE said, he was astonished that the hon. Baronet (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) had called attention to the distinction between the Land Laws of Scotland and of Ireland. The Land Laws of the former country if carried out in Ireland would inevitably lead to a great displacement of property. The mode of land letting was totally unlike in the two countries. In the Highlands a great number of small farmers were removing as they were in Ireland. In the Lowlands of Scotland the farms consisted of large areas of land, containing in some cases 1,000 or 2,000 acres. Such a condition of things if introduced into Ireland would inevitably lead to enormous emigration. In Scotland the law of hypothec was so severe that the landlord could follow the tenant's cattle after they had left his land and seize them for the payment of rent. With regard to the Chancery Bill, which was for a great number of years before the House he was sorry the hon. Gentleman considered that he had given on that subject a factious vote. But he believed that the hon. Baronet had himself on one occasion defeated the Bill by joining the majority—no doubt by mistake—which excess of one vote rejected the Bill. With respect to the general question of legislation for Ireland it would be an unfortunate time, when agitation and rebellion were prevalent, to consider alterations in the great institutions of the country. Besides the hon. Baronet appeared to have forgotten that the great question of Reform had occupied not only the time of the Government, but almost the whole attention of the House. As to the Bills of the noble Lord, he confessed he thought that it would be fatal to the rights of landed property to allow a tenant to borrow money on the security of his landlord's estate without his landlord's consent, and he had suggested the very course which had been adopted in the other House —namely, that it be referred to a Select Committee. Still it was by Gentlemen opposite, and particularly by the hon. Member for Galway, that those Bills had been most strenuously opposed. As to recent emigration, he attributed it to the emigration of past years. It was only human nature that persons who received so striking a proof of the superior prosperity to be enjoyed in a foreign land as was afforded by remittances from their friends who had preceded them, should have a strong desire to seek their own fortunes abroad. A gentleman of great authority, who had come over from America for the express purpose of investigating the true condition of Ireland, informed him that he had found the country in a far better state than he had been led to believe, and that he was convinced that no legislation could have prevented emigration. A great deal had been said about Fenianism, but it could not fairly be attributed to the causes stated by the hon. Baronet. Among the causes to which he thought it might be owing, one was the effect of the large previous amount of emigration to America, and to the remittances which had been sent over from the United States, not in small mites, but in large sums, given by some of the first merchants in New York. He asked the same high authority, who had come to this country from the other side of the Atlantic, why the people there went on subscribing their money, as they could not suppose that the population of Ireland was powerful enough to overcome England? The gentleman replied by asking why the people in this country subscribed money to enable the Poles to rise against Russia without the remotest chance of success. There was, he said, no accounting for it. He came to inquire whether Irish distress and emigration arose from bad legislation, and he stated that he found Ireland in a better condition than he had expected, but that the temptations to emigrate to America were so great that it was impossible for any legislation to stop it. Another cause was the succession of bad seasons. The Government had been charged with neglect of the interests of Ireland. But it was not a time to make great alterations when the country was not at peace. Upon many subjects connected with Ireland no insignificant progress had been made during the present Session. The Government had assented to the issue of a Commission with respect to the Church in Ireland. The Land question had been debated in that House, as also in the House of Lords. A Committee was sitting on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. The question of the Irish railway system was after all the most important, perhaps, for Ireland. The Government had pursued the sensible course, not of taking for granted figures hastily brought forward, but of referring the question to a most pains-taking Committee. He felt certain that, if the Government should be able to see their way to a sound and practicable measure, they would bring it forward next Session. The question of education was a most difficult one. but when they were told by the hon. Gentleman who last addressed the House that every individual in Ireland was in favour of the denominational system, he must, on behalf of one of the provinces of

Ireland, express a contrary opinion. He could adduce in proof of his assertion the Report on the subject of the National schools, from which it appeared that the number of pupils under instruction in those Schools was progressively increasing, and the average attendance last year was greater than before. It was a remarkable fact that out of a population of 5,400,000 the attendance at the National Schools numbered 900,000. He could not hear the general statements condemnatory of the landlords of Ireland and remain silent, being convinced that they would allow no private interests of their own to stand in the way of any measures which would promote the prosperity of the country. Hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House were by no means indifferent to the true interests of Ireland; they were quite prepared to support measures founded on justice and truth, and likely to promote the real advancement of the country.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he was quite ready to admit the very kindly and candid disposition of the hon. Baronet; but those who knew anything of Ireland must be well aware of the reasons why that part of the country with which he was connected had so greatly prospered compared with the other provinces of Ireland. The Land question was settled in Ulster: there they had tenant-right, while the three other provinces had no such advantage. In Ulster, the Church question was settled: the Established Church enjoyed its revenues; the Presbyterians had the *Regium Donum;* and with the Queen's Colleges there was no educational difficulty; but the other provinces were made the scene of constant oppression and misgovernment. What was the real condition of the South of Ireland? As a rule, there was no security for the tenant—no protection for his industry. He knew there were many great improving landlords; but, as a rule, the state of things was that leases were discouraged in three of the provinces of Ireland. Let him suppose a man in Tipperary. He held from year to year—he might make improvements, but, if evicted, he had no claim for compensation, and his landlord might turn him out a beggar. There were hundreds of such cases. In Ulster there existed a sort of tenant-right which protected the tenant in case of eviction, and enabled him, at any rate, to make sure of having some money in his pocket when he had to leave; but in Tipperary a man might be evicted, and he had no right to protect him—nothing that he was able to dispose of to the incoming tenant. Something was wanted similar to what existed in Ulster, and that would be given by leases. It was unfair to twit hon. Members with having opposed the Bill of the noble Lord. The hon. Member for Galway had only done by that Bill what they had been invited to do, and what they had done, in the case of the Reform Bill, rendering it by their suggestions, Motions, and Amendments, a great scheme, worthy not of one side or the other, but of the British House of Commons. The Bill of the noble Lord was good so far as it went, but the hon. Member for Galway was right—it could not be satisfactory without leases. It would only hold out with one hand what it destroyed with the other. What was wanted was a measure that would appease the deeply-seated discontent of Ireland. He knew it was too much the habit to despise the Celtic people. He would tell the House, then, what he had seen they were capable of under good legislation and generous treatment. He had been in the other House of Parliament in March last year with a Roman Catholic Bishop from New Brunswick. A noble Lord was addressing the House, and expressing his deep regret that emigration was draining away the life-blood of Ireland. Earl Grey used some such expression, when a gentleman standing near said to the Bishop—

> "I don't agree with Earl Grey; for unless Irishmen leave the country—unless Ireland be re-peopled with Englishmen and Scotchmen, there is no chance of her prosperity."

The Bishop knew he (Mr. Maguire) was about to go to America, and asked him to come and see with his own eyes a living refutation of the implied slander. In company with the same Bishop on his late visit to New Brunswick, he went 200 or 300 miles up the St. John's River, and into the heart of an essentially Celtic settlement. What did he see? In 1861, the first man and woman went into the living forest, where no human foot but that of the lumberman had ever trodden. The second year another man and woman went there; the third year the settlers began to pour in in large numbers. He was there in October, 1866, when he saw 600 human beings in the settlement. They passed through a long avenue of the forest, and from a moderate eminence saw a vast plain —miles of it cleared and dotted all over with human habitations. He was in fifty of these farms and houses. He scarcely saw one shanty—in most instances they were large, roomy, log cabins. There were cows, horses, hogs, and barns bursting with produce. Not only were there large and commodious log cabins such as settlers in the United States and British colonies were content with for years, but he saw fourteen or fifteen large framed houses, as good as any he saw in the United States, occupied by these people, who had scarcely £600 among them when they first entered the forest. That was what the Irish people could do when the opportunity was afforded them, and he had known it done in a hundred other instances. Among the people who dwelt in that clearing were those who had been cleared from estates in Ireland. He was told by a member of it of a family who, having been robbed, stripped, and plundered by a landlord in Galway, had been driven by sheer disgust and destitution across the ocean, and was now rising every day in wealth and independence. Instances of this sort were enough to show that the Irish peasantry were as competent as any peasantry in the world to become laborious and thrifty, if the road were left open to them; but in Ireland it was not. Let them compare what was done in the colonies, in the matter of land, with what was done at home. In Prince Edward's Island, some time since, a league was established for the avowed object of resisting the payment of rent. Now, they did not talk of this in Ireland; all they wanted was security against the oppression and the unreasonableness of the landlords. The result of the agitation in Prince Edward's Island, however, was this—that the Colonial Secretary (Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton) sanctioned a plan for disposing of land in the island belonging to absentee landlords at a reasonable price, and for distributing it among the old as well as among new tenants. He believed that, under this arrangement, a vast property of 110,000 acres belonging to the Cunard family had been broken up. The Parliament of Canada had also, with the sanction of the Home Government, purchased the seigniorial rights that interfered with the independence of the tenants, though their pecuniary value was only 2*d.* an acre, at the cost of £1,000,000; but the Home Government refused to sanction in Ireland that which they had cheerfully assented to in the colonies. What had been done for Ireland? Twenty-five years ago the hon. Gentleman had described her condition in the gloomiest colours; and the same language was as true now as it was then. Was not the question of the settlement of Ireland equally important with the settlement of the Reform question? For his own part, he hoped that the question of Reform would not be heard of again in that House for the next twenty or twenty-five years. Of course, in saying that he did not wish it to be supposed that he alluded to the Irish Reform Bill, which he hoped would be carried next Session. Ireland wanted peace, and it was only by contentment that peace could be obtained. One great cause of Irish discontent was owing to the Established Church in Ireland, which inflicted a badge of degradation upon that country which would not be submitted to for a moment by England or Scotland. They had been told that the men of Ulster were against tearing up the old institutions of the country; and he was against tearing up those which were worth preserving. Was the Established Church in Ireland worth preserving? There was no dominant Church in Scotland. The Established Church there was the Church of the majority. ["No, no!"] Well, he would leave Scotch Members to settle that question among themselves. At any rate, they had not in Scotland one eleventh of the population possessing all the ecclesiastical revenues of the country. Scotchmen would be very different to what he took them for if they would stand for twelve months being treated on the question of their Church as the people of Ireland were treated as regarded their national religion. [Mr. WHALLEY: How about Wales?] He had nothing to do with that country, and the hon. Gentleman might answer that question for himself. Again, the question of education should be settled in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of the Irish people. The hon. Baronet who spoke last stated that Fenianism was chiefly the result of bad seasons; but he could tell them that the feeling of discontent in Ireland had been deepened—he did not say caused—by the denial in this country of the existence of distress in Ireland in 1860-1-2-3. He had no desire to use threatening language, but he warned the House and the people of England that such a feeling of animosity and vengeance existed among the Irish in America as would some day or other prompt them to endeavour to plunge the two countries into war—a result that would be calamitous, indeed, for Ireland, but would be calamitous also for the two countries. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had at present more power than any man in England, possessed the heart and the courage for the attempt, he might immortalize and render his name far more great and glorious as the pacificator of Ireland than as — he would not say the juggler of Reform, but as the carrier of a Reform Bill. In the one case, the right hon. Gentleman would gain eternal honour; in the other, a mere party triumph. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would rise to the comprehension of the question, and would grapple boldly with the causes of Irish discontent. He must not, however, be understood as placing the Church, the Education, or the Railway question, before the Land, for this was the fundamental point. The Church might be settled by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in a single Session, and Education in a single speech; but unless the people remained in the country it could not prosper. If Parliament shrank from compulsion, let them hold out inducements to landlords to give leases, for with security of tenure the humblest peasant in Connemara, Cork, or Tipperary would become loyal and contented. He would then be as strong a Conservative as the gentleman who had the highest rent-roll. It had been said that there was an analogy between Ireland and Scotland. He contended that there was none. In Scotland no man would take a farm unless he could obtain a lease; but, in Ireland, he was obliged to take the farm whether he could procure a lease or not. If 1,000,000 more of the population crossed the Atlantic, a feeling of burning hatred would be aroused which would hereafter cause our Statesmen to mourn over neglected opportunities of conciliating the people and removing the causes of discontent on this side of the Atlantic and of machination on the other. Irish Members would return home with the miserable satisfaction of having made places for a few eminent lawyers, but of having still left their countrymen ready to listen to the wildest whisper of rebellion. Our Statesmen would mourn in sackcloth and ashes that they had not availed themselves of the opportunity of conciliating the people of that country. In the name of Ireland, and in the name of this great Empire, he asked the House not only to save Ireland, but to prevent the safety of the Empire from being endangered.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he did not concur with the hon. Member for Cork in thinking that the Land question went to the very root of our Empire. His own theory was this —and he challenged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to deny it—that the real evil of Ireland — that which distinguished Ireland from Scotland and Wales, and which distinguished Irishmen from Englishmen —was entirely, absolutely, and exclusively, the action, policy, and mode of procedure of the Romish priesthood. ["Hear, hear!" *and a laugh.*] This was evinced in every page of our Statute book and in every page of our history, ever since Ireland had been made the head quarters of the Romish priesthood. He thought some better answer should be given to this opinion, which he stated distinctly, than ribald interruptions, ridiculous exhibitions of laughter and the extraordinary silence of the Government. He had offered in every form and shape to prove his statements by evidence. He had asked for Committees, and had challenged contradiction of his statements. But his attempts had been thwarted in various ways—sometimes by the House being counted out, sometimes by one device, sometimes by another. Something more was required than ridiculous assertions of the grievances of Ireland by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway. What were the grievances of Ireland? What were the grounds on which the House was called upon to incur unlimited expense in regard to the Fenian insurrection, which according to the authority of the Prime Minister, contradicting the statements of his predecessor, were an exact continuation of the proceedings of 1848, those being an exact copy of all former insurrections? The Fenian insurrections which had been put down were to be identified, not with the Land question, but with all the preceding Irish rebellions, from 1641 downwards. The three great questions affecting Ireland were the Land question, the Church Establishment and Education. He called upon the House to remember the solemn warning of Sir Robert Peel when he granted Roman Catholic emancipation, which he described as the last effort for the conciliation of Ireland. The Roman Catholic priesthood said, "Grant us that, and we shall be satisfied, and we will never interfere with Established Church; we only want our civil rights." Sir Robert Peel said if that attempt was not succesful they ought never to make another concession. But this as well as all other attempts made to conciliate the priesthood had failed. The hon. Member for Cork had alluded to the difference between Scotland and Ireland. What were the differences between these countries with respect to the Land question, the Established Church, and Education? In Scotland there was an Established Church which was not the Church of the majority of the people; but the old Church and the Free Kirk travelled harmoniously together the road to salvation. In Wales a larger proportion of the people than in Ireland dissented from the Established Church and supported their own Ministers. In Wales, which was occupied by a race more alien in habit and language than the Irish, they heard no such complaints as were sent up from Ireland, and if he or any one else attempted to preach sedition in that country he would be looked upon as an absolute lunatic. But from Ireland they heard cries of distress at every excess of rain or cold, and at every ordinary casualty. The difference between Ireland and Scotland and Wales, with respect to the Church question was this — the Romish hierarchy in Ireland found it a convenient means of arousing the passions of their own people and of disparaging the character of this country, to point out the apparent injustice of a Church Establishment supported by the endowments of the State, whilst a large body of the people were obliged to support their own ministers. The object of the establishment of that Church in Ireland was not to indoctrinate or teach the Thirty-nine Articles, or any other creed, but to bring under the control of the Sovereign and the State, the religion of the country, so as to protect the country against that foreign invasion, which came in not with the sword of the conqueror but with the slipper of the priest. What was the difference between Ireland and Scotland and Wales with respect to the Land question? The Irish people said they wanted permanent rights. The Common Law of England showed that all the freehold land got gradually out of the absolute possession of the old landlords, and large blocks got into possession of the present tenants, first by custom the basis of copyhold tenure, which had merged into freehold. In Ulster the people, by arrangement with the landlords, had made agreements which were useful to both parties. To suppose that the Irish people were more interested in having their improvements secured than the people of this country was a mistake. But that matter, like everything else, was taken advantage of by the Irish priesthood, who laughed in their sleeves when such pretences were put forward. Was not the House rendered contemptible and laughed at by the people of this country when continuous debates took place on questions which every farmer thoroughly understood? The fact was that the Romish priesthood took advantage of the distress which they by their own practices had inflicted on the people, and acted upon that ignorance which it was their main business to perpetuate. On the point of education, it was well known that the Roman Catholic priests claimed, in the name of their religion, the exclusive right to teach the children of their faith. What was the remedy for that? To repeal the Catholic Emancipation Act, or re-enact the penal laws? He was as far from recommending such a course as any hon. Gentleman in the House. The people most deeply interested in securing a remedy for Ireland's wrongs were the Roman Catholics themselves, and the policy he recommended was this—he would have them made acquainted in the fullest and most complete manner with the doctrines held by the priesthood, and the manner in which they acted as men and teachers. ["Agreed!"] The Irish Members might well be agreed with him in this, for they might well be anxious to seek liberty from the bonds by which they were enthralled. When the people thoroughly understood all the devices of Popery, it would be for them to decide whether they would live under such a system, and whether they would have exclusive denominational religion for their children. If the parents still wished to have the denominational system, and to put their children exclusively into the hands of the Roman Catholic priesthood, then let them have it. But it was not the people of Ireland that desired the denominational system. It was the work of Dr. Cullen and the priesthood. He would undertake to prove that the emigration which had lately taken place from Ireland, was not to escape from the oppression of England, but to escape from the oppressive exactions and the dictation of their own clergy. If the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take up the challenge which had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Cork, and enter upon the inquiry he (Mr. Whalley) advocated, he would have opportunity to obtain a position in the history of this country and of the world such as few men before him had ever obtained. It was only yesterday that he had a conversation with a Member of the Italian Parliament, who said to him that if they held up to the people what were the doctrines and the practices of the Roman Catholic clergy, that even the priests themselves—all but those who had shared the highest prizes of the profession—would say, "Oh, yes, we are glad you have found us out, we shall be glad to get rid of this system, and we will heartily join the people." No men more heartily despised the system and doctrine of Popery than the Italian priests, and all they wanted was men like Garibaldi to protect them.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I agree with the hon. and learned Member for Clare that the House is about to disperse at a time when the state of Ireland is very unsatisfactory. When, indeed, we remember that the Habeas Corpus Act remains suspended in that part of Her Majesty's kingdom, to say that the state of Ireland is unsatisfactory is inadequately to describe its condition. The truth therefore of the statement will not for a moment be challenged. I would go even further than the hon. and learned Member for Clare, and say that most persons interested in Ireland, especially those responsible for its government, must view the state of society in Ireland with great regret and anxiety. But I have not heard from the hon. and learned Member for Clare, nor from any Gentleman who has addressed us, any intimation that they attribute the peculiar condition of their country to the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, or to that of our predecessors in office. It therefore becomes us to consider whether the causes which have led to a suspension of civil rights in Ireland have not arisen from something totally irrespective of any system of government established or encouraged by England. The present condition of Ireland has been occasioned probably by a combination of circumstances almost unprecedented in the history of any other country. There never was an instance before of such an external influence as has been brought to bear upon Ireland, creating disaffection to a certain degree, but exciting alarm in a much greater; exercising over a society which, as a rule, shows no spontaneous sympathy with this external agency, such a baneful control. Much is already known to the House of the working of this external agency; much of it also still remains to be made known. Probably the day will soon come when fuller particulars of this occult influence will be made familiar to us all. At present, however, the action of this agency would greatly perplex, if not baffle, the energies of any Government, and I think I may claim credit to the present Government for the manner in which it has exercised, under circumstances of painful difficulty, the great powers which Parliament in its patriotic wisdom has intrusted to it; for, while the action of the Government has preserved tranquillity among the people, it has done so without having recourse to anything at all approaching tyranny.

The hon. Member, pursuing his consideration of this subject, quoted a passage from an address which I delivered to my constituents when I had the honour of accepting office. In that passage I deplored the general condition of Ireland, with especial reference to the vast tide of emigration which was then taking place, but which I am glad to know is at this moment diminishing. [Lord NAAS: "Hear!"] I listened to the hon. Member as he read that passage with attention, and heard no word which I can regret or that I wish to re-call. Even if produced by inexorable economical laws, I must regard the violent and sudden diminution of the population of Ireland as a political calamity. When we remember how much the Empire owes to the hearts and arms of Ireland, we cannot help feeling that it is a question whether the strength of the Empire has not been diminished by this drain upon her people. Therefore, I do not regret the declaration of that opinion, which was well considered, nor do I think I have reason to withdraw any expression which I then used with regard to the means which might be devised to prevent, or at least to lessen, this drain upon the population. I was then in communication with my noble Friend who accepted office at the same time as myself, and we had freely conferred together and with our Colleagues on that subject. It was the result of our consideration that it was by no means impossible to devise some measures which might have a remedial tendency in that respect. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Cork, laid it down that the emigration from Ireland was entirely to be attributed to the want of a satisfactory tenure of land in that country. He said that all they wanted was the Ulster custom; that if they had in Ireland generally the custom of Ulster with respect to tenure they would be satisfied. I listened to that observation of the hon. Gentleman, and I have heard it made before. But when I consider that the amount of emigration from Ulster in proportion to its population is greater than the emigration from any other part of Ireland, I am somewhat perplexed as to the conclusion at which I should arrive. I do not deny that a great deal may depend on the relation between landlord and tenant. But if I am correct in the statement I have made in regard to the amount of emigration from Ulster, it shows how very complicated the causes must be which have brought about this state of affairs, and that the simple statement of the hon. Gentleman must not be accepted as being at all a satisfactory solution of the present position of Ireland in that respect. Thinking that the relation between landlord and tenant in Ireland might be improved, Her Majesty's Government, by my noble Friend the Chief Secretary, introduced measures with regard to that subject. Of course, they had the complete adhesion of the Cabinet, and personally, they had on my part a strong conviction of the enlightened wisdom of their general policy. But what reception did they meet with? That they were not mean measures, nor conceived in a petty spirit, and that they aimed at dealing largely with the subject, must, I think, be evident from the subsequent comments made upon them by many gentlemen whose confidence we generally have, but whose approval at first we did not possess. On that occasion our Friends, the expression of whose opinion has been adverted to to-night, behaved with the utmost forbearance. They were not willing to discourage us, even if they hesitated for a considerable time in the expression of their opinion; and they were prepared, I believe, at the last moment to make many concessions. But what reception did our proposals meet with from hon. Gentlemen opposite, who on this question had taken very leading and determined parts, and who had made use of very strong expressions in relation to it? I must say I do not remember any measures ever brought forward which were received with more captious criticism, or in a colder and more discouraging manner. One hon. Gentleman, the Member for an Irish county, who had over and over again dilated on the absolute necessity of any Government dealing with the question of the relations between Irish landlords and tenants, although we had introduced our measure—a measure of no mean proportions—stated in my hearing that it was a mere mockery, and that he preferred the present state of affairs to that which our proposals would produce. What was said by another Member for an Irish county, then sitting opposite to us? "You have brought forward a measure of compensation to the tenant,—compensation is all moonshine." That was the very expression I heard used. What encouragement, therefore, did we get from Gentlemen who had declared that the subject was one which must be dealt with by the Government of the day, whoever might compose it? What prospect is there of settling this difficult question if, while those who are supposed to represent generally the interests of the landlords are prepared to meet their opponents in a spirit of concession, those, on the other hand, who year after year have insisted that compensation to the tenant should be the principle of a regenerating policy in respect to land in Ireland get up in this House and tell you that compensation is all moonshine? I mention this in vindication of the Government. We hear it stated that we have not attempted to legislate for Ireland. I take the greatest subject of all, that of the land. You have always told us that the Church question, that the Education question, is nothing as compared with the Land question. I say then that, although the time of the House has necessarily been greatly absorbed by other important questions, we have brought forward large measures with reference to the relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland—the largest and most liberal measures, I believe, ever brought forward by a Ministry. And I say that we did not obtain from hon. Gentlemen opposite, who arrogate to themselves the function of exclusively representing the interests of the tenant, the slightest encouragement, but rather a reception calculated to prove fatal to the course and conduct of our legislation. Yet now we are told that, although they spoke in terms of such intense depreciation of our proposals, they were resolved to give us their assistance. I think, therefore, that we are not open to the accusation of the hon. and learned Baronet as regards the Irish Land question and the relation between landlord and tenant, and that we have not been neglectful of Ireland even in the present Session. But now it is said, "After all, the question of leasing is the whole question. Give them power, and take steps that leases should be granted, and the whole question may be deemed to be satisfactorily arranged." The hon. Member who made that observation must have forgotten that, besides the more considerable measure introduced by my noble Friend the Chief Secretary, there was also a leasing measure introduced, which was treated by hon. Gentlemen opposite as though it were hardly worthy the consideration of the House. Therefore, the charge of the hon. and learned Baronet has fallen entirely to the ground. He may return to his constituents with the consolatory conviction that he has not only discharged his duty to their interests; but, what is more, has given to his political opponents the opportunity of entirely exonerating themselves from his imputation.

But we are told that we have wholly neglected another subject for legislation; and extreme disappointment has been expressed that, during a protracted debate the other day, in which the question of Irish education was involved in connection with one of its most eminent institutions, I did not give the House my opinion. I was not, I believe, present at so much of that debate as I ought to have been. Public affairs called me elsewhere. But I watched it with great interest, and I am pretty well aware of what took place and of the division which occurred. I found the hon. and learned Baronet, and many of his Friends, of whose opinions on Irish education I thought I had some cognizance, supporting the motion of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) with regard to Trinity College. But the success of that motion would have placed that institution in the category of those Queen's Colleges, the establishment of which has been so much denounced, and the general character and tenour of which have been held up to so much general public reprobation. Without questioning the propriety of the conduct of the hon. and learned Baronet and his Friends, I must own I was perplexed by it. While it seems that he was astonished at the non-expression of my opinions, I was somewhat surprised at the expression of his, as they appeared to me contrary to all the opinions which he has before expressed, and which his Friends have supported. But the question of Irish education has not been neglected by Her Majesty's Government. It is one of great difficulty. I have no wish to conceal my belief that the question of a Roman Catholic University is not to be neglected; and that it is a subject which should be met, I hope, in a spirit of wisdom, I do not say by both sides, but by all the parties who have entered into the controversy on that matter. While the question is one of great difficulty, it is one which I think ought to be considered and settled. I trust that by all the parties connected with the controversy there will be exhibited such a spirit of conciliation and wise forbearance that we may arrive at a conclusion which will be for the public advantage.

There is another question which the hon. and learned Baronet says he is surprised I have not favoured the House with my opinion upon this year, and that is the question of the Irish Church. The hon. and learned Baronet is exceedingly disappointed because I did not take the opportunity of speaking in a debate originated by the hon. Member for Kilkenny (Sir John Gray) on the subject of the Irish Church. If I thought I could at all advance the prosperity and welfare of Ireland by following in the line of those who indulge in historical invective as a means of remedying political discontent, I might also have taken some part in that debate. But debates on the Irish Church consisting substantially of announcements that that institution is a badge of conquest, and ought therefore to be subverted, appear to me to be only encouraging a vein of expression and feeling which cannot in any way conduce to the welfare of that country. The great misfortune of Ireland has been that too much has been destroyed, and too little renovated; and I cannot bring myself to think that by going on indiscriminately destroying we shall produce a state of affairs in that country to be desired. Even if there were no other or higher considerations involved, when we are told that Ireland has suffered, and is still suffering, from absenteeism, a course of policy which would drive a large body of intelligent, pious, and, to a certain degree, opulent, resident gentry from that country does not seem one which should commend itself to our adoption as conducive to its welfare. The hon. and learned Baronet also quoted a passage from another speech of mine, which I made several years ago—in the year 1844 I think—on the subject of Ireland. It was unnecessary for him to quote that passage with the elaborate accuracy he did, in order, of course, that my memory with respect to it should be thoroughly refreshed. I believe I have heard it quoted at least six times this Session; and there has hardly been a Session of Parliament for the last ten or fifteen years in which it has not been brought to my recollection. Well, Sir, it is a rhetorical passage. What degree of error it may involve is another question, and one which I shall not now trouble the House by discussing. Rhetorical passages must always be subject to criticism. They convey general results. But I may just say that the hon. and learned Baronet and all his predecessors by whom this passage has been quoted—though I have not ever thought it worth while to trespass on the time of the House by making any remarks on the point—have quoted it most unjustly. The passage has reference to the peculiar condition of Ireland in 1844, when the great Irish orators who then flourished among us were in the habit of telling us night after night that we were responsible for the good government of what they familiarly but ardently described as the teeming population of that country. The hon. and learned Baronet, however, tells me to-night — and his predecessors by whom the passage was quoted always said the same thing — that nothing has been altered in the position of Ireland since I made these observations. But that is not a true statement. The greatest changes have taken place in the state of that country during the interval. The teeming millions which were described as giving for every square acre a population greater than that of any part of England no longer exist. The 8,000,000 by which Ireland was then peopled have dwindled down to 5,500,000. Thus, one of the most material causes of her peculiar political position, which I painted, it may be, with a somewhat coarse brush, but, as I believed at the time, and believe now, with no little degree of truth, has undergone a vast change. Ireland does not to-day present to us the singular spectacle which she did in 1844, of an immense teeming population in an impoverished land. The statistical and political circumstances—and the political must always depend a good deal on the statistical circumstances of a State—are greatly altered. The very conditions under which the problem is to be considered and solved are widely different. The diminution of the population of Ireland by 2,500,000 is one of those great changes compared with which none of the great events that occur in the history of a nation, as conquests, for example, can be regarded as of greater importance. It is, in fact, one of the greatest and most remarkable events which have occurred in the history of any country; and that the hon. and learned Baronet and his Friends should, under those circumstances, twit me year after year with having uttered expressions in 1844 before that change, and ask me whether I am now, since that change, prepared to act in accordance with those expressions, is really, not only unjust, but, to a certain extent, absurd. The great diminution in the population of Ireland, one of the most remarkable events of our century, must therefore be taken into account in considering the condition of that country. What may be her future condition, and what it may be in the power of Governments and Legislatures to effect for her, I cannot pretend to foresee. All I can say is that personally the present Government take the deepest interest in that important portion of Her Majesty's dominions. I should like to see Ireland —what her gifted race deserve that she should be—a thriving, a happy, and a prosperous land. That is a result which I believe may be brought about by a combination of those circumstances which only, in my opinion, can realize good government —a desire, on the part of those in authority, to govern with justice, and, on the part of those who are governed, to meet, in a spirit of forbearance and gratitude, the efforts of those who are sincerely anxious for the amelioration of their condition. When I remember what Ireland has been and what she is now, her ancient history, and her present condition, the eminent men she has produced, the gifted race who possess her soil, and the great assistance which England has always received from her connection with that island, I cannot think that in an age, which is an age of progress, and which is marked each successive year by some considerable improvement in all the principles of good government, she has not a brighter destiny before her than that which, unfortunately, within our experience has been her lot. I hope the population of Ireland may be sustained ; that it has been greatly diminished by different economic causes no one can deny ; still, by the improvement of agriculture, the promotion of manufactures and the arts of life, by a combination of various industries, and by avoiding a too great devotion to one source of the wealth of nations, I trust her position may be, not only greatly, but rapidly, improved. Of this I am conscious—and I speak for my Colleagues as well as myself — that no material advantages can alone satisfy a nation, and that the Government of Ireland must be—as I trust it now is—inspired by principles of justice, and animated by a due deference to the fair claims of the people who inhabit that country.

SIR JOHN GRAY: I have heard with the deepest surprise the speech which has just been delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I can hardly venture to express to the House the feelings with which I believe that speech will be received throughout the length and breadth of Ireland. As I understand that speech, and as most hon. Gentlemen sitting near me understand that speech, it amounts to a distinct declaration on the part of Her Majesty's Government that they have done all they intend to do with regard to the Irish Land question; and that they consider they have done enough to justify themselves for not atttempting to do anything effective next year, by referring to the manner in which their measure on this subject was received this year. For my own part I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman has really any cause of complaint because of the Amendments proposed in his Bill by the Irish Members. The Chancellor of the Exchequer complains that the Irish Members have clamoured for leases, abandoning the once popular doctrine of compensation for improvements. The complaint comes to me as a novelty, which I have heard for the first time, that the Irish Members repudiated the doctrine of compensation. Why, that is the doctrine which they have so long advanced on behalf of the Irish people, and which has been so earnestly supported by all who were desirous of seeing a settlement of the Irish Land question. Some phraseology may have been made use of by some persons in the heat of debate which has escaped my memory—that may seem to the right hon. Gentleman to warrant that allegation; but I can assure him that he labours under a grave misapprehension if he rests under the belief that, for one moment, the Irish Members repudiate the docrine of compensation. They one and all hold it to be a most essential doctrine, that there should be legislative protection granted to the tenant. If a tenant, by his industry, his capital, or his labour, which is his capital, improves the land he occupies so as to make it more valuable, and so as to render it fit to produce a higher marketable value, we say that man ought to have the benefit of the improvements which he himself has made, and that he shall be compensated for the improvements which he has created. [Lord NAAS: Hear, hear! That was my Bill.] I am glad to hear the noble Lord cry "Hear, hear!" I have described the principles for which we contend, but those were not the principles enunciated in the Bill which the noble Lord introduced. The noble Lord wished to enact that the tenant in occupation should be debarred from all right to improve his land in certain respects without the written consent of the landlord. Six classes of improvements were recognized in his Bill, three of which the Commissioner might give him power to make, while he could not make the others without the written consent of the landlord, and these latter three were the most important in an agricultural point of view for the occupying tenant. Examine into the agriculture of this country, and you will find the best agricultural authorities declaring that the essential improvement of the land is to be effected, not so much by drainage, not so much by fencing, not so much by putting houses upon it, but that the great improvement in the land is effected by properly cultivating, digging, ploughing, and manuring it, and rendering the soil more productive. There is no authority which has laid down that doctrine more clearly than Mr. Caird in speaking of the backward condition of the land in Norfolk for the want of proper arrangements between the landlord and the tenant. If you examine into the practice of agriculturists in Ireland, you will find that the tenant, when his lease is expiring, feeling that he has no security for the improvements which he has made, in justice to his own conscience, and the interests of his family, exhausts the land, and gets back from it as much as he can before he surrenders it. He knows, perhaps, that he will not get a renewal of his lease, and therefore he is bound to get as much of the capital he put into the land back from the land as he can while he is permitted to remain on it. The moment a lease is approaching towards its termination the tenants try to "scourge the life out of the land," and to exhaust it; and it is handed back to the landlord in a worse condition than ever. This may, to some extent, account for the unwillingness of some landlords to grant leases. Having said so much in reference to the Land question, I think it will be a very strange announcement for the Irish people to hear also that Her Majesty's Chancellor of the

Exchequer said that, as regard the Church question, he desires, on behalf of his Government, to announce that he will take no part whatever in settling that question. Can any man have heard the speech of the right hon. Gentleman to-night without coming to the conclusion that that is the meaning of it? He says he will be no party to driving 2,000 or 3,000 educated gentlemen, who spend £200 or £300 a year each, out of the country when so much is said about absenteeism, and the only defence he is able to make for the Irish Church is that the money wrung from the people, and put into the coffers of this alien Church, is spent in Ireland by a certain number of gentlemen; and those gentlemen are to be continued in that alien Establishment in order that they may spend their money in that country. The right hon. Gentleman states emphatically that he will not touch the question of the Irish Church, and I would ask is that not a grievance in Ireland which the Government of this country is bound to deal with? Let us look at the condition of Ireland for one moment. Is it a condition which is satisfactory to any party in this House? Is it a condition which is satisfactory either to the Members of the present Government or to the Members who formed the late Administration? The Chancellor of the Exchequer says that the condition of Ireland is very much changed since he delivered his speech in 1844. But are we not daily reading in the journals of Ireland, no matter whether the opinions of the paper be Whig, Tory, Radical or Liberal Conservative, appeals made to the charitable inhabitants, imploring them to subscribe for the purpose of saving the lives of the people in the West of Ireland? Is this not a shame to the Government and Legislature of the country? The population may have been decimated and reduced by 2,500,000, as the right hon. Gentleman says, but whose fault is that — to what is that due? Is that a result for our rulers to be proud of? If we have not the teeming population, have we not still the alien Church and the absentee proprietary, for which a strong Government ought now, as when discussed before, be expected to produce remedial measures? The people are less numerous, but the Church is not less alien, and if it ought to have been removed according to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman; because it was alien at that time, he ought, before defending it now, to demonstrate that it has ceased to be alien and is one with the people. This question has been ably debated and fully discussed, and I should have been unwilling to have intruded any details upon the House, but I could not quietly sit and hear the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the Liberal Irish Members, and those who represent the agricultural interests in that country, have abandoned the question of compensation. They do not give up the claim to compensation, but they desire that, along with compensation, there should be given a certainty of tenure which should secure them against eviction. We desire them to have a sense of safety, and, if they add to the value of the land, that what they do add should not be confiscated from them; there is no injustice to the landlord in that doctrine of compensation. The principle of compensation is this—not that the tenant shall receive from the landlord a sum which may have been recklessly expended on the soil by the tenant — but that he shall receive compensation for the actual improvement which he can show he has effected in the condition and marketable value of the holding; that, in fact, the tenant shall receive compensation from the landlord in proportion to the amount of improvement which he may have effected in the annual value of the land by his industry and his capital. That is our doctrine of compensation. We have been often told in this House that tenant property is protected at present, and that it requires no compensatory legislation to secure him in the full fruits of his industry. But it is not so; the moment the property of the tenant touches and becomes mingled with the property of the landlord it ceases by law to be the property of its rightful owners, and is confiscated to the sole use of the landlord. If a tenant farmer purchases a cow, or horse, or sheep, he acquires a property in the animals so purchased. If, however, instead of investing his money in cattle, the tenant farmer proceeds to the adjacent town and spends £20 or £100 on bricks, on draining pipes, and on guano, surely it will be admitted that his right by purchase to a property in the bricks, the drain pipes and the guano is as complete and perfect as would be his right by purchase to the cattle. Well, so says the law, and if any robber waylay the farmer on the high road and take away that property he will be treated as a felon. But if that tenant use those bricks to build a house on his farm, if he use those pipes to drain and improve his land, if he scatters that guano over a ploughed field, and so incorporate his hundred pounds' worth of purchased property with the soil of the landlord, that property, which the week before was his, and to take which without his consent would be felony, ceases to be his, is by law confiscated to the landlord, and the tenant who bought it, paid for it, and whose by right it is, ceases to be the owner of it in law, and would be prosecuted if, after his eviction, he attempted to possess himself of his own property. We want, then, that this law shall be changed, and that all the *bonâ fide* property of the tenant shall be his—his at all times, and shall not be confiscated by being brought into contact with the property of the landlord. And now, Sir, as regards Education, the explanation which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has given is fair and candid. He boldly states that that question ought to be dealt with, and he asks the House to give it a frank and generous consideration. I think hon. Members will cheerfully give that promise; I think I can speak on behalf of a number of Irish representatives near me, and say that we are ready at once to enter into a conference for the purpose of considering what ought to be done in a broad and generous spirit. The principle which ought to be held in view is this—that as those Protestants who wish to enjoy a University education can do so without let or hindrance to the full development of their religious opinions—arrangements ought to be made for granting University degrees to the Roman Catholic students, and that there shall be a College or University which shall be full and free for the instruction of Catholic pupils in those principles of religion which they are taught to revere. If the right hon. Gentleman had been as plain with regard to the Land question, and if he had asked us to go into a conference on that question in a manly, frank, and generous spirit, we should have received the announcement with the greatest possible gratification. I ask Her Majesty's Government, and those who support it, to look at the condition of Ireland from another aspect? Are the people contented? Are the middle classes well affected towards the Government? Do the gentry in Ireland feel secure in their homes, and safe against the recurrence of those disturbances which have taken place during the past two years! Is not the present disaffection owing to the want of confidence of the whole masses of the people in the justice and impartiality of the governing powers of this country? That remark applies not only to the present Government, but those who preceded them, although I must say the last Government did endeavour in some respects to legislate for the people of Ireland. But mere intentions will effect little: coercive laws you have tried often, but always in vain. For once let the English Minister try the effect of generous and comprehensive measures of justice.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON said, it was not his intention to follow the rambling discussion and useless dissertation upon Irish questions generally which had been entered upon by hon. Members opposite, without the slightest explanation of how they were to be dealt with in the present Parliament. The real key to the cropping up of the Land question was that hon. Gentlemen would soon have to meet their constituents and explain how it happened that a Bill meeting the wants and wishes of the Irish people had failed to become law this Session. That Bill not only afforded compensation for the capital which was spent upon the land, but also for the labour which contributed to give it its real value. Those who had prevented the Government from carrying this Bill now attempted, by raising illusory and profitless discussions, to conceal what their own line of action had been. Everybody knew from the state of public business in the present Session how little time any individual measure could command. The proposal, therefore, to add a profitless rider—in other words, a simple obstruction to the passing of the Bill, showed, on the part of any one knowing the usages of the House, a palpable, barefaced determination to render legislation impossible. To charge upon the Government the consequences of the acts of Gentlemen opposite approached very closely to hypocrisy. The Irish people would be very much deluded if they put faith in statements made with that object in view. The hon. Member opposite might assert for himself that he had never repudiated the doctrine of compensation, but he acted with those who did, and the effect upon the Bill was precisely the same. It was their fault that there was not at that moment upon the Statute book a sound and useful enactment for giving compensation to tenants in Ireland for improvements. It was the want of practical good sense and practical honesty on the part of hon. Gentlemen opposite which was the bane of

Ireland. He should like to know where were the eloquent voices of Irish Members on the Opposition Benches when really good Bills for their country were introduced. It seemed to be the desire of many Irish representatives rather to have a popular grievance than to have sound legislation for Ireland. To represent the landlords of Ireland as aided by the soldiers and police in seizing the property of the unfortunate tenants was a favourite illustration of professional agitators fond of maligning their countrymen; but the people ought by this time to place a just value on the idle declamation so characteristic of some of the Irish representatives, as distinguished from the practical good sense of the English and Scotch representatives.

Mr. PIM said, there was one observation made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer which surprised him much, and that was that the Irish Land Bills of this year were the most liberal measures on this subject ever submitted to the House. He did not think that they were so liberal as those introduced upon former occasions by Conservative Governments. The measures introduced by the present Prime Minister, when Lord Stanley, and by the Conservative Government of 1852, might both advantageously compare with the Bills of this year. But it was not a material question now whether the Bills of this year were liberal or not. The Bill of the late Government had been accepted as a settlement by some of those best entitled to the respect of the Irish people in connection with this subject. The essence of that proposal, as stated by Lord Dufferin, the ablest defender of the landlord view of this question—

> "Was to leave the right of contract perfectly free; but to substitute, where no contract existed, a presumption that, within certain limits, any improvement made by the tenant was his property."

Lord Dufferin also says—

> "That it cannot be disputed that such a declaration on the part of the law is no interference with the right of property,"

—and that

> "It is in some such compromise, if in any, that a solution of the Irish Land question is to be found."

Legislation in reference to the Land question ought to have in view, first, to give the most ample scope for contracts; secondly, to afford the utmost facility for enforcing contracts; and, lastly, in the absence of contract, to establish, by rule of law, the presumption that the ownership of the improvements was in the person who made them. The proposal of the noble Lord the Secretary for Ireland (Lord Naas) in the present Session amounted, to some extent, to an adaptation of the Montgomery Act, which had been of great advantage to Scotland. But the noble Lord's Bill would not work well in Ireland, because it contained restrictions which the Montgomery Act did not contain, and withheld powers which the Montgomery Act gave, so that the legislation proposed in the present year was inferior to that which was enacted a hundred years ago in reference to Scotland. The subject had now been before Parliament for a longer time than the Reform question, and he was not without hope, notwithstanding his discouraging tone, that it would receive the serious attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and that, at the commencement of next Session, they would see better prospects of its being dealt with by the Government. The Act which had been passed 100 years ago for Scotland had settled the Land question in that country. If a similar measure had been passed for Ireland, he believed that similar satisfactory results would have followed. He deprecated the hostility of the Ulster Members to the discussion of the Land question. He believed that they were opposed to it under the impression that it was mixed up with religion. He wished he could disabuse them of that notion, and then he might hope that they would discuss it with impartiality. It was not a question of Protestant and Roman Catholic. It was not even a mere tenant's question, but one which concerned the whole people, and the proper settlement of which would raise the condition of landed property for the benefit of the whole nation. It was true that the religious question exercised an important influence in Ireland. The Roman Catholics demanded equality, and they ought to have it. It was urged that equality would not satisfy them; but that if they obtained it, they would next demand supremacy, for which they required equality as a stepping-stone. Being a Protestant he could not pretend to answer for Roman Catholics in this respect; but this he would say, that nothing less than equality ought to satisfy them, and that no Protestant Member of that House would, under similar circumstances, rest content without it. The real question is, how far are their claims just? And the best way of acting would be to do as the lawyers did in a disputed case—namely, pay the money into court. Give the Roman Catholics what they were fairly entitled to, and trust to public opinion to prevent their demanding, at least with success, what was unreasonable. When justice was done, Protestants would be better able to resist unjust demands. The condition of Ireland was most unsatisfactory, and he did not see how it would be better in twelve months than it was now. It was regretable that the Habeas Corpus should be suspended; but he believed that that suspension worked for the benefit of the country. He did not attribute the bad feeling which prevailed in many parts of Ireland to any one cause. He believed that it was the result of various causes—the fruits of oppressive government during the long course of centuries, and it was not to be got rid of without time. It would, however, be got rid of in time, for the circumstances of England and Ireland rendered it impossible for the two countries to be separated, and the people would ultimately adapt themselves to each other. It was impossible to review this subject without reference to the past. Ireland had been in times past systematically oppressed and kept down—the Roman Catholics by the Protestants, both by England. He would support himself by the authority of the late Sir George Lewis, as quoted by Lord Dufferin. Sir George Lewis says—

> "At the same time that a wide and impassable line was drawn by the law between the two religions, and the one persuasion was made a privileged, the other an inferior class, the whole of Ireland was treated as a province or colony, whose interest was to be sacrificed to those of the mother country. Hence arose the restrictions on Irish commerce—on the exportation of corn, cattle, and woollen goods—avowedly for the benefit of England. A system of government administered in this spirit, and in a country where a people were already in a state of great rudeness and disorder, necessarily led to the degradation and demoralization of the bulk of the population."

The present circumstances are the natural results of such a policy. Our fathers sowed the wind, and we are reaping the whirlwind. The recovery must be the work of time; but before the healing influence of time could commence, every portion of that which was unjust must be rectified. Every splinter of the arrow that inflicted the wound must be extracted by a skilful hand before the wound could be healed, and that had not yet been done. Before recovery could be effected there must be a removal of all injustice, and of all semblance of injustice, to Ireland. Hon. Gentlemen representing the North of Ireland referred with just pride to the condition of Ulster, but it ought not to be forgotten that the linen manufactures planted there were encouraged by England, while its policy was to discourage the woollen manufactures of the South. Mr. Cobden remarked on this subject that—

> "If we look to the prosperity of Ireland's staple manufacture—the only industry that was tolerated by the Government of this country—it warrants the presumption that, under similar circumstances, her woollens, or indeed her cottons, might equally with her linens have survived a competition with the fabrics of Great Britain."

It should be recollected that full justice would not be done by the mere cessation of injustice. There should be reparation also; but he did not look for reparation for the past, but only justice for the future. Unhappily there was no national sentiment in Ireland—no real public opinion existing amongst the people. The parties are not Whigs and Tories, or Liberals and Conservatives, but Roman Catholics and Protestants. The question of religion was a constant source of disunion. Every public matter that was mooted was viewed as it affected Protestant interest on the one side, and the interest of the Catholic Church on the other. Until this question was settled there was no hope of union, of the formation of a sound effective public opinion, or of the existence of a general feeling of nationality. The feeling of nationality was not necessarily antagonistic to England. National feeling was strong in Scotland, and the feeling of union with England was strong also. The great effort of Statesmen ought to be to remove religious inequality in Ireland. Nothing would give peace to Ireland except the removal of the inequality under which three-fourths of the population laboured. Equality was justice, and that equality ought to be established. He hoped that the subject which had been debated that night would receive more attention from the Government than the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had led them to expect, for no man was better fitted to settle the question than he was. He believed that questions affecting Ireland could never be settled so well as by a Conservative Ministry, who, having shown their power by settling the Reform questisn—for he might say now that it was settled—could certainly settle the Irish question also. No one knew more about the Land question than the noble Lord the Secretary for Ireland, and he felt certain that if they had further opportunities of discussing these subjects, much less difference would be found to exist between the noble Lord's views and those entertained by the country than was generally thought. He trusted this subject would be taken into the anxious consideration of Her Majesty's Government, with a view to a satisfactory settlement of a long-vexed question, and one which from its present condition was a source of great and general discontent.

MR. MONSELL: I never was present at a debate that gave me greater pain than the one we are now engaged in. It is abundantly evident that neither my noble Friend the Member for Tyrone, nor the Chancellor of the Exchequer, appreciate in any degree the dangerous position of Ireland and the peril which that position involves to the United Kingdom. I am most anxious to avoid anything which can have even the appearance of party conflict, so I shall say but little on my noble Friend's speech. He scattered broadcast imputations of hypocrisy, bad faith, and ignorance, on everybody who happens to differ from him as to the best mode of settling the Land question. That question is one of great difficulty. My noble Friend (Lord Naas) deliberately avoided in his Bill the question of tenure. All other compensation Bills had indirectly tended to promote some security of tenure. There really was nothing extraordinary if hon. Gentlemen at this side of the House, who considered that no measure that did not promote the giving of leases could be satisfactory, had given expression to that opinion. They had done so fairly, and it required somewhat of a heated imagination to discover in their conduct any grounds of complaint. I pass on now to the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. A distinguished Statesman, just before the French Revolution of 1830, said he should be less anxious if Prince Metternich were more so. I certainly should feel much more hopeful as to our prospects if I could discover in the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer any real conception of what the state of Ireland is. I am happy to find that the grievances arising from the present state of University education in Ireland are recognized by the right hon. Gentleman, and that he is prepared to redress them. At this side of the House we shall be prepared to give a candid consideration to any proposals he may make on the subject; but I must say that he has very much misunderstood the course we took on the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Brighton. I submitted an Amendment to that Motion which, if it had been carried, would have preserved the distinctive religious character of Trinity College, but would have opened the University of Dublin to the whole nation. Trinity College rejected my proposal. It deliberately preferred that the Dublin University should remain the University of a sect to a proposal which would make it the University of the nation. My right hon. Friends the Members for Louth and Merthyr Tydvil and I, believing that, without religious equality the evils of Ireland cannot be cured, had but one course open to us:—If Trinity College refuses to open its privileges to the whole nation, in our opinion those privileges ought to be abolished. We wish to "level up;" if we are prevented from doing so we must only "level down." I sincerely trust that we shall not be driven to persevere in this course. I hope that the eminent men who direct the councils of the University will not insist on preserving a monopoly which is an anachronism, and that before the next Session comes they may have acquired a little more wisdom, and I must add foresight, than have characterized them during the late debates. I have expressed my satisfaction as to the right hon. Gentleman's statement upon University education. I must say — and I say it without the slightest tinge of party spirit — that my satisfaction with the enunciation of the views of the Government ends with that statement. The right hon. Gentleman limits the action of the Government on the landlord and tenant question to the Government Bill of the Session, which, notwithstanding the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that it was the most liberal Bill introduced on the subject, is, I venture to say, far less liberal in its provisions than the Bills of 1845 and 1853, and obviously, as I have already pointed out, does not touch, or attempt to touch, that vital question of tenure with which the Bill of the late Government dealt. The right hon. Gentleman's measure will, at all events, give no satisfaction in Ireland. On the Church question the right hon.

Gentleman is explicit — he gives us no hopes that he will even touch it. I do not think his attempt to reconcile his present inaction with the views he so eloquently put forward in 1844 very successful. He says, that Ireland had a teeming population, at the earlier period, and that now her population had diminished. If he had been able to show that the relative numbers of those who belong to the different religious bodies there had been materially altered, he would have used an argument of some weight; but the fact was otherwise — the members of the Established Church are nearly in the same proportion to the whole population now that they were then. The injustice of appropriating the funds destined to supply the spiritual wants of the whole nation to a minority remains unchanged; and while the funds remained the same, those to whose use they were exclusively appropriated had diminished from 850,000 to 650,000. But while the Chancellor of the Exchequer was explaining away his former wise and liberal views, what was occurring in Ireland? Never in the memory of any living man was there such deep-rooted disaffection as there was now. Never were the minds of the people so alienated from the Government under which they lived. They were indifferent to the action of Parliament. Their eyes were turned not to Westminster but to Washington. That disaffection prevails among the lower classes no one would deny; but it goes up much higher in the social scale. I do not refer to actual Fenianism, but to that feeling of hostility to Great Britain which is from day to day becoming more intense. I have made inquiries on that subject which satisfy me that this feeling pervades, not the town population only, but also the farming classes. It pervades the vast majority of those who pay less than £100 a year rent. Many of the younger members of the families of even larger farmers share it. Most of the shopkeepers in the smaller towns, and many of the smaller shopkeepers in larger towns are in ardent sympathy with it. What is the newspaper that is waited for with the greatest interest? The *Irishman,* which is full of unmitigated treason. If you want to get a frame for a picture, you find the framers and gilders overwhelmed with demands for frames for General Burke's portrait. You see placards in the streets of the large Irish towns advertising *Voices from the Dock,* — in other words, pamphlets containing speeches delivered by the Fenian prisoners at their trials. Only the other day, at Dungarvan, many of the respectable inhabitants showed the direction of their sympathies by providing champagne and every delicacy of the season for some American Fenians arrested there. At Waterford, not long ago, the mass of the people in one part of the town hurried out at short notice to rescue some Fenian prisoners who were marching through the town. These were the sort of things which were taking place every day in the South of Ireland, and which demanded the most serious consideration of this House and of the Government. Has any Cabinet ever devoted to that consideration one-tenth part of the time it bestowed on the compound-householder? Is any verification of the truth of my description asked for? Look across the ocean—

> "Cœlum non animam mutant qui
> Trans mare currunt."

Does not every Irishman who lands in America at once become a Fenian? Does the voyage change his opinions? Is it not manifest that there he only professes openly the political creed he may have concealed at home? Here then is the result of 600 years' connection between England and Ireland—military occupation—suspended liberties—universal discontent, and a new Irish nation on the other side of the Atlantic, re-cast in the mould of democracy, and watching for an opportunity to strike a blow at the very heart of this Empire. Now, let me ask what is the cause of this disastrous combination? Is it destiny? Is it a wayward fate? Must we fold our hands in despair? Are we powerless in this emergency? Is it impossible for two distinct races such as the English and the Irish to be cordially united in feeling? Look at Alsace. There you have a population of German race—speaking the German language, separated only by a river from the rest of the German race: and yet the inhabitants of Alsace are as thoroughly French in feeling as the inhabitants of Touraine, and woe to the Germans who endeavour to tamper with their allegiance. Well, then, if race is not the obstacle to concord, is it religion? Look at Silesia—in 1742 Silesia was taken from Austria and annexed to Prussia. From that day to this Catholic Silesia has expressed by word and deed nothing but thankfulness for the transfer it underwent, and, as was shown in the war last year, no part of the Prussian dominions contains a population more devoted to the House of Hohenzollern than the Silesians are. Look again at Canada—look at the Canadians of French origin. All history teaches the same lesson, justice and equality have a binding force which nothing can destroy. But, Sir, let me ask is it not the most natural course to go to the Irish people themselves, and find out from them what is the cause of their dissatisfaction? You will find that they all will give the same reason. I am going to repeat what my hon. Friends who come from Ireland have heard *usque ad nauseam.* The people of Ireland say that they are not governed according to their own wishes, or feelings, or requirements, but according to the wishes or prejudices of the people of England. They say that they have no effectual control over their Government, which is controlled by England, and that measures admittedly just and suited to Ireland are abandoned because the Government of the day is obliged to conform its measures, even those that regard Ireland alone, to the views, often ignorant, and to the narrowest prejudices of the people of Great Britain. I do not say whether this view is right or wrong, but I can vouch for its being the opinion, nay the conviction, not only of the peasantry but of the middle and farming classes in the greater part of Ireland. ["No, no!"] I do not know who says "No, no," it must be some one not very well acquainted with Ireland. I see now who it is. It is the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney-General for Ireland. The other day that learned Gentleman said that the people of Ireland were not at all discontented. To the authority of a Gentleman who made such a statement it is quite unnecessary to oppose any argument. What the people of Ireland, then, ask is to be governed according to their own requirements, just as the English and Scotch are according to the requirements of their respective countries; and they point to two remarkable instances in confirmation of the view that Irish interests are sacrificed to English opinion. They take the Land question, an old grievance, for more than two hundred years ago Sir John Davies said—

> "No care is taken of the inferior people. Tenants-at-will, by reason of the uncertainty of their estates, did utterly neglect to improve the land."

They say that Parliament recognized this grievance twenty-two years ago—that it deliberately admitted that the Irish law of landlord and tenant was not adapted to the wants of that country; and yet, in spite of eloquent speeches and the exertions of eminent statesmen, nothing had been done to redress the grievance. Over forty Bills have been introduced—not one that touches the admitted grievance has been passed. They ask—not, I think, unnaturally—would an English or a Scotch grievance have been so dealt with? Next they turn to the question of the Irish Church. For a longer period, even than twenty-two years, ever since 1834, the most eminent orators and statesmen have declared that no grievance like it exists, or ever has existed, in the world. Nowhere else, as Macaulay, Brougham, Lord Grey, C. Buller, &c.—a cloud of distinguished witnesses—have proclaimed, are the funds destined for the spiritual wants of a whole people appropriated to the exclusive use of a small minority. But eloquence, and reason, and authority, and logic, have been powerless against prejudice. An injustice pregnant with evil to the social state of Ireland—an injustice the magnitude of which you have so long admitted—remains untouched. Can you wonder that the Irish people compare your admissions with your acts, and believe that they are governed according to the wishes and prejudices of the people of England rather than according to their own requirements? Do you wonder that they resent the deprivation of that which Guizot in his last volume declares to be the end of representative government—namely, that the people should have a constant direction and effectual control in their own government—that they should be ruled, not according to abstract principles but according to the peculiar wants generated by their own special circumstances? If you mean to satisfy them, then, you must give them what they reasonably and justly ask for, not what those at a distance think suitable for them. Let them be the judges in their own concerns. It is, believe me, perfectly idle to attempt to change the condition—the perilous and menacing condition of Ireland—unless you gain the hearts of the Irish people. Those hearts you never can gain until you remove the impression that English policy or prejudice, not Irish interests, rule your deliberations. No advancement in national prosperity—no improvement in the material condition of the people will do anything so long as that policy of injustice rankles in the mind of the people. Indeed, the more educated they become, the more they are able to compare their lot with that of the inhabitants of other countries, the more acutely they must feel their own wrongs. I earnestly entreat Her Majesty's Ministers seriously and deliberately to consider this matter. Depend upon it our present position is charged with danger—do as you would be done by. Give what you would wish for yourselves in similar circumstances; I ask for nothing more. Regulate the Irish Land question, not according to English ideas, but according to Irish wants; regulate Irish education so that the rights of conscience may be held sacred; regulate the Irish Church according to those immutable principles of justice which your most eminent statesmen have so often proclaimed in discussing it. Do to Ireland as you would that she should do to you if she were strong and you were weak. Do this — make those that are not Fenians loyal, and you need not trouble your heads about the Fenians. Act thus, and you will soon obliterate from the Irish heart the memories of the past. On the other hand, if you refuse to do this, do not be blind to the consequences — you will have perpetual discontent deepening from day to day, and you will do best if you confine yourselves to one law more—one to make the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act perpetual.

Mr. O'BEIRNE defended the conduct of those who repeatedly pressed upon the attention of the House the complaints of the Irish people, and maintained that, instead of improving, the condition of Ireland had deteriorated since its union with England. The words uttered by the noble Lord at the commencement of the Session were quickly re-echoed on that side of the House, and the Irish Members thought they were words of hope, yet now at the end of the Session of 1867, not a single step has been taken in the way of good legislation for that country. He was determined to support any man who proposed good measures for the benefit of Ireland. But he was disappointed. The promises of the Liberals were fair, but their performances were *nil*, because before they had the opportunity to fulfil them they were driven from their places. He believed that Mr. Gladstone had a sincere feeling in favour of what he might term the Irish question, and he should be glad to see him in a position to carry out his views. At the same time he admitted that the promises of the present Government were equally fair, and he concurred in the encomiums lavished on Lord Naas, but whether it was the Reform Bill, the pressure of business, or the laxity of conduct which seemed to come over a man when he entered on office, there was no question that he had not fulfilled the promises he had made to meet the difficulties of the Irish question and heal old sores; for his speech on the 2nd of August last, in which he said it was the duty of the Government to propose to Parliament measures for the benefit of Ireland, remained a memento of those unfulfilled promises. No doubt the noble Lord had, in concert with the Cabinet, inaugurated the Session with earnest zeal. He introduced two Irish Bills of importance and he (Mr. O'Beirne) had heard with surprise the unfounded assertion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that they were not received with encouragement by Members on that (the Liberal) side of the House. It was true that these Bills did not go the length desired by the Irish Members on that side of the House, but they never meant to throw any obstacles in the way of their passing, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer was grievously in error when he made that statement. But the noble Lord, when he laid these Bills on the table, seemed to have finished his work as the legislator and benefactor of Ireland. They continued dangling before the House in such a way that it appeared to him that there was really not much intention to press them forward. What had happened? The "massacre of the innocents" commenced a few days since, and amongst that massacre those two Bills were conspicuous victims. It was a mockery to introduce measures which were never intended to be carried. The noble Lord should tell them at once that he did not mean to legislate; if he did, those Bills ought to have been carried through at all hazards. The Reform Bill had been made the excuse for not dealing with this subject; but it would have been more straightforward, more honest to have told the House that the time that would be occupied by the Reform Bill would prevent Irish legislation, in which case he did not believe that any member from that country would have objected to delay the question till next Session, if a disposition had been shown to deal with them at the earliest possible period. Such a policy as that which had been pursued tended to foster distrust and create dissatisfaction which was nearly akin to disaffection. He suggested no threat, but, if this policy was continued, a day might come when the whole force, physical and mental, of this kingdom, might be found inadequate to stem the torrent of rebellious disaffection which might now, by well timed conciliation and concession, be altogether avoided. The Irish people were generous, but sensitive, and he regretted to say that many of the speeches delivered in the House by the hon. Gentleman near him (Mr. Whalley) had caused considerable dissatisfaction in Ireland. That hon. Gentleman said that he was an echo of the feelings of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the echo of the hon. Gentleman bore the same resemblance to the Chancellor of the Exchequer as the celebrated Killarney echo did to the original sound. In Killarney the question put was, "How are you Paddy Blake?" and the echo was, "Very well, I thank you." He could not help expressing his regret that, so far as any indication had been given by the Ministry, there was very little chance of any good measures for Ireland emanating from that quarter.

Lord NAAS said, he would not have attempted to address the House at that hour were it not for some remarks which had been made by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. His indisposition to address the House was not owing to the circumstance that he did not appreciate the importance of the question, but because he believed no practical good could arise from the discussion. They had heard tonight a great deal which they had heard before about the grievances of Ireland. In many respects those grievances had been most eloquently described, but when he looked for a practical remedy he heard none proposed. He did not intend to follow the various speakers in the remarks they had made. They had said a great deal which would command the attention of the country and excite much interest in Ireland; but as regarded the particular accusations brought against himself on the subject of the Land Bills he desired to say a few words. An imputation had been thrown out by the hon. Gentleman opposite that these Bills were not introduced with the *bonâ fide* intention of carrying them into law. He was the best judge of that, and he could assure the House that no speech was ever made with a more sincere intention of carrying those Bills than that which he made in the beginning of this Session. He believed that, if passed, they would have conferred a great boon upon the county, and when it was said on the other side that he had not proposed them as a settlement of the question, he must have been too modest in the language which he used in introducing the Bills. He said on that occasion that he could hardly hope to succeed where so many men of great ability, knowledge, and eloquence had failed. But he also said that if those Bills were passed they would go a long way to remedy many grievances ostentatiously put forward on behalf of the Irish people, and that they would offer a simple and easy mode of obtaining compensation for real improvements in the land. He did not think, therefore, that he was open to the imputation of having brought forward those Bills without an intention of passing them, or as a mere attempt to touch the outside of this great question without contributing to its solution. It would be safer and wiser if the House were to deal with the question of compensation separately, and leave the question of tenure by itself. If this Land question was ever to be dealt with, these two subjects of compensation and tenure must be kept apart. His opinion was that if the House attempted to deal with the latter question with the view of forcing the proprietors to give their tenants any particular form of tenure the attempt would be defeated. He had endeavoured, therefore, to deal simply and practically with the question of compensation. Whatever might be said of the details of the Bill upon that subject, no one could deny that its object was good. That object was to redress a grievance which had been put forward again and again on the part of the tenantry of Ireland. And yet it was said that any measure of compensation was mere moonshine, and was not asked for by the Irish people. He was filled with astonishment that Gentlemen, who for years had been clamouring for something of that kind, should turn round and say, "That is not what we want at all; compensation is a mere bagatelle; what we want is a measure on the subject of the tenure of land." He should be glad to see the practice of giving leases more prevalent in Ireland. The question was a very critical one, and no doubt likely to give rise to considerable difference of opinion. But he would remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that before they recommended anything in the shape of compulsory leasing, they ought to show that the granting of leases led to an improvement in the cultivation of land. If the discussion on the Land Bills had proceeded he should have been prepared to show in the clearest manner that it had never yet been proved that the leasing of land would be a panacea for the ills of Ireland. He believed there was one thing which would lead to the giving of leases, and that was, if the tenantry themselves could show to the proprietors that where leases were given for a reasonable term, there industry, thrift, and the comfort of their dwellings were promoted. That would be the best argument to produce in favour of giving leases. He was not at all prepared to say that the granting of leases was not going on to a certain extent gradually, slowly, and steadily, and he was very glad of it. But he believed that if the giving of leases was to be promoted, it could best be done by the tenants placing themselves in a position to say to the landlord, "If you will give me a lease I will show you that I am both able and willing to treat the land in the best possible way." It was quite a mistake to imagine that there were no such things as leases in Ireland. It was of course very difficult to give statistics on the subject, but he had consulted a great number of persons who were well acquainted with this matter, and their impression, which he believed was not far wrong, was that out of the whole of Ireland between one-fourth and one-fifth of the land was at the present moment leased. Beyond that, too, if the demand for leases on the part of the tenants were greater the system of leasing would be much more general than it now was. He had had some personal experience in this matter, and he found that the anxiety for procuring leases was by no means so great as had frequently been asserted in that House. Fixity of tenure was promoted more by the present system than it would be by a system of leases. As long as men remained yearly tenants they felt tolerably certain that the farms would remain under their care from year to year, from father to son, without any increase in the rent, whereas, at the termination of a lease of fourteen or twenty-one years, they felt equally certain that there would be a re-arrangement of affairs which might not perhaps be so advantageous to them as they might desire. To that fact a great deal of the prosperity of Scotch agriculture might be attributed. But the Government had evinced the disposition which they felt in this matter by introducing a Bill—for the provisions of which, indeed, they took no credit, inasmuch as they were due to the late Government—for promoting and facilitating the granting of leases in Ireland. In introducing the Bills which they had brought before the House the Government had been actuated by no other desire than to contribute something towards the settlement of this long-vexed question. If the Bills had been withdrawn it was simply because the great measure, the consideration of which had taken the place of every other subject during the last five months, had utterly precluded the possibility of sufficient time being given to other important questions. He did not pretend to maintain that they had proposed any legislation of a very important character; in fact, the Bills with which they had been able to proceed could not have been pressed forward at all if they had been seriously opposed. They had, as a rule, been taken at a late hour of the night, when it would have been impossible to have discussed any measure of cardinal importance. He felt certain, therefore, that the failure of the Government in this respect would not be attributed by the country to any indisposition, or want of courage to deal with the subject. He had a strong hope—indeed, he anticipated with a confidence almost amounting to a certainty, that the important questions which required solution might yet, in a succeeding Session, be settled in a satisfactory manner if Members on both sides approached them in a spirit of compromise, and with a sincere desire to procure their settlement. That would be especially the case in reference to the subject of Education. It was their duty to endeavour as fully as possible to meet the wishes of the Irish people. The opinion of all classes in that country was that religion ought to form a portion of the educational system, whether in schools, Colleges, or Universities. By keeping that principle in view we should be able to approach the consideration of these questions in a manner which would give satisfaction to the Irish people. He could not help expressing his surprise at the division which had taken place the other day on this subject. A Motion on that occasion had been brought forward by the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) insinuating in the strongest and plainest terms the necessity for a system of mixed education in Trinity College. An Amendment was moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick (Mr. Monsell) which if it meant anything at all meant that the system to be pursued in the College in future should be a denominational one. The two propositions were directly opposed. The one was as clear, as decided, and as emphatic a negative to the other as could possibly be. Yet the Amendment was withdrawn, and the advocates of denominational education in the Universities went into the lobby with those who were in favour of a directly opposite system. This was not calculated to facilitate the question; but he hoped that the conduct pursued on that occasion was a matter of chance, and arose from the opinion entertained by some hon. Members that if the whole system of Trinity College could not be altered it was better to leave it alone altogether. He was not, therefore, without hope that the course pursued on that occasion was more the result of accident than design. He felt convinced that the question of University education in Ireland could be settled in a manner which would be satisfactory to the Irish people. He would only say, before sitting down, that he and his Colleagues felt deeply the responsibility attaching to every person connected with the administration of Ireland in the present time. The past year, he could assure the House, had been one of deep responsibility. He would make no attempt to say anything in defence of what had been done in regard to Fenianism after the kind and flattering terms in which it had been referred to that night; but he could not sit down without expressing a hope that the events of the past year would not be forgotten by the Irish people. If anything could show them how foolish, how hopeless, how insane, and how wicked, were the attempts to overthrow the Government of the country by force, the events of the past winter would furnish that proof. Surely it would also show the people of that country that in dealing with crimes and offences of that kind the ordinary laws of the country were fully strong enough to preserve peace and protect the loyal members of society in the enjoyment of their rights. He hoped that the lesson would not be lost upon the Irish people. He hoped that they might be brought to believe that which he knew to be true—namely, that in the House and in the country there was a most friendly disposition towards Ireland; that there was every disposition to make allowance for the weakness and folly which had been displayed by so large a portion of the population, and to favourably consider all proposals, no matter from whom they emanated, which tended to benefit the people and promote the happiness, welfare, and prosperity of the country.

ABYSSINIA—IMPRISONMENT OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he introduced this subject to the attention of the House, not with the view of raising a discussion on the question of intervention or non-intervention, but simply in order to publish the lamentable position in which nearly sixty Europeans were now placed by command of the King of Abyssinia. Among these prisoners was Her Majesty's Consul, an Ambassador who carried an autograph letter from Her Majesty to the King of Abyssinia, two gentlemen attached to his embassy, and a number of religious missionaries with their families. They were all held as prisoners on account of the quarrel between the King and Her Majesty's Government, and were treated with the greatest severity. By all Governments, civilized and even uncivilized, the person of one holding the position of Ambassador was regarded as sacred. Abyssinia appeared to be a solitary instance to the contrary, and the circumstances of the case demanded that some notice should be taken of her infraction of the usages of all countries. This was putting the question in the mildest form. Most countries would have earned censure if they had kept in durance one even who was not an Ambassador but simply a traveller, especially if the traveller were one engaged in spreading religion and civilization. He would not say that the fault was entirely on the side of the captors; but there was no doubt that the sufferings of the prisoners were very severe. Into the circumstances attending the captivity of these prisoners in Abyssinia it would be unnecessary for him to enter, as they were well known. The Monarch, at whose mercy they were, was no ordinary man. The kingdom of Abyssinia was the sole remnant of ancient Christian domination in the East, and King Theodore was a ruler who might, for bold original character, and dauntless courage, be compared to Mehemet Ali, or even to Peter the Great. He had distinguished himself by the reforms which he had introduced, with the object of raising the power and ultimately of extending the limits of his kingdom. He had subdued the neighbouring chiefs, re-established one sole monarchy, abolished many savage customs, introduced a standing army for the suppression of brigandage, abolished the barbarous practice of mutilating prisoners taken in war, done away with the slave trade, reformed the marriage law, prohibited polygamy, and tried to reform the Church; he had acted with the avowed intention of hastening the time when, in his own language, the ox which drew the plough should be of greater value than the most costly steed which carried the warrior. Unfortunately, his ambition did not rest here. He desired to extend the limits of the Ethopian kingdom, to interfere with the possessions of his neighbours, the Egyptians, who, it must be admitted, were always worrying him, and carry his conquests as far as Jerusalem. It would be seen then that we had to deal with a man of intense energy, a formidable opponent, who would exhaust the resources of his country to the utmost of his power before withdrawing from an object; a man who was formerly well-disposed to this country, but who, unfortunately, had been embittered against us. How this change had been occasioned was a point he did not intend to discuss. The question was, what was to be done? Some of the prisoners had now been captives for upwards of three years, and the question remained what was to be done for their liberation. Conciliation had been tried and failed. Last year a gentleman was sent out with presents calculated to please King Theodore, and accompanied by some artizans, whose arrival the King had particularly desired. An autograph letter from Her Majesty was also sent, in the hope that in this way the original cause of offence would be removed. But the negotiations failed, the prisoners were not released. There seemed therefore to be no chance of procuring their release by any means hitherto adopted, for although the result which attended the dispatch of the Queen's autograph letter to King Theodore had not been announced, it was evident that it had not led to the release of the prisoners. Presuming, then, that it was absolutely necessary that fresh and vigorous action should be taken in the matter, he would state the courses which he thought were open to the Government. In the first place, it was impossible that the captives could be left in their prisons. They were at times treated with the greatest cruelty, with chains both on their hands and feet, and with these chains linked together in such a way that the captives were kept in a recumbent position; and from the latest accounts greater cruelties still appeared to be in store for them. If the captives were left to themselves, they would soon rot in their chains, and he need not ask whether that was a fit end for an Ambassador and a Consul of Her Britannic Majesty? The missionary whom the King had permitted to leave Abyssinia had returned with the much coveted artizans and presents, and the autograph letter of Her Majesty, which was couched in the most conciliatory terms; but even this had not proved successful. Further attempts at conciliation would be not only useless, but derogatory to this country. It had been suggested that we should ask Egypt to assist us in obtaining the release of these captives. He thought it would not be wise to do so. The Turks and Abyssinians had for many centuries past been inveterate enemies, and it would not be wise to ask the Egyptian Pacha, who was the most formidable and inveterate enemy of the Abyssinians, to assist us. The only course which remained was to undertake the release of the captives ourselves. After so great an insult had been inflicted upon us we were bound to take this course, and send an expedition to Abyssinia from India. The first objection to that course was the expense, but surely that consideration ought not to weigh with us when the national honour was concerned? The second objection was that the captives might be killed if such a threat were held out. But that was not to be feared. King Theodore was described as a man of violent passions, but also of strong reason, and he never allowed his reason to be overcome by his passion. If he was passionate, he was also politic; and it was most probable that instead of sacrificing his captives he would come to terms and release them. The third objection was, that the risk to our troops would be great, that the country was difficult and the people warlike. Two years ago Lord Clarendon said in the House of Lords that the reason why he had not sent a man of higher position than Mr. Rassam was, that if anything happened to a high official we should have been obliged to send an expedition to obtain his release or avenge his death. Now he (Mr. Henry Seymour) humbly submitted that if a great country like this invested any person, however humble, with the sacred character of Ambassador, he should, by reason of the office he filled, be as much considered as though he were the highest noble in the land. No doubt the country was difficult and the people were warlike, but these had not prevented our undertaking other expeditions where English honour or interests were at stake. This was not a more difficult enterprize than that against Bhootan or the Akhoond of Swat; and it was absolutely necessary in order to maintain our character as an honourable and courageous people. Our indifference to the sufferings of our fellow-countrymen was already the subject of remark on the Continent, in America, as well as India, highly detrimental to the legitimate influence which we ought to exert in the affairs of the world. In Abyssinia, the country was healthy, the climate temperate, supplies were abundant, the people were badly armed, and the King was reduced now to the possession of a few provinces in the centre of his kingdom. He was a man, too, well acquainted with the power of England, and probably only held his captives because he thought he could make something by them, and that we should not proceed to extreme measures against him. If an expedition were thought desirable, it might proceed by one of several routes. By one of these, starting from the port of Massowah, and passing through Egyptian territory, no difficulties would be experienced until the troops were within four days of Gondar, the Abyssinian capital; and if this, which was the most flourishing province of his kingdom, were seized, and his treasury thereby drained, he would probably listen to terms. No doubt, badly armed as they were, the Abysssinians would oppose our passage through the difficult defiles of their country in this four days' march; but with our rifles and light ordnance there could be no doubt of a successful result. Another route was by Halei, another by Amphila, a fourth by Tajurrah; all were well-known, and all practicable for an army. But his firm belief was, that if we prepared an expedition, the King would come to terms before it was absolutely necessary to undertake those contingencies for which, however, we ought to be fully prepared. Great interest was excited throughout England in the captives, and it was felt that this country was disgraced in allowing them to remain so long in captivity. If we only determined that the thing should be done, it might be considered as done; and now, if the Government spoke strongly, King Theodore would have notice, and would probably yield. It was to be feared that the King thought at present that we did not choose to exert ourselves, and doubted also whether Mr. Rassam really represented the Queen as he pretended. Dr. Beke arrived in Abyssinia at the same time as Mr. Rassam, and this seemed to have created a doubt in the mind of his Abyssinian Majesty as to whether Mr. Rassam really represented the Queen. Dr. Beke's embassy, though well intentioned, had not the effect desired. It had been suggested in influential quarters that we should attempt to ransom these captives. But that would produce an extremely bad effect all over the world: semi-barbarous monarchs would seize Englishmen, calculating on their ransom; a hundred Theodores would rise up, and the lives and liberty of English travellers would be jeopardized in all parts of the world. Even if we could consent to ransom a private traveller, we could hardly ransom an Ambassador, sent out with an autograph letter from the Queen, and that to a King who had mustered 100,000 men in the field. No doubt, the King attributed our temporizing to fear, and as he retained the captives by force they must be released by force. If an ultimatum was sent to Theodore, stating that if the captives were injured he would be held responsible, and that if they were not released in a certain time an expedition would be sent against him, and if this was done by a proper embassy and a firm front was exhibited, the probability was that the captives would be released. This was the course which the Egyytian Government took in the case of the Coptic Patriarch whom Theodore attempted to detain ten years ago. The Pacha thus obtained his release. Mr. Flad expressed a strong opinion against sending out presents last year, and he and Colonel Merewether suggested at the time the alternative of a strong threatening letter, backed by a naval demonstration. Of course, the English Foreign Office had no intention but to do its utmost for the captives, but the Foreign Office hardly knew how to deal with these Oriental questions, which the India Office could undertake more successfully. The Foreign Office had more to do with the West than with the East, and the show of force and authority, which appeared absurd when exhibited towards Western nations, were sometimes necessary in our dealings with Eastern nations. Nothing was necessary but to show a bold front towards Abyssinia. Surely this country would not suffer these unfortunate men to be left to their fate; some of them had suffered dreadful tortures, and all had friends and relatives. They owed their position to a quarrel between the English and the Abyssinian Governments. It was a disgrace to this country that they should remain in captivity, and some effort must be made to release them. He had full confidence that the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office (Lord Stanley), however strong might be his love of peace, could show likewise that he felt the duty which we owed to private Englishmen who had accepted perilous missions at the command of their Sovereign, and would show also that he had a keen sense of what was due to the national honour. The noble Lord would remember what had been done during the last twenty years to raise the reputation of this country, and to make the lives of its citizens sacred in any part of the world. In China, Japan, or Brazil, or wherever Englishmen or the English flag had been insulted, reparation had been demanded firmly and with success. The noble Lord had a reputation to make at the commencement of his career as Foreign Minister, and he felt confident that the honour and reputation of the country would not suffer in the hands of the noble Lord.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that proper steps may be taken to procure the release of Her Majesty's Consul and other subjects of Her Majesty at present held prisoners by the King of Abyssinia, if necessary, by force of arms,"—(*Mr. Henry Seymour,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR HENRY RAWLINSON: In rising to second the Motion of the hon. Member for Poole, I desire to say in the first place, that I cordially agree with my hon. Friend as to the inexpediency of entering upon the past history of the Abyssinian difficulty. A retrospect of past events would be merely "a ripping up of old sores," and could answer no useful purpose. It would, at any rate, be quite irrelevant to the question now before the House. That question, which demands our immediate consideration, and on which the House is now invited to express an opinion, is simply what may be the best means of extricating ourselves from the painful, the humiliating—I may say the intolerable—position that we now occupy in regard to King Theodore of Abyssinia. In explaining this position, I will not pretend to follow my hon. Friend into a detail of all our grievances. I will merely state in broad and general terms the one great wrong of which we complain. Two employés of the Crown, then—one an officer in Her Majesty's Consular Service, and the other an Envoy—accredited on a special mission to the Court of Abyssinia, are now languishing in chains in a dungeon at Magdala, associated with felons, exposed to every possible indignity and even torture, and in daily—I might almost say hourly—risk of their lives; and they have been brought into this dreadful state of degradation and suffering—not by any fault of their own—not by any indiscretion or shortcoming of which they may have been guilty, but simply because they have done their duty, loyally and conscientiously, and have carried out to the best of their ability the instructions with which they have been intrusted by the Government they serve. On this plain showing of the case, without any colouring or exaggeration, or any appeal to sentiment, I ask if there can be a difference of opinion as to the obligation, the imperative duty, which devolves upon us, of interfering to rescue our officers and to vindicate the national honour? What, Sir, then, can be the causes that have led to all this hesitation upon our part, that lead us still to hesitate, we whose boast it has ever been hitherto, that an Englishman, like the old "civis Romanus," could roam through the world covered by the national ægis, and secured by it against insult or wrong? I have heard, Sir, three arguments, and three arguments only, used against sending an expedition to Abyssinia, and endeavouring to rescue our officers by force of arms. I will briefly state these arguments, and then proceed to answer them. Firstly, it is said that by sending an army, we endanger the lives of the captives, who as I am assured, men, women, and children included, amount now to almost fifty in number—since the tyrant if defeated in the field, or even if severely pressed, might execute his captives before finally taking flight and seeking safety in the interior of the country. Secondly; the hazards and difficulties of the expedition are duly weighed, as it is very proper they should be; and the risks attending the dispatch of an armed force into the interior of Abyssinia are thought too serious to be encountered; in fact, it is apprehended that, bad as our position now is, it may be rendered still worse by failure; and it is suggested, therefore, that our best policy may be, after all, to remain passive under our present monstrous indignity. And thirdly, in regard to expense, which is also of course a very essential consideration, it is maintained by many, as a conclusive argument against war, that whatever loss we may sustain from the effects of failing to redress our wrongs, such loss cannot be nearly commensurate to the heavy sacrifice both of life and treasure we should incur from engaging in actual hostilities with King Theodore. I will now, Sir, proceed to answer these objections. Firstly; in regard to the lives of the captives, it must always be remembered that this proposed appeal to arms is a last resource. We have done everything we could to obtain the release of the prisoners by fair means and we have failed. If we abandon any further effort, and our present inactivity is prolonged, that the prisoners will one and all, in due course, sink under their sufferings, is almost a matter of certainty. The question, therefore, resolves itself into a choice of evils. In one case the death of the captives is almost certain; in the other there is a chance—I might say a fair chance—of saving them; for, if we look on the favourable side of the picture, it seems quite possible—nay, probable—that the prisoners may be surrendered by King Theodore on a mere demonstration being made against him, or at any rate on the first application of real pressure; or, on the other hand, they may be withdrawn from the power of Theodore by some rival chief, who will send them in, as we advance, in order to make his own terms with us. In fact, in the only two parallel cases on record, or at any rate, in the only two cases which at present occur to me—I mean the example of the prisoners in China and the prisoners at Cabul—as our troops advanced into the country the captives were better, rather than worse treated, and in both instances they were ultimately delivered up to us unscathed, as the natural result of our success. Besides, in the case that we are now considering, as far as this question of life is concerned, the parties most interested are undoubtedly the prisoners themselves; and they are, I understand, unanimous in desiring to encounter the risk of our advance rather than die by inches, as they are now dying in their dungeon at Magdala. I will now, Sir, reply to the second objection. With regard to the hazards and difficulties of the undertaking, I do not by any means underrate them. I have taken some pains to acquaint myself, from the best authorities, with the nature of the country to be traversed between the sea-coast and Magdala; and I have also collected information with regard to the climate and resources of Abyssinia, and the facilities which exist for obtaining carriage and supplies, and the other requisites for the advance of an army into the interior, and I am obliged to confess, as the result of all my enquiries—I cannot indeed conceal it from myself—that the invasion of Abyssinia from the sea-coast would be a most arduous undertaking. But because the undertaking may be arduous, that is no reason that we should flinch from our duty. In thinking over the matter, indeed, from this point of view, I am reminded of the noble and eloquent words which were used by my old commander, General Nott, under very similar circumstances, when the difficulties of an onward march were urged against a renewed attempt to relieve Candahar—

> "I am obliged to you," wrote General Nott, to his correspondent in the South, "for pointing out the many difficulties attending our position; but you are aware that it is our first and only duty to overcome difficulties, when the national honour and our military reputation are so nearly concerned. Nothing can be done without effort and perseverance."

Sir, I think it would be premature and impolitic to review at present the possible difficulties of an Abyssinian campaign; I think it at all times undesirable to discuss in the House of Commons details of military organization, which properly belong to the Executive, and which can only be conveniently arranged and decided on the spot. By whatever route we advance, we shall no doubt meet with difficulties in ascending the table-land of Abyssinia; but I cannot believe that such difficulties are insuperable to the troops who scaled the mountain peaks and passes in the recent Sitana campaign. Besides, the word "impossible" should be as foreign to our vocabulary as it is said to be to that of the French. Relying, indeed, on the unrivalled efficiency of our Indian Commissariat, and remembering that we should have our base on the sea, from whence unlimited supplies could be thrown into the country, I should feel little doubt but that an energetic and experienced Commander, at the head of a force numbering from 5,000 to 10,000 picked men of all arms, European and Native, which would be ample for advanced columns, supports, and reserves—I should feel little doubt, I say, but that a good General at the head of such a force would march triumphantly from the sea-coast to Magdala and fully achieve the objects of the expedition. I have now, Sir, to refer to the third objection, which concerns the cost of the expedition, and which declares such cost to be out of all proportion to the benefit to be derived from it. This objection is chiefly urged by Gentlemen who disregard, or at any rate undervalue, the advantages of "prestige," and with whom therefore it is somewhat difficult to contend, as we have no common ground of argument. I hope, however, I may be permitted to state my own views on this question of "prestige;" and I would further ask leave, in support of those views, to remind the House that, having been employed officially in the East for nearly thirty years, and having passed by far the greater portion of that service in immediate connection with Native Courts, my opinions with regard to "prestige" are not derived from theory or from books, but are the result of personal experience and observation. I would say, then, that I look on "prestige" in politics very much as I look on "credit" in finance. It is a power which enables us to achieve very great results with very small means at our immediate disposal. "Prestige" may not be of paramount importance in Europe, but in the East, Sir, our whole position depends on it. It is a perfect fallacy to suppose that we hold India by the sword. The foundation of our tenure, the talisman—so to speak—which enables 100,000 Englishmen to hold 150,000,000 of Natives in subjection, is the belief in our unassailable power, in our inexhaustible resources; and any circumstance therefore which impairs that belief, which leads the Nations of the East to mistrust our superiority and to regard us as more nearly on an equality with themselves, inflicts a grievous shock on our political position. It is impossible, Sir, in such matters to trace cause and effect with mathematical precision — much must depend upon opinion; but in illustration of what I have said, I will give it as my opinion, derived from a very careful scrutiny of passing events, that the Sepoy outbreak in 1857 was mainly—I will not say wholly—attributable to the loss of "prestige" we had incurred from our exhibition of weakness in the Affghan War. Since we had allowed our Envoys, Colonels Stoddart and Conolly, to be murdered at Bokhara without making any effort to avenge their fate, and since by retiring from Affghanistan we had confessed our inability to hold the country, it was evident that we were human and might succumb to pressure; and hence, I believe, arose the germ of that confidence of the Sepoys in their own power which led them to try conclusions with us. And if, Sir, a Nemesis thus overtook us in 1857, the same Nemesis may again overtake us now, if we exhibit to the East such a miserable example of moral cowardice and military weakness, as to allow onr Envoys to perish in an Abyssinian dungeon and yet make no sign, show even no desire to wipe such a stain from the escutcheon of England. I have one more remark to make on the economical question. I cannot subscribe to the doctrine now so prevalent of weighing the honour of England against gold and silver. I cannot calculate in pounds, shillings, and pence the exact loss we may sustain, owing to this Abyssinian disgrace; but this I do feel, that the dispatch of an expedition for the release of the captives would, in all probability, be a measure of real economy in the end, as much as a necessary national duty; I mean it, Sir, in this wise, that if by remaining inactive we allow the fatal seed of a mistrust of our power to be sown in India, it will germinate in the dark, and will then crop up some day, when least expected, bringing in its train a harvest of disaster that will far more than counterbalance any saving we may now effect by refusing to send an expedition. And now, Sir, I will only venture on two further observations. One relates to the object of the Motion now before the House; the other, to the source from whence the expenses of an expedition to Abyssinia might be defrayed. The object of the Motion brought forward by my hon. Friend is, as I understand it, not to invite discussion on details, but merely to induce the House to express an opinion on the general question — on the desirability, in fact, or otherwise, of sending an expedition to Abyssinia, either to recover our captive officers, or to exact retribution for their fate. There are, of course, a multitude of collateral considerations of much importance connected, both with the conduct of the expedition and with the policy which should shape its course; but I cannot think that these are fit matters for discussion in the House of Commons; they must be left to the discretion and decision of the Government, who is alone responsible for them. There are two points only upon which, if an expedition were decided on, I should like to have an assurance beforehand. The first is, that we should engage in the affair single-handed and free from the entanglement of any foreign co-operation, although, as Abyssinia can only be approached through an Egyptian port, a certain friendly understanding with the Viceroy of Egypt would seem to be indispensable. The second point of importance is, that we should keep clear of any future engagements with the country. Our objects, it seems to me, are immediate and direct. We should endeavour to release the prisoners and to punish King Theodore; but it would be most inconvenient to find ourselves committed to the support of any other claimant to the throne, or, in fact, to be entangled in any way with future Abyssinian politics. The other observation that I would desire to make refers to the expenses of the expedition. It is rumoured out of doors that there has already been much discussion between the different Departments of the State as to whether the cost of any expedition that might be undertaken should be borne by the Indian or the Imperial Treasury; and, if we remember the discussions on the same subject which took place on the occasion of the China and Persian wars, the present rumours would seem far from improbable. On this subject, then, Sir, I would desire to say that, although the quarrel with Abyssinia is strictly an Imperial quarrel, although the officers imprisoned by King Theodore were accredited from the Foreign Office, and the conduct of the negotiations with that Potentate have been hitherto entirely under that department, yet, inasmuch as the evils from which we seek to be relieved by the dispatch of an expedition, would, if no such expedition were sent, fall almost exclusively upon India, I do think that India is bound to contribute something towards the cost of relieving her from the threatened danger. I mean, Sir, that, as our loss of "prestige" would hardly be felt in Europe, but would be felt severely in Asia, being, in fact, circulated, in the first instance, through the concourse of Mahomedan pilgrims in the neighbouring city of Mecca; and, as the ill effects of that loss of prestige would thus mainly fall on our Indian possessions, it would seem only fair that India should pay a moiety of the expenses of the war—as she did in the case of the China and Persian wars—as the price of the political benefit she would derive from the expedition. Sir, I have nothing more to say on the general question. I do appeal to this House to support my hon. Friend the Member for Poole in his Motion praying that steps may be taken to obtain the release of the Abyssinian captives, if necessary, by force of arms. It is almost surprising to me that there can be two opinions on the subject. Is there any other of the great nations of Europe, let me ask, that would hesitate in such a matter? Should we hesitate ourselves if our antagonist were in a more accessible position? Are we prepared, then, to admit that a barbarian prince like King Theodore, living within 250 miles of the sea-coast, can set us, the greatest maritime Power in the world, at defiance? And are we prepared, let me add, to abdicate our place among the nations of the earth, for such must be the inevitable consequence if we sit down quietly in our shame, exposed to the scorn and pity of the East? No, Sir; I cannot believe in such pusillanimity, in such—I must call it—suicidal cowardice. It seems to me, Sir, that in justice to our officers, whom we are bound to protect, in justice to ourselves, in the name of humanity, of civilization, and of national honour, we have no alternative but to send a force to Abyssinia, and that, too, without a day's unnecessary delay. There are times, Sir, when too much prudence amounts almost to a betrayal of the national honour; and I do feel, Sir, that those who can recommend our submitting without further effort to the intolerable disgrace which now oppresses us incur a most awful responsibility, and that, if their advice be followed, and those troubles should supervene, which there is every reason to anticipate, they will hereafter be called to a most severe account.

MR. LAYARD said, this was a question of no common difficulty. No question which came before him during the time he had the honour to hold office gave him greater anxiety; for, whatever way the matter was viewed, it was full of embarrassment. Rising, as he now did, to propose to the noble Lord opposite a course of action, he confessed that he did so with great difficulty and misgiving. Matters, however, had now gone to a length when some step must be taken, something must be done on behalf of the unfortunate people still kept in captivity. Most unfortunately, the question had been treated from the very beginning by those connected with it, but unconnected with the Government, as a question of antagonism to the Foreign Office. The difficulties of that department had thus been very much increased by those who ought to have sympathized with and aided its action. A portion of the press in this country had perversely misrepresented the facts of the case throughout—a course which had been attended with most mischievous results, as copies of the articles were sent out to Abyssinia, and communicated to the authorities. He regretted, further, to say that in another place a noble and learned Lord made a speech so mischievous and dangerous in its character as materially to contribute to the difficulties of the Government. Lord Clarendon entreated that noble and learned Lord not to bring the question before the House, but he could not resist the temptation to indulge in party feeling even at the risk of doing irreparable injury. The report of that speech of Lord Chelmsford, in which it was described as almost an insult to the British Government that Mr. Rassam should be sent to Abyssinia, was forwarded to that country. The copy of the *Standard* containing it, most mercifully reached the hands of Mr. Rassam, and was intercepted. Had it reached the hands of King Theodore, the whole of the party would probably have been put to death. In the House of Commons, also, an attempt was made to raise an equally injudicious debate. A late Member of the House—Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald—was requested by the same parties to bring it forward. But he came to the Foreign Office, where the Papers were placed before him. He saw that there was but one object in view, that of releasing the prisoners, and in the most honourable way he declined to make himself the vehicle of a mere party attack upon the Government. That was a fact which ought to be known to the House concerning Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald. Mr. Rassam was very kindly received and treated by the King at first, but, unfortunately, some friends of the captives in this country determined to send out an opposition mission. Contrary to the entreaties of the Foreign Office, Dr. Beke was sent out. Mr. Rassam himself had stated that from the moment of Dr. Beke's arrival at Massowah the King's conduct towards him changed. From every point of view the case was surrounded by difficulties. Neither in his time, nor since his time, had the Foreign Office had fair play in the matter. In answer to his hon. Friend (Mr. Henry Seymour), he must say that the question originally had not arisen out of a quarrel between the two Governments. The statement of the King himself put the matter on very different grounds, and the other had only been put forward recently, and as a secondary matter. The statement of the King was, that Consul Cameron had gone among some tribes at war with him, and that the origin of the quarrel was as to the extending British protection to certain tribes on the frontier. There was no use, however, in going back to the origin of the quarrel. The question was, how to liberate these unfortunate persons. As the noble Lord opposite was aware, from the commencement of the negotiations, he had been most anxious that anything like a threat or reference to an expedition should be avoided. He had hoped that by negotiation the matter might have been settled, that Mr. Rassam, who was so singularly qualified for the mission on which he was sent, would have been able to induce the King to release the captives. But such had not been the case. The King, however, appeared to entertain to Mr. Rassam the most remarkable personal attachment. He had imprisoned and chained him, it was true, but not by the foot and hand like the others, only by the foot. The King preserved amicable relations with him and sent him friendly letters. In proof of this, he might mention that Mr. Rassam, being desirous of obtaining provisions from the coast, wished to send down mules to the coast. But the King would not hear of this. He sent down for the provisions himself, and when they arrived, the packages being too large to be carried on the backs of the men, the King forwarded them to Mr. Rassam, with letters of apology for having been obliged to open them on that account. It might be said, perhaps, that the King took a strange way of showing his friendship for Mr. Rassam; but if Gentlemen knew the character of King Theodore it would account for much that appeared extraordinary in his conduct. His hon. Friend (Mr. Henry Seymour) had pictured King Theodore in colours which he did not deserve—as an

Asian, or rather an African mystery. He had not abolished torture; but he had tortured persons to a great extent, and had been guilty of many atrocities. With great reluctance he (Mr. Layard) had come to the conclusion that there was only one course left to us now, and that was an expedition to Abyssinia. He did not conceal from himself all the difficulties of such an undertaking—difficulties which his hon. Friend who spoke last was near the truth in describing. The expedition would be really a very arduous one. But the question was, whether the honour and credit of the country did not render such an undertaking absolutely necessary? If he entertained the remotest hope that any kind of negotiation, or that any other measure would be likely to release the captives, he should be totally opposed to a military expedition. But, with a full knowledge of all the circumstances, he had been compelled to relinquish all such expectations. He hoped that the expedition might be accompanied by some negotiator of skill, in the habit of dealing with the Eastern potentates. From all that could be learnt, King Theodore was at present reduced to great straits, having been deserted by most of the tribes over whom he had formerly control, retaining jurisdiction over one province only, and having no army but that by which he was immediately attended. He had every reason to believe that the chiefs who had risen in insurrection against him would be prepared to join the expedition, and King Theodore might be compelled in a very short time to leave the country. Then, as regards the danger to the captives themselves, no doubt they would incur a certain amount of risk, but on this point he entirely concurred in the remarks of his hon. and gallant Friend who last addressed the House. The captives themselves were most anxious that an expedition should be sent, and were willing to run all the risk rather than pass the remainder of their lives in the wretched captivity in which they were now placed. But an expedition was a most difficult matter, and one which required the most careful consideration. He was surprised to see how lightly the matter had been treated in the newspapers. Even those of the greatest experience in such matters differed as to the mode in which an expedition should be conducted. For instance, a gentleman of such great knowledge and experience as Sir Henry Bulwer suggested in a newspaper that we should avail ourselves of the aid of the Viceroy of Egypt, whilst Mr. Rassam had stated that one thing was certain to bring death to them all—namely, if an Egyptian force were to invade the country; such a step would have the effect of uniting all those Chiefs who were opposed to the King, and the whole country against us. It was to be hoped, therefore, that such a step would be no longer thought of. He entirely agreed with his hon and gallant Friend that if we went to Abyssinia it must be only for one definite purpose—the release of the unfortunate captives. We must not get entangled in any alliances with the Native Chiefs, which might embarrass us, and, the object being accomplished, the sooner we left the country to return no more the better for all parties concerned. He entirely concurred, also, in what his hon. and gallant Friend had said respecting the effect in the East of this captivity. Nobody who was acquainted with the East in the slightest degree could be unaware of the effect which would be produced by the reports brought back by the thousands of Indian pilgrims who went to Mecca, who would proclaim through the length and breadth of our Indian dominions, that a representative of the Queen of England and a number of English subjects were confined in a dungeon by an African Prince, and that nothing had been done by the English Government with a view of procuring their release. In this country, perhaps, such stories would have very little weight, but in India they would produce a very serious effect, and nobody was more fully aware of that than his hon. and gallant Friend, Indeed, no one could doubt that the fact had become known throughout the East. Wherever Indians congregated it must be known that the authority of the British Government was despised and contemned by a barbarian chief whom we could reach by means of a military expedition. As regards the way in which the expedition ought be undertaken he would not venture to give one word of advice; Sir William Coghlan, Colonel Merewether, and other officers in the Indian service, could give the best advice on the subject. He must, however, impress upon the noble Lord the necessity of having the thing done at once. An expedition could not be sent to Abyssinia except at one period of the year—in September or October. The troops must land about that time, or the expedition must be deferred to another year. He trusted, therefore, if the noble

Lord and the Government should determine to send an expedition to the coast, to advance if necessary into the interior, that no time would be lost, but that immediate instructions would be given for the dispatch of the expedition. If there were any chance of negotiations proving successful, it would be through the King knowing that our troops were actually on the coast, and ready to advance into the interior.

LORD STANLEY: I can assure the House that, almost from the first day that the present Government succeeded to power, the question of what should be done for these unfortunate Abyssinian captives has occupied our most earnest attention. It is quite useless now to go back to the past and to consider whether it was worth while originally to send a mission to Abyssinia or not; whether any political or commercial object was thereby to be secured, or whether a different course would have led to less unsatisfactory results. What was done was doubtless done for the best, and it is only right to say that the result which occurred — the detention of these unhappy men, without reasonable cause or provocation, as far as we know—was an event so out of the way of all ordinary calculation, so little to have been anticipated, that it would not be just to hold the originators of the mission responsible for it. In saying this I am only doing justice to those who originated this matter, and rather more justice than has been done to the Lord Chancellor by the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Layard). I listened to what the hon. Gentleman said as to the speech of the Lord Chancellor with some anxiety, because I knew it was quite possible, in a matter of this kind, even with the best intentions, to do more harm than good. But I was greatly relieved in my mind when the hon. Gentleman went on to say that the speech of the noble and learned Lord in "another place" might have done immense mischief if the King had read it, but that, in fact, the King knew nothing about it. If so, I do not see how, even on the assumption of the hon. Gentleman, the Lord Chancellor can be responsible for what has occurred. Our business now is to get these men out of captivity. If that can be done I imagine that there will be very little inclination on the part of the House or of the Government to trouble themselves further with Abyssinian politics. The question is, how can their liberation be effected? There are two means only: conciliation and force. I think every one will admit that it was our duty to exhaust every means of conciliation before adopting a different line of policy. We had this to consider—that an expedition to rescue the captives must in any case be expensive, that it must inevitably be attended with heavy loss of life, by climate if not by military operations; that it was possible that it might even lead to a massacre of the prisoners, and that, for aught we knew, it might be wholly unnecessary, since their detention being apparently a pure act of caprice, the same caprice might at any moment lead to their being again released, without effort on our part. We determined, therefore, to try peaceable means in the first instance. I received numerous offers from gentlemen who expressed their willingness to undertake the risk of leading a new mission into the country. Those offers we thought it right to decline, and for an obvious reason. Whatever the original motive of the King in detaining these men might be, it was clear that it had become with him a policy to get into his hands as many Europeans as possible, and we did not think it desirable to increase the number. We therefore sent no one up to Magdala, but availed ourselves of the return of Mr. Flad, a German missionary, whose family were residing there, and who was in any case compelled to return to see after their safety. We sent a commucation by him, which will appear in the printed Papers, and at the same time sent out, by Colonel Merewether, presents of various articles, such as it was understood King Theodore desired. Bnt here a difficulty arose. The King had expressed a strong wish to have the assistance of some English artizans, and those who knew him best, said that, unless they were sent, the presents would do no good. I determined, therefore, to send them as far as Massowah, carefully explaining to them the nature of the risk they ran, and making sure that they fully understood the position, but at the same time deciding that they should not be allowed to go up the country unless ths prisoners were previously released. Of course, if that release took place, we should be justified in supposing the King was acting in good faith, and we should entertain less apprehension in trusting him with these artizans. From the value of their services to him, and his wish to increase their number, there would be every inducement to him to treat them well. At the same time it was clearly explained that they went of their own free will, and that no influence would be used to urge them to go on, if they thought the risk greater than they chose to encounter. So the matter stood some months ago. I regret, however, to say that that attempt appears to have failed. The prisoners have been treated with greater severity than before. The King made an effort to get the presents and the artizans at once. This we declined to allow till he released the prisoners. Since then we have not heard from him. I then wrote again, warning him that unless these men were liberated, he could expect no friendship on the part of the British Government, and further demanding their release. I did not accompany that communication with any expression of menace, wishing to leave the hands of the Government entirely free, whatever further course might be necessary. I am afraid, however, that, looking at all the circumstances, we must now say that the policy of conciliation has been fairly tried and has failed. The question then arises—and it is a most serious one—what further steps shall be taken? I agree with the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Henry Seymour) and others who have spoken on this subject in conceiving that on the one hand nothing could be more repugnant to our feelings as a nation, nothing less creditable to us as a matter of honour, than to leave not merely our fellow-countrymen, but Envoys who have been commissioned by the Sovereign in the hands of a half-savage king, and exposed to any cruelty which his caprice may inflict. On the other hand, I feel bound to tell the House frankly and fairly that to obtain the release of these men by force is not an easy matter. I do not speak of military resistance, which in all probability would be insignificant; but we have to consider the country, the climate, the heat at one season, the heavy rains at another, the cost of supplies, the absence of all means of transport, and our total ignorance of what would be the feeling of the people towards an armed force advancing through their country; and all these things, taken together, make operations against Abyssinia a very serious matter. Something has been said about our having Aden near as a convenient point of departure for such operations. But Aden is a place without stores or resources, and all the supplies that would be required for the invasion of Abyssinia, whether proceeding from Egypt or from Bombay, must be provided beforehand. Magdala, where these men are detained, is at least 300 miles from the coast, and must be approached through a country which is known to be mountainous and difficult, without anything which we should consider as a road; in many parts said to be destitute of water, and of which we really know very little. I am sure, therefore, that the House will feel that, however anxious we may be to attain the object we all have in view, it would be madness to throw a British army into an unknown country, in a tropical climate, far from the sea, very far from its reserves and its supplies, without a full previous investigation as to the means of moving, feeding, and keeping them in health. That inquiry we look upon as an indispensable preliminary. I have been in communication with the War Department and with the India Office as to the best mode of proceeding. My right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for India (Sir Stafford Northcote) has telegraphed to the Indian Government to send over an officer or officers on whom they can rely to meet Colonel Merewether at Aden, and with him to examine minutely the points on which information is necessary. I do not wish to anticipate the result of that inquiry, but I hope that the House will be of opinion that in making it we have only done our duty. On the one hand, we cannot consent to leave these men to their fate without some attempt to rescue them. On the other hand, by precipitation and by acting in the dark we should be running the risk of involving ourselves in great calamities, and might bring on ourselves not only political, but also the possibility of military disaster. It is possible that when King Theodore sees that we are in earnest he may take warning and release the prisoners without giving us further trouble. We may hope for this, but we ought not to count upon it. If he should not the responsibility rests with us of deciding upon our future course. We must be guided to a great degree by the reports we receive from those whom we employ to make the investigation to which I have referred. I do not think we should be called upon even now to give any pledge on the part of the Government as to an expedition, unless it is found to be practicable with only a reasonable expenditure of men and means. It may be said, "Send it to the coast of Africa, that will be enough;" possibly that may be enough, but if you send an expedition to the coast and that fails, you cannot rest there, you must proceed further, you are free to send an expedition or not to do so; but having once begun you are not free to leave off without success. If you undertake the enterprize at all, you are bound to carry it through. I hope the House will leave the decision where the responsibility must be left. I think they will see by the Papers, which are now all but ready to be laid on the table, that whether we have taken the best and the wisest course or not—on which differences of opinion may exist—at any rate, we have not been guilty of neglecting or treating with indifference this most painful business.

COLONEL SYKES said, that King Theodore could not be dealt with in the matter as they would treat a European Sovereign, for he was a barbarian, and not at all influenced by European sentiments. He had no more idea of the sanctity of an Ambassador or Envoy than an Arab Sheik or a Chief of the Feejee Islands had. He only acted on his impulses, which were capricious and variable. As he had, previously to these proceedings, carried on amicable relations with us, there must have been some cause for his sudden revulsion of feeling toward us. In the present discussion that cause had been kept in the background, but it was necessary it should be known. In the time of Consul Plowden everything went on satisfactorily. He exerted his influence against Turkish raids; and the Abyssinian Christians at Jerusalem received our protection. But when Consul Cameron, whose head-quarters were at Massowah, and not in Abyssinia at all, succeeded him, protection was withdrawn from the Abyssinian Christians at Jerusalem, who were left at the mercy of the Turkish authorities. Raids also took place from the Egyptian into the Abyssinian territories, without any effort on the Consul's part to prevent them. The Foreign Office having sent Consul Cameron into an insurgent province of Abyssinia to make inquiries with regard to cotton, on his return to Massowah, instead of avoiding Theodore, he went to the King's camp. King Theodore demanded of him whether he had not brought with him an answer to the letter which that King had sent to the Queen of England, admitting, as the Consul did, that he was in communication with the Foreign Office. As Consul Cameron had no such answer to produce, the King deemed himself insulted, and refused to let our Consul go until he received an answer from Her Majesty. He was not the apologist of the King of Abyssinia; but that King's conduct in the matter appeared to be owing to the course pursued by our Foreign Office—not while the noble Lord (Lord Stanley) was at its head, but prior to that period. When an expedition into Abyssinia was spoken of, it should be remembered that the British taxpayers had a great interest in the matter. As a soldier, he should of course sympathize with those who were anxious to undertake an expedition to release British prisoners; but as a representative of the people he was bound to look at its cost. The cost of such an enterprize would not fall upon India, but upon this country, as the interest involved was not Indian, but British. No force short of 10,000 men would suffice for the purpose in view. He would quote a passage from a letter written by a companion of Mr. Rassam to show the nature of the difficulties which such a force would have to encounter in advancing from Massowah into a mountainous region. The following was an extract from that letter:—

> "We started from Massowah on the 15th of October and reached this place (Matammah), after no end of worry, on the 21st of November. I would not undertake a similar journey, unless ordered to do so, to gain a kingdom. The heat all the way was insufferable, and if we had not brought eatables with us we should have starved. Of the thirty-seven days which it took us to come from Massowah, six were lost in waiting at Athie Marcam and Kassala for camels, as we were obliged to change these animals different times on the road."

And of the climate he says—

> "Although it is not deemed unhealthy except in the rains, half the inhabitants are laid up with fever. All my servants have been attacked, and I have had a touch of it myself. I fancy it is the extreme change between hot days and cold nights; between sunrise and noon is often 40 degrees, and never less than 30 degrees. A few days ago in my tent (at night) it was 53 degrees, and next day at noon 98 degree, under a double fly."

Dr. Blanc, who also accompanied Mr. Rassam, gave an equally discouraging account. Now when a party of ten or a dozen men could not find the means of carriage, how, he should like to know, could the Commissariat and the baggage of an army of 10,000 men be conveyed? Seeing, then the difficulties by which such an expedition as that which was suggested would be beset, and that the lives of the captives did not appear to be in danger, he thought it would be unjustifiable to sacrifice our soldiers, and to throw additional burdens on the taxpayers in this country.

MR. AYRTON said, he regretted that

none of the leading Members of the late Government were present to repudiate the idea that hon. Members on his side of the House were desirous to encourage the Government to send out an armed expedition for the purpose of releasing the captives in Abyssinia. He was sorry also to hear from the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs that all amicable means of effecting that release had been exhausted. There were natives of the country who carried on a trade between the coast and the interior, and from all he could learn, they would be better able to bring about a solution of the difficulty than any European diplomatist. There was a general objection on the part of the Indian Government to secure the services of natives, or unofficial persons, in matters of importance, but in dealing with such a person as the King of Abyssinia, success was more likely to be attained through an irregular channel than by regular diplomatic agency. To spend £500,000 on an expedition which was just as likely as not to lead to the deaths of the captives, was not, in his opinion, a wise course to pursue. £5,000 given by way of premium, in the way he had suggested, would in all probability be productive of much more satisfactory results.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Original Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till Monday next.

COURTS OF LAW [FEES] BILL.

Resolution *reported;*

"That it is expedient to make provision for the application of Surplus Fees paid by Suitors in the Superior Courts of Law and other Courts towards the expense of providing the intended New Courts of Justice, and to amend the Laws relating to the fees and payments in such Courts."

Resolution *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DODSON, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 287.]

CLERK TO JUSTICES IN COUNTIES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. COLVILE, Bill to regulate the office of Clerk to Justices in Counties, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. COLVILE, Mr. PAULL, and Mr. PEASE.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 286.]

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. HUNT, Bill to continue various expiring Laws, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. HUNT and Mr. Secretary GATHORNE HARDY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 288.]

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) BILL.

Bill "for providing a further Sum towards defraying the Expenses of constructing Fortifications for the protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards, and the Ports of Dover and Portland," *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 285.]

House adjourned after One o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, July 29, 1867.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Canongate Annuity Tax (Edinburgh)* (264); Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal* (265); Weights and Measures (Dublin)* (266); Dublin Metropolitan Police* (267).

Second Reading—Industrial and Provident Societies* (253).

Committee—Representation of the People (227).

Third Reading—Local Government Supplemental (No. 5)* (221); Naval Knights of Windsor* (252); Vice President of the Board of Trade (99), and *passed.*

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—(No. 227.)—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: I am sure both sides of the House will hear with great regret that the Prime Minister is unable, from the present state of his health, to come down to the House, and in his absence, therefore, I am obliged to move that your Lordships go into Committee on the Bill.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve into a Committee on the said Bill.—(*The Earl of Malmesbury.*)

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: I now rise to move the Amendment of which I have given notice. I am quite aware, from the question addressed to me by the noble Earl on Friday, and also from some observations which fell from the First Lord of the Treasury on Tuesday, what line the Government are likely to take on the subject of this Motion. They will say it is a vague proposition, and that it points to no definite plan. If I had adopted a definite plan I am afraid I should have been obnoxious to the censure of a noble and learned Lord, who told us the other night that the party to which I belong claimed for themselves a monopoly of dealing with the question of Reform. I can assure your Lordships that I have no wish to interfere unnecessarily with the course that the Government have pursued. I am actuated by one motive, and by one motive only, that of contributing as far as I can to — that which I believe to be of the greatest importance to the public interest —an early and satisfactory settlement of this great question of Reform. It seemed to be assumed the other night that objections were taken by the Leaders of the Liberal party to the settlement of this question by noble Lords opposite. That, my Lords, is not my opinion; for I believe they are better able to deal with it and to pass it to a satisfactory conclusion than the late Government was. We have seen this Session that their influence with the great Conservative party has induced that party to support a measure which they will hardly deny that, under other circumstances, they would have steadily opposed. But further than this, some experience in public matters has led me to think that forming a detailed plan upon so large a question as the present is far easier for the Government than for any individual Member, or even the party in Opposition. An individual Member of your Lordships' House, or of the other House, may bring forward, and may even succeed in carrying, an isolated Motion, or may obtain the opinion of the House, and lay down some principle of action. But when it is necessary to form a detailed plan the Government is in possession of information, or, at any rate, has the command of information, which no individual Member of either House can have, and without which it is perfectly impossible to form a detailed plan upon a large scale. Having said this I need hardly disclaim any intention of making this Motion in any way whatever as a party Motion. I confess that I am a party man, and that I attach great value to party. I believe that the organized action of party in support of the principles by which that party is bound together is not only the mainspring but the safeguard of Parliamentary Government. And if I had thought it desirable to make a party Motion, I should not have hesitated to do so, and to avow it. But I am not sure that the Motion which I now make is as good as a mere party Motion; and, at any rate, and however that may be, I conceive that the importance of settling this question is far above any party purpose, and I should be ashamed of myself if I allowed any party consideration to interfere with what I believe to be for the real interest of the country. That is the reason why I have not brought forward, as I was invited to do, a detailed plan. I was anxious to bring forward no plan which could even appear as a rival plan to that of the Government. That might have been called a party movement. The noble Earl talked the other day of being influenced by a determination not to be outbid by his opponents; but we were determined not to propose a plan in rivalry with that of the Government with the appearance of outbidding them to be again outbidden in our turn. Such was not our view of our duty under the present circumstances. My object, and that of the noble Lords among whom I have the honour of sitting, is to point out that the scheme of the Government in respect to re-distribution is inadequate and unsatisfactory. That is not our opinion only, it is the opinion generally entertained—the opinion of every man one meets in the streets; and only this morning I received from a steady Conservative Member the expression of his dissatisfaction with the scheme as proposed by the Government, which he said gave satisfaction to none but to the very small boroughs. I am anxious to point out the defects of the scheme of the Government; and, without pledging myself to any detailed plan, I wish to suggest in what manner those defects may best be remedied, and to impress on your Lordships the importance of settling this question in the present Session. In one sense only can I admit that this is a party Motion — that on the part of noble Lords near me I tender our support and co-operation if the Government will undertake to amend their scheme. My noble Friend the noble Earl near me, in the debate on Tuesday, offered our support to the Government if they would amend their Bill, and if he had met with any response I should not have been standing here to propose this Motion. But we feel it of such importance that the question should be settled, that now, in a more formal and solemn manner, we offer our assistance, that we may not fail in anything we can do towards settling this question this year. Having disclaimed any party object, I hope I may receive the support of some of your

Lordships, whose opinions I am inclined to think concur with my own on this subject, but who, if I had made the Motion in a hostile temper and spirit, would naturally and rightly have voted in opposition to it. Before, however, I touch upon the question of the re-distribution I wish, in order to clear the way, and to have no concealment from your Lordships, to say one word on the other part of the scheme—that relating to the franchise. The Government have proposed the largest measure in respect to the franchise that has ever been proposed to Parliament, and I have no doubt they have proposed it with a view of effecting a settlement. I believe it is large enough to effect that object. And, although there may be some details which may be capable of amendment with regard to the franchise, I can only say that with that part of the measure I, for one, am perfectly satisfied. I do not participate in those fears which have been expressed by some of your Lordships as to the effect of an extension of the franchise. I have perfect confidence in my fellow-countrymen. I have had some experience in dealing with all classes of society, in canvassing large and populous towns. Every one who has gone through contested elections knows well to what an extent a candidate is brought into contact, not only with electors, but with all classes of society. I have had the advantage of having gone through ten contested elections, and have been fifteen times returned to Parliament. I speak, therefore, with some experience, and I can bear my testimony to the almost universal reasonableness of the working classes with whom I have been brought into contact, and I can especially bear testimony to their vast improvement of late years. I never found them unreasonable even when I differed with them. I found no development of democratic spirit among them, and I have perfect confidence that they will not abuse the franchise with which they are about to be intrusted. With this part of the Bill I am perfectly contented and satisfied; I wish the other half of the Bill had been conceived in the same spirit. Before entering into the detail of the proposed plan of re-distribution, I wish to notice two of the objections which have been made to my proposal. One is that it is too late to amend the Government scheme; and the other is that the House of Commons will not be willing to receive a measure on the subject from your Lordships. I trust, my Lords, that you will not allow yourselves to be influenced by these arguments. I believe that there have been occasions when your Lordships have threatened to refuse to entertain a Bill brought up so late in the Session as this has been. This, however, is certainly not a Bill which you can refuse to entertain, and I believe it has been brought up to your Lordships' House as early as the exertions of the other House rendered it possible. If this be the case, are we not to discuss the measure because it comes up so late? Are we to be reduced to the situation of merely registering the decisions of the other House in the case of measures brought up late in the Session? I cannot believe your Lordships will entertain so low an opinion of your Constitutional functions, or that you will grudge the time necessary for the fair and proper consideration of the measure. I feel it the more necessary that we should do so because the scheme of re-distribution was hardly discussed in the other House. Indeed, I believe that such was the weariness of that House with regard to the Bill that the Schedules passed at a single sitting. It must likewise be remembered that some Members of the House of Commons are more nearly affected by a measure of re-distribution than is the case with your Lordships, and I am inclined to think, therefore, that the matter may be considered here in a fairer and more impartial spirit than it was in the other House. Nor do I believe that there is any ground for supposing that the House of Commons would not entertain Amendments proposed by your Lordships. We might, indeed, appear obstructive if we narrowed the measure of enfranchisement adopted by the other House, but we shall clearly be only performing our duty in assisting to frame a proper measure with regard to the seats; and, if it should happen that in any line of disfranchisement we touch a borough over which a Member of your Lordships' House exercises a predominant influence, depend upon it that our dealing with it would be regarded as a graceful sacrifice on the part of this House, even by those who might object to our interference in other matters. I am convinced that an enlarged scheme of re-distribution, emanating from your Lordships' House, would, if founded on just principles and fairly carried out, entitle this House to the gratitude of the other House and of the country. Nor do I believe that, if the Government would accede to the representation I am now making, and would reconsider and amend the defective parts of their plan, there would be any indisposition either here or in the other House to devote such prompt and unremitting attention to the amended scheme as to allow of the measure being passed through both Houses without any great loss of time. I have thus explained the sense in which I am anxious that this Motion should be considered—not as a hostile or party Motion, but as expressing the opinion generally held that the measure in its present shape is insufficient, and as pressing on the Government the propriety of reconsidering the whole plan with a view to framing such a scheme as, in the opinion of the public at large, may settle for some time this long-vexed and important question. I now proceed to point out what I regard as the prominent defects of the scheme of re-distribution, and I will take first, as it stands in the Bill, the proposal for disfranchisement. The Bill of the Government takes away one Member from all boroughs with less than 10,000 population; but it leaves untouched many of those smaller boroughs which are the great blot of our representative system. From a Return which has been laid on the table giving the existing boroughs in the order of population, your Lordships will find that there are ten boroughs, each with less than 5,000 inhabitants. They contain altogether a population of 38,900, and have 3,190 electors. Of these ten, moreover, six are so decaying that they have now less population than they had in 1831. Now, let me contrast these ten boroughs with the great hives of wealth and industry. The town of Liverpool alone has 440,000 inhabitants, or more than ten times as many as the whole of these ten boroughs. The city of Bristol — for I do not wish to refer merely to Northern places — has a population of 154,000, or four times as large as the whole of these boroughs. Let me refer to those boroughs which have of late years largely increased both in wealth and population. Why, the increase of Wolverhampton within the last thirty years is twice as large as the whole population of these ten boroughs. The largest borough with one Member—Birkenhead—has also increased during the last thirty years to as large an extent as the whole population of these boroughs. Excluding the metropolitan boroughs, which I do not allude to, because they are so beyond all calculation, three of the boroughs which this Bill proposes to enfranchise have a population as large as the whole of these ten boroughs. Now, I ask the most Conservative Peer whether the maintenance of these small boroughs on their present footing is defensible. I have taken the ten boroughs with the smallest population, only as an illustration of my views; other persons might prefer a different test, the number of houses or the number of electors. Take any test you like, that of population, of houses, or that of electors, you will find that there are a number of small boroughs at the bottom of the list which cannot be maintained in their present position, and which are a source of weakness and object of attack. It must be remembered that the disproportion between them and the larger boroughs is increasing every year. I have taken the population of 1861, but a Return laid before the other House gives the computed population of 1866, and you will find that the small boroughs are smaller still, and the large boroughs infinitely larger. Moreover, the enfranchising provisions of this Bill will increase the electors in the large towns out of all proportion to the increase which will take place in the small towns, so that the anomaly will become more patent than ever. I come now to the plan for enfranchisement, and I will first take the proposal as to counties. The Government proposes to give six Members to nine counties and four Members to four divisions of counties. The noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) told us that the principle on which the Government proceeded was to give six Members to counties, with a population of 300,000. Six Members are to be assigned to Derbyshire, with 296,000 inhabitants, and six to Cheshire, with 306,000. Cornwall, however, with 306,000 inhabitants, is left out, and the West Riding of Yorkshire, with 842,000 inhabitants, is to have only six Members. Now, do not imagine that we in the West Riding grudge counties smaller than our own the representation which it is proposed to give them; but we do think that when you distribute Members in this way, and increase the county representation, there ought to be some proportion between population and representation. I should be sorry to see the country cut up into electoral divisions with equal population and an equal number of Members; but, while a more than adequate representation is bestowed upon smaller counties, an adequate representation surely ought to be bestowed on the larger ones. Under this Bill Derbyshire will have one Member to under 50,000 population, the West Riding one Member to 140,000, and South Lancashire one to 150,000. In many of the smaller counties there is one to every 30,000 or 40,000 inhabitants. I do not pretend to say that these Northern counties ought to have Members proportionate to their population, according to the scale of the smaller counties; all that I say is that a greater approximation ought to be made to what is fair. There cannot but be discontent with a plan so inadequate and unequal. Nor is the proposal for enfranchising the new boroughs any better. In their first scheme the Government proposed to enfranchise twelve boroughs; in the next two were struck out and three inserted — namely, Keighley, Luton, and Stockton—making thirteen in all. Then came the proposal made in the House of Commons for giving three Members to six of the largest boroughs. The Motion was resisted and defeated by the Government, but before long they changed their minds—very properly, as I think—in deference to what they found to be a general opinion of the House. I entirely approve what they did so far as it went, and if they had taken the four Members from some small boroughs the Government would have done perfectly right. But, instead of taking away the Members from some of those petty, decaying places, they withdrew the Members which they had promised to four flourishing towns, which a week before were in their opinion entitled to representation. And not only did they do that, but they did not leave out the smallest of the proposed boroughs. Why they left out one borough while they retained another I cannot see. The Government is no doubt in the possession of better information than we can be, and it may be that they are right; but look at the figures, and you will find that, *primâ facie,* the case is entirely against them. Before I refer to the particular places, I wish to say that I do not in the slightest degree grudge a Member to any one of the places which has received it. The Government have retained on the list Darlington and Stockport, the population of each being between 16,000 and 17,000. But then there are St. Helens with 41,000 inhabitants, Keighley with 34,000, Barnsley with 30,000, and Luton with 22,000, and these they have struck out of the list. I have here taken the population within the proposed Government boundaries. I am perfectly ready to admit with respect to one of those boroughs (Barnsley) that the boundaries proposed by the Government Bill comprised an area of twenty square miles, which was perfectly preposterous. But if you take the area in the same boroughs which, strictly speaking, may contain the nucleus of representation, you will find that precisely the same difference exists as I have stated with regard to the large areas. The township of Darlington contains 15,000, and the municipal borough of Stockton 13,000 inhabitants. There is no distinct and smaller area for St. Helens —it forms a part of different townships; but I understand that what would be a continuous town area would contain about 35,000 inhabitants. But in other cases there is a restricted area. The township of Darlington contains 15,000 inhabitants, the township of Barnsley 17,800, Stockton has 13,000, Keighley 18,000 inhabitants. Therefore, neither as regards the larger area nor the restricted area is there as large a population in the boroughs which have been retained as in the four which have been left out. I have illustrated the case from places with which I happen to be acquainted, not because I have any particular leaning to those places, but because what I have stated I know to be accurate. There are also, as I find from a Return which has been laid before the other House of Parliament—I am not quite sure that it has been laid upon the table of your Lordships' House—some other boroughs which have a population larger, or as large as those to which the franchise has been given. I find that Glossop has 19,000 inhabitants, Leamington 17,000, Doncaster 16,000, and there are others with populations nearly as large. I am aware that one cannot depend altogether on these Returns, and that is the reason why I say that the Government ought to undertake the question. I know, for instance, one town in Yorkshire, which appears in this Return, with a population of 7,000—the town of Rotherham—and I am confident that the population, within reasonable limits, is above 20,000. I think, then, I have shown, first, with respect to the small boroughs that they are insignificant and decaying; and secondly, that the scheme of redistribution proposed by the Government is unequal as respects both counties and boroughs. I say, therefore, that I do not think it can be expected that when these sources of discontent are created by the Bill satisfaction and content will be produced throughout the country. It cannot be expected that those towns which, even in the opinion of the Government, are entitled to representation will be content to remain quiet and not agitate, or that those persons throughout the country who take an interest in Reform, and wish to see the question put upon a satisfactory footing, will be content that the question should rest as proposed by Her Majesty's Government. Well, my Lords, I think I have satisfied your Lordships that there are just causes of dissatisfaction with the measure of the Government. If I were to propose anything in the shape of a rival plan, I might be exposing myself to the imputation of having acted in a party spirit. But I think your Lordships have a right to expect from any one standing in my position that he should suggest, at least in general terms, a remedy for the state of things with which he has found fault. My Lords, I am prepared to make such a suggestion; but I beg your Lordships to understand that I am most anxious not to commit any of your Lordships to my plan, still less to propose it in the light of a rival scheme. I will leave it to the Government on their own responsibility, and with the information they possess, to state how far they can go. Now I say, in the first place, that I think we ought to deal with some of these small boroughs. I do not say whether the test should be a population of 6,000, 8,000, 10,000, 12,000 or any other figure. I do not say that population alone should be taken as the test. I leave it to the Government to determine what test they think best to act upon, but I say that the smaller boroughs must be dealt with. In 1852 the Bill of the Government proceeded on the principle of retaining every existing borough as the nucleus of representation, and adding other towns in order to strengthen them. My Lords, in some cases I think that might be done very well; but in many cases it would be found absolutely impossible, and there is this further argument against it, that you could not, by pursuing this method, obtain Members to be given to large constituencies. I think there are strong arguments against any increase in the number of Members of the House of Commons. Of course, I do not pretend to say that there is any particular charm in the number 658. But depend upon it it is far more easy to adhere to the existing number than to lay down any limit at which you can stop if you once depart from that limit. As boroughs increase in population to 15,000, or 20,000, or 25,000, what answer can you make when they say "Give us now a Member?" I do not see where you can stop if you once begin to increase the numbers of the House of Commons, and I think that anyone who has had any experience of the working of that House will pronounce such an increase to be inconvenient and uncalled for. I am aware it is said that you must increase the number of Members for the purpose of giving additional representation to Scotland. Now, I am not opposed to that additional representation. Two successive Governments have proposed such an addition, and Scotland is fairly entitled to it. But it is absurd to draw between the two countries a distinction which would make them jealous of each other. There are some differences of law and custom between the two countries, but their feelings and interests are identical, and if the large counties or large towns in Scotland are entitled to additional representation, I have not the least objection to give it to that country by taking it from some petty English borough. I am strongly opposed, however, to an increase in the total number of representatives. There are, then, but two ways in which these small boroughs can be dealt with. One is the same course as that taken in the Bill of 1854—that of disfranchising altogether certain small boroughs. The second is that proposed in the Bill of 1866, which was also proposed by Mr. Laing in the other House, and which a noble Friend of mine has given notice he will bring under your Lordships' notice now—I mean the system of grouping. The Government has expressed a strong opinion against total disfranchisement. I do not wish to say anything which will bind myself or any of your Lordships to either of these proposals. There are arguments in favour of each course; I leave it to the Government to decide in accordance with what they hold to be their duty or their principles which they will adopt. All I can say is, that in one way or the other these small boroughs ought to be dealt with, and the Members taken from them should be given to large and populous districts. The measure of disfranchisement must depend on what you think the just claims for additional Members of the large counties and towns—Parliamentary boroughs now existing or boroughs to be enfranchised. When you have made up your minds to what extent these claims ought to be met, you will have the measure of your disfranchisement. If you cannot obtain a sufficient number of Members in this way, you may obtain more Members by extending your partial disfranchisement to boroughs with a population of more than 10,000. My noble Friend proposes to extend the limit to boroughs with a population of 12,000. But you must first decide upon the enfranchisement which is necessary, and then, and not till then, you will know to what extent to carry your disfranchisement. What places, then, are there which have the best claim to increased representation? I, myself, have no doubt, and I think your Lordships will agree with me, that the large counties of England are at this moment under-represented, and have the best claim for additional representation. The Bill proposes that a third Member shall be given to every borough with a population above 200,000, and I entirely concur in the propriety of that proposal. But there are five divisions of counties with a population above that number. Why are they to be put in a worse position than these large boroughs? There is no conceivable reason why they should not be placed upon the same footing. I suggest, therefore, to the Government, that a third Member should be given to counties with a population over 200,000—namely, the two divisions of South Lancashire and the three divisions of the West Riding. Mr. Laing proposed further to give a third Member to two other boroughs with a population of between 150,000 and 200,000, and he was supported by a very large minority of the House of Commons. The Government refused to extend the limit so low; but I confess I can see no reason why these two boroughs should not receive a third Member too, and in that case it would only be just and fair that a similar increase of representation should be given to counties containing a similar number of inhabitants. There are seven counties or divisions of counties with a population of over 150,000, and I think it only right that each of these should receive a third Member. No doubt they are chiefly counties in the North of England, because the wealth and population have increased in the North out of all proportion to the rest of the country. Surely, however, representation ought to follow wealth and population. Three counties in the South of England—Middlesex, East Kent, and West Cornwall — come within the same category. Speaking without partiality, I think that such constituencies as I have referred to form the best constituencies, because they are constituencies of a mixed character. It may be true that in the House of Commons a fair decision may be arrived at by the balance of the conflicting opinions of Members who represent antagonistic interests; but it is infinitely better, in my opinion, that each Member should, as far as possible, be returned by a mixed constituency, for he brings to the discussion of questions a mind much more impartial and dispassionate than he otherwise would be likely to bring, because he represents different classes and different interests, different wants and opinions. I have presented a Petition from Marylebone asking for additional representation. With regard to the claims of the metropolitan boroughs, I may fairly say that I do not consider the representation of the metropolis exactly on the same footing as that of the large constituencies in different parts of the country. You have here one immense town, you divide it into districts, and you assign two Members to various portions of it. At the same time, the Bill acknowledges the claims of these large metropolitan constituencies by the division of the Tower Hamlets, and the creation of Chelsea and Kensington into a new borough; and therefore the claims of the larger of the other metropolitan boroughs may be well worth considering. But with regard to the four or six towns which the Government thought entitled to representation, I do not see how you can expect them to sit quietly down without an effort to obtain it. Other towns, according to their own showing, have claims to representation equal or superior to some of those which the Government have enfranchised; and if the Government are disposed to reconsider their scheme, I think it will be well worth their while to examine more closely the different claims of these towns—and no doubt they will do so fairly and equitably. My Lords, I have now performed the task which I have undertaken. I have stated in what respect the scheme of the Government is, in my opinion, defective, and I have pointed out generally in what way I think those defects might be remedied. As to the particular boroughs, or the exact number of boroughs, to be enfranchised or disfranchised, it is the function and the duty of the Government to settle that point, and with it I wish in no degree to interfere. I am against any further subdivision of counties, and I am in favour of giving a third representative to the large constituencies. A good deal has been said of late of the representation of minorities, and the noble and learned

Lord opposite has given notice of a Motion to effect that object. It is no party question; it has been advocated by what I may call the philosophical Members of the Liberal party; it has been advocated, also, by strong Conservatives. I do not in the slightest degree wish to mix up that question with my own Motion. Those who are in favour of the proposal may be inclined to support my Motion, as affording more scope for the introduction of that principle. All I wish to say upon that subject is, whether the Motion of the noble and learned Lord be carried or not, I think the giving of a third Member is favourable to the representation of minorities under any circumstances. Every one knows there is in this country a strong feeling in favour of a fair compromise; and, quite irrespective of the adoption of any distinct Motion for the purpose, I believe the giving of third Members is favourable to the representation of minorities. I have very little more to add, except to press upon your Lordships most earnestly how desirable it is that an early settlement of this question should be come to, and, if possible, that it should be one which is likely to be satisfactory and lasting. I have before alluded to the difficulty there will be in point of time; but I must say I cannot express to your Lordships too strongly the importance I attach to the passing of a measure for England in the course of the present Session. I would address an observation to those who are afraid of going too far; I would have them take warning by what happened last Session. We know upon the authority of one of the leaders of the Conservative party that they then thought that the proper figure of the borough franchise was £8; they objected to £7. This year they have passed that and every other figure; and now it is not £8, £7, £6, or £5, but absolute household suffrage, without any figure at all. Last year the opponents of Reform declared that there was no feeling in favour of Reform in the country; they taunted Reformers with apathy; they provoked an agitation, and have yielded to it. Depend upon it there is a pressing necessity for the early settlement of this question. A noble Lord behind me told us the other night that we had outgrown our Institutions. If so, your Lordships may be assured that it would be wisdom to adapt our Constitution as soon as possible to our altered circumstances. It is true Conservatism to be wise in time. I have stated that I am not afraid of the changes to be produced by this Bill; but I am afraid of the agitation which may arise if there be any delay in the settlement of the question. The First Lord of the Treasury reminded us the other night of the agitation which accompanied and carried the Reform Bill of 1832. I think the noble Lord somewhat exaggerated what took place then, and he did not give credit to the authors of that Bill for the deliberation and consideration with which its form was determined. I saw something of the agitation and turmoil which then prevailed, and I saw more than enough to make me glad when the measure was passed into law. I do not profess for a moment to compare that time with this; but I remember enough to be sure that a chronic state of agitation is the worst condition a country can be in. Let me also remind your Lordships of the arguments that were used last year when the Government, of which I was not a Member, introduced a Franchise Bill without a re-distribution scheme attached to it. It was argued, and perhaps justly, that if you lowered the franchise as far as £7, you were incurring great risk of democratic changes, for you were creating a lever with which in a future Session of Parliament a Radical scheme of re-distribution would be enforced. What are we doing now? You have increased the strength of the lever—you have weakened the foundation of the object to which that lever may be applied. You cannot withhold the lever which you have created, and all you can do now is to strengthen the object so as to prevent the overthrow of that on which the lever may be exerted. I can only hope your Lordships will do so, that you will build the foundation of the structure on the confidence and affection of those in whose hands you place the lever, and that they may see it to be their interest, not to destroy, but to maintain and uphold our institutions. I have to thank your Lordships for the attention with which you have listened to me. I have endeavoured to say nothing which could savour of party; I have endeavoured to say nothing which could indispose any of your Lordships to support the recommendation I make, or the Government to accept it. I believe that the Government are the best qualified to promote the passing of any measure, and the fittest parties to do it; and if we look for the passing of this Bill in an amended shape this Session, we must look to the influence and authority of the Government for its success. If, in compliance with the opinion, which I hope may be expressed by a considerable number of your Lordships, the Government are induced to reconsider and amend their scheme, it will be no discredit to them to do so. It will be no party triumph to us, for it in is no party sense that this Motion is made. I believe, and my noble Friends near me believe, that it is of vital importance to the interests of this country that no time should be left open for agitation, but that this long pending and difficult question of Reform should be closed, and that the representation of the people of England should be placed as soon as possible upon a basis which will form a permanent settlement.

Moved to resolve, "That for the Purpose of effecting a Settlement of the Question of the Redistribution of Seats the proposed Scheme is inadequate, and that it is expedient to provide the Means of giving more Representatives to large and important Constituencies than are given by this Bill."

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: My Lords, I find myself at the eleventh hour of this great controversy obliged to take the place of one of those eminent and distinguished Leaders who are rightly reckoned by us the pride of Parliament: and, my Lords, I feel that, although I may take his place, I cannot replace him. Under these circumstances, I hope to meet with all the indulgence which your Lordships are wont to extend, not only to me personally, but to all who are placed in a difficult position. Your Lordships will understand me when I say I never was so anxious as I am at this moment to stand well with this House. If I did not feel rather discouraged by the circumstances under which I am obliged to address your Lordships, I should at once go fully into the subject which the noble Lord (Viscount Halifax) has brought before you, and answer to the best of my ability the arguments he has adduced. But, before I do this, I feel myself obliged, from motives of personal honour, to make a few remarks upon what has been said with reference to the course pursued by the Government on the debate which has already taken place upon this Bill. During that debate upon the second reading we were much taunted with inconsistency—indeed, stronger words even than inconsistency were employed. We were charged with having utterly abandoned our principles, and with being—in fact, I will quote the expression, which I must say is a most offensive one—"organized hypocrites." My Lords, we were attacked by two noble Earls, one young in years, but who will soon be old in honour. Both showed great ability—as they always have done—but they did not show equal fairness in charging the Government with great inconsistency. My answer to them, as far as they are concerned, is that they are young in politics, and too young to have been inconsistent; when they are as old as I am they will probably find their opinions, their ideas, and their views in all matters connected with politics, and even on all other subjects, will not fit them any better than the clothes they wore at twenty-five. The noble Duke, also, who now sits on the opposite Benches (the Duke of Argyll), also made an attack upon us. I regret very much the expressions he made use of, because I cannot but think he sacrificed facts to the temptation of forming a sonorous sentence. In the second sentence of his speech, the noble Duke spoke of all the Members of the Government as "steeped to the very lips in prophecies of those most dangerous consequences that would arise from the power of numbers;" and he spoke of us as public men discredited, and discredited most of all, for the time, by our very successes. As the noble Duke spoke of all the Members of the Government and all the Members of the Cabinet, I challenge the noble Duke to state on what occasion and in what place he ever heard me say one word on the question of Parliamentary Reform, or where he ever read a single sentence to that effect of mine in writing. Not only have I never expressed any opinion on the subject, but the only occasion from which the noble Duke could possibly judge of my opinion with respect to Parliamentary Reform was in 1859, and that rests solely on the circumstance that I was then a member of Lord Derby's Government, and that Government brought in a measure of Parliamentary Reform. That certainly would not go to show that I am an anti-Reformer. What is the history, not only of myself, but of thousands of others in this country, with respect to their sentiments on the question of Parliamentary Reform? Let us go back a few years. Some of your Lordships are too young to recollect the events of 1832. I had then the advantage of the personal friendship of that illustrious statesman Lord Grey, and I shall never forget the kindness and openness with which he spoke to me, then a young man, in reference to the subjects which agitated the public opinion of that day. I was also acquainted with others who took a great part in passing the measure of 1832, among whom were Lord Sydenham, then Mr. Poulett Thomson, and Lord Durham. I was too young at that time to have entertained any opinions of value, but I could judge from the language used what were the intentions by which the promoters of that Bill were actuated. Their first and most generous intention was, undoubtedly, to enlarge the constituencies by extending the suffrages and Parliamentary privileges of the people; but there was also another intention, and that was, no doubt—for often did I hear it stated—to prevent the Tory party as long as possible from coming into office. In both these objects they succeeded. They succeeded in enfranchising a large portion of the population, and in placing a preponderating power in the hands of the middle classes: they also succeeded in preventing, for many years, the formation of a Tory Government. We, the Conservatives, anticipated the consequences of the Bill, and we accepted them. Everything went on quietly enough, and the authors of that great measure were silent and apparently satisfied with the results they had attained by that Bill until the second object of their labour was subsequently frustrated by the great innovator of all things—Time. They found, as time wore on that the Tory party, which, after having retained power for so long, had become very unpopular in 1832, were gradually being more favourably regarded by the people. A storm rose upon the subject of Free Trade, and the Tory party came into office, and remained in office, for five years. When, therefore, the second object of the Reformers of 1832 became frustrated, then for the first time the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell), who of all men had shown so much ability in connection with the measure of 1832, manifested dissatisfaction with his own handiwork, and commenced blowing the trumpet of discontent, and telling us, not only that the Bill was a failure, but that a new measure had become necessary. But this discovery was not made until a Tory Government had come into office. Then commenced an agitation which resulted in one Reform Bill after another; and the country, finding that it was a perpetual see-saw between Reform Bills and Governments, became weary of the procrastination which was the inevitable consequence of party conflicts. When we proposed in our Bill, in 1859, reducing the franchise in counties to the amount of the borough franchise we were met by the adverse party in the House of Commons by very much the same sort of opposition—I am not speaking of language, for nothing could be more fair or courteous than the language of the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax)—as we have to encounter to-night in what the noble Viscount terms his innocent proposal. Years passed away; and then came the Bill of 1866. The debate of last year showed that the question of the franchise had become a simple sliding scale. At one time £8 was proposed, at another £7, at another £6, so that it became evident, not only to myself, but to thousands of others, that there was no resting-place to be found but in household suffrage, because between £8 and £7, between £7 and £6, there can not be any real and important difference—there can be no reason for maintaining one figure more than another. That is the explanation of what the noble Duke opposite is pleased to regard as my conversion. I now turn for a moment to my noble Friend, lately one of our Colleagues (the Earl of Carnarvon), who accused me of being one of those who, entertaining a secret opinion in favour of household suffrage, could only be regarded as belonging to a party of "organized hypocrites."

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: I beg the noble Earl's pardon. The noble Earl has clearly put into my mouth words which I never used.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: If I have misinterpreted what my noble Friend said I beg his pardon, but I certainly understood him to say that if household suffrage had been for some time the secret opinion of the Conservative party and the Conservative Government, we had been living in organized hypocrisy. [The Earl of CARNARVON: Hear, hear!] But what is the difference between the two statements? Let me, however, remind my noble Friend that his evidence is anything but correct on this subject. I am quite sure he is so truthful, and has so good a memory, that he will bear me out when I remind him that, long before this question was discussed in the Cabinet, even, I believe, before we were a Government, when he did me the honour of paying me a visit in the country, we had a long conversation upon this very important subject. I then told him in distinct terms that, in my opinion, there was no resting-place short of household suffrage, and that I believed the adoption of that suffrage afforded the only hope of passing a Reform Bill. My noble Friend will also, I dare say, recollect the long and probably wearisome letter which I wrote him to the same effect. I am entering into these details because I am anxious to vindicate the conduct of the servants of the Crown. I addressed that letter to my noble Friend long before we were Colleagues, and in it I informed him that in a Conservative sense I would rather go to household suffrage than stop at any intermediate figure that has been proposed. My reason for advocating that course is because if republican opinions are entertained at all in this country—and I am sure they are entertained by very few—they are mostly held by that class who would be admitted to the franchise between the line of £7 and household suffrage. The members of that class, as a rule, are not friends of the Church, for a great number of them are, in the nature of their opinions, Dissenters; but those below them I believe to be pre-eminently loyal. The noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury), in his admirable speech the other evening, speaking of the poorer classes, said that in many cases the members of this class were so ignorant that they were not acquainted with the name of the incumbent of the parish. I can only say that I believe the statement of the noble Earl is exaggerated; but, however that may be, there is not one who is unacquainted with the name of his Sovereign. This class, moreover, even in times when the Sovereign has not been popular, has never despised the Throne. Now, I have always thought that there are but two principles from which we can choose in dealing with the question of Parliamentary Reform. One of those principles is that of universality, the other of restriction. We have in this country decided in favour of the latter; but how far that principle of restriction is to be carried is simply a matter of detail, of which men must judge for themselves according to the circumstances of the time. Now, my Lords, a great deal has been said in this House in the way of prophecy—in fact, we have so taken to the habit of prophesying that I am almost afraid we shall soon be consulted by the public as to future events, and be regarded more in the light of an oracular than a deliberative assembly. At all events, we have had in the late debates more of prophecy than argument. For my own part I place very little faith in the prophecy of any sort but one, and in that I have great faith—I mean that in which the prophet has it in his own power to carry his predictions into execution. In that light I think I must look upon the prophecies of many noble Lords, and among such prophets I think I may fairly number the noble Lord who has just sat down (Viscount Halifax). He looks upon this Bill as one that has no permanence. But what, my Lords, is permanent in this world but change? To say, then, that this Bill will not be permanent is, I think, a mere platitude. I cannot help thinking that, when the noble Lord attempts to frighten us with the ephemeral character of our scheme for the re-distribution of seats, he will be one of the first to give effect hereafter to his prophecy. Under these circumstances, we can, no doubt, safely be told that our measure will not be permanent. But let us look at the position in which we are placed, and let us then consider the recommendation of the noble Viscount with a view to determine whether it deserves our approval. My Lords, I ask your Lordships on both sides not to look on this measure as a perfect one, because I confess myself that it is imperfect, as we might have expected it to be from the circumstances under which it was passed in the House of Commons. It could not have been made a perfect Bill because the House of Commons had determined that it should be a Bill of compromise; and if it had not been made a Bill of compromise it never could have reached your Lordships — it never could have been carried at all. It is because former Reform Bills had not been made Bills of compromise, it was because they were put forward and discussed as party measures, that we have waited for Reform so long. If the Bill of last year had been made one of compromise—if the House of Commons had been taken into partnership by the able man then conducting the business of the Government in that House—I verily believe the measure would have passed. But of that distinguished man it may be said he was *impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer*. He shook hands with no one; he compromised with no one; he put a pistol to the head of the House of Commons, and told them they must pass the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill—and even that they must pass it within a certain date. My Lords, I would ask whether Englishmen were likely to pass a Bill placed before them under such circumstances and under such management, even if they had liked its provisions more than they did? The same fate would have overtaken our Bill if we had pressed it in a similar temper. But the experience of the past had taught us that such a course would be useless, and had shown us that if our Bill was to be passed it must be a Bill of compromise. Remember that the measure has been five months—five most laborious months—in the House of Commons; that my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has undertaken the direction of the gigantic work, and has succeeded — after discussions in which all parties expressed their opinions and made their propositions—in sending up to your Lordships' House the most comprehensive Reform Bill that has yet been proposed since the passing of the Act of 1832. Well, my Lords, would you, at the eleventh hour, tamper with the work of so many months, and so many laborious nights—a work, I may call it, of so much diplomatic skill—a work of men who had to consider their own political interests and the interests of the particular House to which they belong? The House of Commons having discussed and divided upon every possible point of the measure over and over again, would it, I ask, be discreet or becoming in your Lordships, at this period of the Session, to interfere in the manner proposed by the noble Viscount with a question so intimately connected with that House? The noble Viscount proposes in a very straightforward way to disfranchise all boroughs with a population under 5,000, and I believe he said there were ten of them.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: I said there were ten of these boroughs, but I would not disfranchise them or any other constituencies.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: Then I am at a loss to understand what it is the noble Viscount proposes.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: I said that as the Government expressed their opinion that no borough ought to be disfranchised, I would not propose any disfranchisement, but that I would leave it to them to determine whether they should obtain the additional seats by grouping or any other means they might think it expedient to adopt.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: This is therefore, in point of fact, an abstract proposition. It is one of those propositions of which the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Argyll) said the other evening that he never would support them. I hope the noble Duke will not vote for the one now under discussion. We really do not know what the noble Viscount wants us to do. Before those boroughs can be grouped they must be disfranchised, as I understand the word. And suppose you resolve in the first instance to disfranchise these ten, there is another proposition coming from the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey), by which all boroughs with a population of between 10,000 and 12,000 should return only one Member. Now, there are twelve of these boroughs, so that, if both propositions be adopted, your Lordships would advise the House of Commons to disfranchise twenty-two boroughs. But in neither proposition do I find any statement as to how the seats thus gained are to be disposed of. The noble Viscount in his speech proposed that the Government should take them in hand and do the best they could with them. I am obliged to the noble Viscount for his confidence in the Government; but I do not think it is our business to fill up blanks which he would create. I altogether object to that. I think that any determination on the part of the House of Lords to alter a Bill which occupied the attention of the House of Commons during five months, and which has decided the question of re-distribution, to the extent of abolishing twenty-two borough seats, would be a monstrous proposition for your Lordships to originate at any time; but to send down such a proposition to the House of Commons on the 6th or 7th of August seems to me the most inconceivable scheme that ever was heard of. Suppose those twenty-two prizes to be thrown overboard, on what coast are they to be stranded? Is it on the coast of Ireland, or on that of Scotland, or in England? My Lords, the proposition before you is one for a new Reform Bill. If you adopt the noble Viscount's Resolution, and take with it the Amendment of the noble Earl on the cross-Benches, the proposal you will make will be nothing less than that of a new Reform Bill. After six months' deliberation, the House of Commons have framed and have sent up to your Lordships what they believe to be a satisfactory settlement of this great question, and the noble Viscount and the noble Earl ask you to send down another Reform Bill when the House of Commons are wearied and, I might say, almost dispersed.

You could not expect them to undertake the discussion of a new measure; and the result of adopting these propositions would be that we should again be thrown into a chaos of uncertainty respecting Reform. I think the noble Viscount can hardly have attended to what took place in the House of Commons when he complains that the largest towns are not adequately represented according to population; but we never have taken population as the test of enfranchisement. [Viscount HALIFAX: I deprecated the adoption of that principle.] The noble Viscount says he deprecates the principle; but the question is one of degree or one of discretion. If you do not take population you must use your discretion as to enfranchisement and disfranchisement; but if you take population as your rule, London ought to have sixty Members. Clearly that would be absurd —so absurd that it never has been advocated. But what is it that the House of Commons has done in this matter? They have acted "for the best," to use a common phrase. A compromise took place. The Government at first refused to accept Mr. Laing's proposition, that three Members should be given to each of six great towns; but we afterwards agreed that the representative power of four of these towns should be so extended; and the House of Commons sanctioned that arrangement. It was clearly a compromise. Subsequently, however, an attempt was made to carry the principle further; and with what result? The proposition that two other large towns, Sheffield and Bristol, should have the privilege extended to them was defeated by large majorities. I think the proposition to give Sheffield an additional Member was defeated by 130, and that to give Bristol another representative by 96. Why, then, does the noble Viscount want to interfere with decisions so arrived at, and arrived at so recently as within the last three weeks? A very strong argument against the proposition of the noble Viscount is, that the Bill received a third reading in the House of Commons without a division. Mr. Gladstone had opposed the Bill from the first, and if he had thought it possible to induce the House to reverse its decision his eloquence and his arguments would have been used with that object. Mr. Gladstone did not oppose the third reading. Can there be a stronger proof that he felt as a Statesman, and perhaps as a man of honour, that no such attempt should be made, the House of Commons having already recorded its opinion in favour of the Bill being passed as it stands? Well, the Bill passed unanimously on its third reading. If no other argument were forthcoming to induce your Lordships to vote against the Motion of the noble Viscount, that consideration surely would be sufficient. The last argument I shall employ against the Amendment of the noble Viscount is by no means the weakest that can be used—it is the argument of common sense. I ask any noble Lord in this House whether he thinks that, if the Government were to send down to the House of Commons a Bill altered to the extent which the noble Viscount and the noble Earl on the cross-Bench desire—that is to say, meddling by disfranchisement, grouping, or in whatever manner you please, with twenty-two boroughs which now return Members to that House—in the present state of the House of Commons such a proposition would be favourably entertained? Does he believe such a course would assist in giving, in the present Session, to the people of this country the Reform in Parliament of which they are desirous? Does he think it possible that Her Majesty's Government, having incurred all the pains, anxiety, and trouble of passing this Bill through the House of Commons, can possibly consent by this insidious process to have it overturned and lost at the very last moment? In the name of Her Majesty's Government I cannot consent to a course which must have the effect of depriving the people of this country of Reform when it is almost within their reach. I therefore entreat your Lordships to vote against the Motion of the noble Viscount. I by no means ask your Lordships to refrain from passing such Amendments as in their nature you may consider desirable; but I do entreat you not to meddle at this period of the Session with a part of the Reform Bill so wide and so important as the disfranchisement or enfranchisement of boroughs—a question, moreover, which has been so lately settled in the House of Commons.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON, who rose at the same time with Earl de Grey, said: My Lords, I will not stand between the House and the noble Earl for more than a very few minutes. My noble Friend (the Lord Privy Seal) who has just sat down has done me the honour of alluding to me personally, and, having so alluded to me, my noble Friend has been guilty of some irregularities. The practice of your Lordships' House is somewhat more lax than that of the House of Commons, or else I venture to think that the allusions which have been made to a previous debate would hardly have passed unchallenged. More than that, my noble Friend has been good enough to allude to private conversations which I had the pleasure of having with him under his very hospitable roof in Hampshire. My noble Friend has also referred to private letters, and has referred to the opinions he then expressed to me. I have no doubt my noble Friend has stated the facts accurately, though I cannot precisely call them to my recollection. I can only say that I must decline entirely to enter upon that ground. I am perfectly satisfied myself with the result of the debate of a few nights since. I think it would be very undesirable to recur to subjects which were then fully discussed; and I shall certainly not refer to incidents of private and confidential intercourse. My noble Friend, however, used a further argument, to which I most unquestionably demur. My noble Friend spoke of this question of re-distribution as being the special property of the House of Commons. Now, I am quite willing to assign to the House of Commons all that can fairly and legitimately be brought within their sphere; but I say it is monstrous to assert that the re-distribution of seats is not quite as much the property of the House of Peers as it is of the House of Commons. Why, how can it be contended for a moment that if it be the right of the House of Peers to discuss the question of electoral Reform the question of the re-distribution of seats can be divorced from that of Reform, of which it is so essential a part? And when my noble Friend tells you that we are now at the close of July, and that you have no right to delay the passing of the Bill by discussing the question of the re-distribution of seats, or to send back the Bill to the House of Commons in an altered shape on the 6th of August—

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: I beg my noble Friend's pardon. What I said was that your Lordships had the right to consider the question; but I doubted whether it would be discreet for the House to raise a question of such extensive disfranchisement.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, I submit that whether it be discreet to raise the question or not must depend on whether the question when submitted is in a proper and statesmanlike form. We cannot abandon our duties—we cannot overlook those rights of which we are the guardians—simply because the measure comes to us at a later period of the Session than is advisable, or because our action may involve inconvenience to ourselves or to the House of Commons. With regard to the question of to-night, I think I can state my view very briefly indeed. There are two principles upon which re-distribution may be founded. It may be based upon the principle of a self-acting machinery, adjusting and accommodating itself to the growth of the country from time to time, meeting the case of one town which may increase, and of another town which may decline in population and wealth. Take the case of Middlesborough. That is one of those large towns to which representation is to be granted under the Bill, but which has arisen entirely within the last few years. I believe the existence of Middlesborough rests on the iron and coal traffic; and when the iron is worked out near Middlesborough, it is possible that a large portion of the population in the neighbourhood may disappear just as rapidly as they came together. The first principle consists in adjusting the re-distribution so as to meet the circumstances of a particular town. Another principle is so to frame your re-distribution of seats as to meet temporary exigencies, and to tide over a particular difficulty. I think it is perfectly clear that the re-distribution scheme of this Bill belongs to the second of these two classes. The view which I take, and the view, of course, which will be taken by all those on this side of the House, is simply this — whether the re-distribution of seats contains in itself a fair promise of permanence. That is the one question we have to ask ourselves. If, on the one hand, it is likely to be permanent, then it is a good and useful and Conservative measure; if, on the other hand, it is likely to fail very soon, then I say it is true policy and true Conservatism to endeavour to amend it. I observe, in the first instance, this re-distribution scheme is utterly incommensurate with the extent of the admission to the franchise which you have given under this Bill. It is a scheme which would have been perfectly proportionate to the Bill introduced —say, by Her Majesty's late Government. I think they gave something like forty-nine seats; this Bill gives forty-five. That, however, which would have been perfectly proportioned to a £7 rental franchise is wholly disproportioned to a household rating franchise. In the next place observe that the principle of the Bill, as we now have it—if it be really a principle—is this, that representation is founded upon numbers. My noble Friend admitted as much. You have given Members to counties in proportion to their numbers, and you have allocated Members to boroughs in proportion to their numbers. You have given a third Member to large towns, virtually upon no other ground than that of numbers. I say, then, this is a large and great principle; a new principle, and a principle, above all, that has a tendency to develop itself. Whenever you come to re-construct your electoral system, that principle of numbers will inevitably come in. I say, therefore, it is a dangerous principle to introduce. In the next place, observe that, even under this Bill, the county representation is very far from adequate. Recollect that, under the altered circumstances created by this Bill, the county representation is the one steadying influence on which you can now depend. By the introduction of household suffrage all the conditions are altered; it is to the counties you must look for the ballast to enable you to carry such a heavy press of canvass. You have scarcely increased the present proportion between the counties and the boroughs. In the counties you have now a representation, I think, of some 162 Members; they will have, under this Bill, 183. The representation relatively of the boroughs will be diminished to that extent; but the proportion of the counties will stand after all as 33½ to 66½ in the boroughs; and therefore I maintain that the proportion of county influence is still very inadequate. Lastly, bear in mind—and this is very important —that of these boroughs the larger part is practically under sentence. They are sentenced, first of all, because it is impossible you can long maintain the contrast between these small boroughs and vast, growing, wealthy, populous towns. What chance have boroughs like Arundel, Ashburton, and Dartmouth, with populations of from 1,000 to 4,000, against places like St. Helens, with a population, according to the noble Lord, of 41,000? In the House of Commons, again, you have stimulated the appetite for representation on behalf of the large towns. You have made offers to them and you have withdrawn those offers. You have tendered representation to Keighley, Doncaster, and Luton, and then withheld it. What will be the consequence. Depend upon it those towns will not rest satisfied with the present arrangements. And not only have you this contrast between small boroughs and great—which I believe it will be impossible long to maintain—but you will have the constituencies of these small boroughs, already not very pure in many cases, becoming a great deal more impure, becoming very nests of venality and corruption as time goes on. What chance have you, from all these different considerations, of the real permanency of the system you are now laying down? The inevitable effect will be that you will have renewed agitation. And remember this—that that agitation will be renewed under very different circumstances from any that could be raised at the present moment. It will be an agitation renewed under the conditions of a new constituency and a new Parliament in the first flush of their existence. And what will be the result of that? Is it possible if you leave the Bill in its present position, with the principle of numbers engrained in it—is it possible that you can have any other result except a most wide, a sweeping, and a democratic re-distribution of seats? Is it possible that you can see through the vista any other prospect than that? Well, my Lords, for these reasons, I feel most deeply impressed with the importance of re-distributing the seats, late as is the period of the Session, on a wider and more liberal basis. Still, the course now proposed to us is one very full of difficulty. I see, clearly enough, the importance of a better re-distribution of seats than is provided in this Bill, and I feel that it holds out the only hope of permanence that we have. I accept most heartily the statement of the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Halifax) that he has brought forward this Resolution in no party sense, and with no desire to embarrass the Government. I am aware that those who heard his speech must have been satisfied that such was his inner conviction. But, at the same time, when I come to look at his Resolution I see so many difficulties in this vague, abstract proposition that I cannot bring myself to vote for it. It seems to me that all the arguments used the other night against the Motion of my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) tell with double force against the proposition of the noble Viscount opposite. While, therefore, I must reluctantly abstain from voting for the noble Lord's Resolution, I certainly do not preclude myself from supporting—on the contrary, I desire to say that I, for one, shall most heartily support—the proposal which my noble Friend on the cross-Benches is about to make; and for this reason, that it is a definite and specific proposal, which we shall be able to treat in all its details, and to consider it, I hope, in a spirit free from prejudice or party feeling. I will only say, with reference to that proposal of my noble Friend on the cross-Benches, that when my noble Friend (the Lord Privy Seal) speaks of it as being a Motion of disfranchisement he is under some error. It is not a Motion for disfranchisement; but it is a Motion to carry the line of partial disfranchisement somewhat higher than is proposed by the Government, and, as far as I can see, it involves no real alteration in principle upon the Bill as it has come up to your Lordships.

EARL DE GREY said, he thought their Lordships must have been startled by the marked contrast between the speech of his noble Friend who moved the Resolution and that of the noble Earl (the Lord Privy Seal). His noble Friend (Viscount Halifax), in terms, the sincerity of which no one could doubt, had assured their Lordships that he made his Motion from no party motives and with no party purposes; but when the noble Earl (the Lord Privy Seal) rose to reply on the part of the Government, he occupied twenty-five minutes in making a party answer to speeches delivered a week ago—and certainly he might have been prepared with a better answer than he has given after such an interval—and he only devoted fifteen minutes to the real question now before the House. That question was one of sufficient magnitude and importance—not to the interest of any party, but to the interest of the country at large—to engage their Lordships' close attention. What had been the noble Earl's chief argument against that Motion? Why, that they were now at the end of July; that the Bill had been considered five months in the House of Commons; and that therefore it would not be discreet or "becoming"—for that was the word used—in the House of Lords to alter the scheme of re-distribution passed by the other House. Now, that declaration was singulary inconsistent with what they had heard a few nights ago from the noble Earl the First Lord of the Treasury whose absence they all regretted that night; for the latter noble Earl took his noble Friend (Earl Granville) somewhat to task for having made use of an expression which gave the impression that the noble Earl at the head of the Government did not intend that that House should deal freely with the provisions of the Bill.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, the noble Earl was himself now doing that which he had rebuked him for doing—referring to a past debate.

EARL DE GREY said, he thought he had a perfect right, after what had taken place, to refer to the declaration made by the noble Earl at the head of the Government as to the mode in which the Bill was to be dealt with in Committee, in order to show that the argument of the noble Earl (the Lord Privy Seal) was inconsistent with that declaration. Therefore in spite of the opinion expressed by the noble Earl, that it was too late in the Session to revise the scheme of re-distribution, he trusted their Lordships would not be deterred from dealing with the measure as they deemed best for the interest of the country. As to the House of Commons, which the noble Earl said was almost dispersed, he did not believe it would refuse calmly and deliberately to consider any mode in which their Lordships thought fit to alter the Bill. The noble Earl said the other House had been occupied for five months upon that measure; but only a very small portion of that time had been devoted to the question of re-distribution, which was the only part of the measure which those on his side of the House proposed to alter. They accepted the franchise portion of the Bill—which had so greatly engaged the time and attention of the other House—as it came up to them. But the noble Earl said that that scheme of re-distribution was the result of a compromise or compact. Now, he had never heard of the compromise or compact to which the noble Earl alluded. He knew not with whom it had been made, but he did know that the people of England had been no parties to it; and he said that that portion of the Bill, as it stood, was not satisfactory to the country. The noble Earl talked of his noble Friend endeavouring to raise up an agitation in the country, but he said it was because they deprecated agitation that the Resolution now before their Lordships had been moved; it was because they were firmly convinced that the settlement of the question of re-distribution now proposed was no settlement at all, and would inevitably lead to an agitation throughout the country, that they desired to see it amended. That part of the Bill was deemed unsatisfactory, not by Liberals alone, but by Members of both parties ; and only the other day, at the first election which had taken place since the measure passed the other House, the Conservative candidate at Birmingham told the electors that if returned to Parliament it would be one of his first objects to get that scheme of re-distribution altered. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury) treated this question of re-distribution as though it were insignificant. That did not agree with the language held by the Conservative party last year, who, mistaking the intentions of the late Government in thinking that they did not mean to deal with the re-distribution of seats before they went to a new Parliament under their Franchise Bill, insisted on the vast importance of the subject of re-distribution ; and it would be found recorded in the debates of last Session that there were frequent statements from the then Opposition side in the other House to the effect that the measure proposed by the late Government with respect to re-distribution did not go far enough, and that it was objectionable because incomplete. An opinion prevailed on both sides that this part of the present Bill would not be satisfactory to the country. But the noble Earl asked how it happened that the Bill was read a third time unanimously in the House of Commons and that it was not opposed by Mr. Gladstone. The fact was, that attaching, as the Liberal party did, great importance to the extension of the suffrage, they were not prepared, although they regarded the Bill as unsatisfactory in other respects, to take upon themselves the responsibility of rejecting it on the third reading. The House of Commons, no doubt, looked to their Lordships —they felt that there was another House of Parliament, and they did not think it impossible that the Bill might be amended as regarded the distribution scheme in their Lordships' House. It was his sincere wish —and he believed he might speak for the noble Lords near him—to act in the spirit of his noble Friend the late President of the Council, to co-operate with the Government, and afford them every aid and assistance. If their object had been to get up political agitation and make political capital out of this question their course would have been, instead of proposing this Resolution, to bring forward some rival scheme which the Government could not adopt, and then to have got up an agitation in its favour. It was because they had a sincere desire that the present Government should settle the question that they offered their most cordial assistance if they would only deal with it satisfactorily, and in a comprehensive manner. He thought they might have been met by the Government in a different spirit. The noble Earl the late Colonial Secretary (the Earl of Carnarvon) said, that although he would not support the Resolution on account of its vague character, he would support the Resolution of the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey). He (Earl de Grey) was afraid that if the Resolution of his noble Friend were rejected there would be no doubt as to the fate of that of the noble Earl on the cross-Benches. They were both equally obnoxious to the noble Earl opposite, who taking his stand on the measure as it was—which he said was a compromise—thought it would afford a permanent settlement of the question. The noble Earl must be the only man in the country who held this opinion. He (Earl de Grey) supported the Resolution ; but not because he was hostile to the representation of the moderate-sized boroughs. He should greatly regret to see the large towns and counties only represented, and still more should he regret the establishment of equal electoral districts. Boroughs of moderate size were of great importance, and improved the character of the House of Commons by introducing the important element of variety. And as the tendency of a measure of this description was to place our institutions on a democratic basis, and there was thus a danger of bringing everything to a dead level, it became the more reasonable and important to maintain the representation of the moderate-sized boroughs. It was because he desired to retain these boroughs that he felt bound to object to the scheme of the Government. That scheme unsettled everything and settled nothing. It placed this part of the Bill on a basis wholly inadequate to that which related to the franchise, and it left the question of distribution to be dealt with either in another Session or another Parliament. He thought that the question ought to be settled now. It had been one of the great arguments of the Conservative party in favour of this Bill that they wanted a settlement, and that they went further than many of them liked because they wished for a settlement. If that were their principle he asked them to follow it out, and settle the question of distribution as well as the question of the franchise. Otherwise they ran the risk of having this question taken up in a new Parliament, elected under the new franchise by men who were new to the settlement of political questions, and who might be likely rashly to propose a more sweeping measure than he should like to see carried. It was, therefore, a Conservative course in the true sense of the word that they should place this part of the Bill in a position adequate to the other portion, and that both should possess an equally permanent character. While he thought that the Resolution of his noble Friend would, if it were carried, tend to meet the fair and just claims of large constituencies and rising towns, it would, he believed, work in a Conservative manner, by rendering possible the maintenance, in a fair degree, of the representation of moderate-sized boroughs. Upon these grounds he should cordially vote for the Resolution.

VISCOUNT LIFFORD said, that all the Conservative portions of the Bill had been swept away, and their Lordships could only look to correct its evils to that part which related to the distribution of seats. He should prefer to see that question dealt with by the House of Lords rather than leave it to be dealt with by the Government. He should not like to see the question re-opened by the new Parliament, and, therefore, he regretted that he could not vote for the Government on this question; but, as the noble Viscount had not told them that the result of his Motion would not be the disfranchisement of small boroughs, and as he could not vote for any Resolution which was likely to bring about such a result, he should have to leave the House when the Question was put from the Woolsack, unless he had an assurance to that effect from the noble Mover. When he reflected of what infinite value small boroughs were to the country, and how generally they were Conservative in the true sense of the word, he could not vote for any Resolution which would disfranchise them.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND said, he looked on the re-distribution scheme as incommensurate with that portion of the Bill which dealt with the franchise, and as having no prospect of permanency, and on that account he intended to vote for the Resolution. It could not be supposed that the small boroughs, many of which were decaying and really represented nothing, could be long maintained side by side with the large constituencies which would exist in the counties and large towns. He thought, too, that sufficient consideration was not shown by the Bill to the importance of counties. The counties would not enjoy, under this Bill, so large a share of the representation as that to which their wealth and population entitled them; and though he did not view electoral districts with such alarm as some of their Lordships did, he was convinced that if the Government persisted in the present plan a new Parliament would adopt a scheme of re-distribution approximating to electoral districts. With regard to Stockton and Darlington he believed that they were more likely to return useful representatives than Middlesborough, which had no claim except numbers, being solely devoted to one particular interest. He admitted that small boroughs played an important part in our representative system by enabling persons representing various interests to enter Paliament; but it was only by grouping or disfranchising some of those boroughs that a permanent settlement of the question of distribution could be effected.

THE EARL OF ROMNEY said, that while accepting the declaration of the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax) that his Motion was not proposed from party motives, he thought that an abstract Resolution necessarily bore the appearance of a party Motion, and was equivalent to a Vote of Want of Confidence. While, however, giving his vote on this question with the Government, he reserved to to himself the liberty of giving a candid consideration to the proposal of the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey). He protested strongly against the doctrine of the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury) that because the House of Commons had taken six months in settling this Bill their Lordships were precluded from giving it a full consideration, on the ground that the other House would construe it as an insult. The House of Commons did not regard themselves as precluded from discussing Bills sent down to them by their Lordships, and this House had an equal right to discuss measures sent up to them from the Commons.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I have been perfectly astonished at the spirit in which this Motion has been met by the Government. My noble Friend (Viscount Halifax) has merely taken the first opportunity of urging the Government to re-consider what they propose with regard to the re-distribution of seats. The opinion, not only of those sitting on these Benches, but of the public is, that the re-distribution scheme contained in this Bill cannot be permanent. It is not a settlement such as was proposed last year; and our conviction is that, in the course of a very few years, it will lead to an agitation for further changes which it may be impossible to limit within any possible bounds —we cannot say that it may not extend to dangerous limits. The Government have now an opportunity of preventing that agitation. It seems, however, judging by the speech of the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury), that the Government resolve to incur that danger and that in their opinion this scheme will be a settlement —or, at all events, that it having been adopted as a compromise by the House of Commons, we ought not to meddle with it. The noble Earl told us there were certain parts of the Bill which we might alter, and certain parts which we might not. He might at least have informed us, when telling us that we could not alter the scheme of re-distribution, what portions of the Bill it is open to us to amend; but this he neglected to do. My noble Friend disclaimed party motives, but, instead of answering my noble Friend's argument, the noble Earl made a thoroughly party speech, and adapted facts to his own party views. I am sorry he so completely misunderstood or misrepresented what happened in former years. He stated that, without any reason whatever, except, as he supposed, party interest, I revived the question of Parliamentary Reform and endeavoured to disturb the settlement of 1832. Now, as I have frequently explained, I had no wish to disturb that settlement; but a Motion was repeatedly made in the other House on the subject of the occupation franchise in the counties, and when that Motion was brought forward in 1850 or 1851, I said I did not wish to disturb the existing arrangement, which had many advantages, but that if it was determined to disturb the settlement of 1832, there were other questions which must be dealt with, and that there were, in this country thousands of artizans who by their skill and industry had shown themselves perfectly fit to receive the franchise. I was defeated and resigned office upon that defeat; but when the noble Earl now at the head of the Government was unable to form a Government, I returned to office, promising to undertake to amend the Reform Act, both as to the County and the Borough Franchise. As the question had been raised we thought it would be necessary to consider it; but it was not we who raised it but the House of Commons. The noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury) has stated to-night that he is convinced that there is no safety except in household suffrage. He has told us that the men between £5 and £10 are not loyal, and that you will find loyalty only by going to household suffrage. Now, my opinion is that it is a calumny to say that the persons inhabiting houses of £6 or £7 are not loyal to the Throne. I think the distrust of these men quite unfounded—they are as loyal as the class that will be admitted by household suffrage. But when the noble Earl speaks as he has done of this great body of householders who will now be enfranchised, he may permit me to remind him of what happened in Ireland when the landlords made 40*s.* freeholders by thousands upon thousands, and brought them up to vote as they dictated at the poll. A time came when Mr. O'Connell roused those tenants—poor and miserable and dependent as they were—by a great national feeling, and the power of the landlords was swept away. Now, my belief is that the noble Earl and his Colleagues are entirely mistaken in thinking that the householders, whom he is creating, will always remain subservient and dependent. Some great national feeling will at some time move them, and their dependence on their Conservative landlords will be swept away, as it was in Ireland. The noble Earl may find that while securing a Sessional triumph for the Conservative party, he has been permanently ruining the Conservative cause. Returning to the re-distribution scheme, I think it far inferior to the scheme of the Bills of 1854, 1861, and 1866. I would remind the noble Earl that in the Bill of 1854 no less than sixty-two seats were disposed of, of which I think forty-two were given to the counties and twenty to the boroughs. I believe that something like that would be a wise course to pursue at present. If the Government refuse to pursue it they must accept the entire responsibility of all the agitation for a new distribution which may follow.

LORD TAUNTON said, he had heard with the utmost regret the speech of the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury) who had addressed the House on the part of Her Majesty's Government. He could not help expressing his opinion that the course which Her Majesty's Government proposed to take would be satisfactory, neither to the House nor the country. He hoped, however, the division might go on the Amendment of his noble Friend, that the Government would be convinced of the unspeakable importance of reconsidering this question of re-distribution without delay. The same opinion had been expressed by noble Lords of great weight and experience on the other side of the House as well as on that; the opinion of the House had therefore been unmistakeably expressed, and it would be well if the Government would accede to the proposed Resolution. He believed that they stood that moment in a most critical position. He could not conceal from their Lordships that he contemplated—he could not say with despondency, but with anxiety—the great changes which had been made in the suffrage. These changes were so great that they required all the moderating influences possible, to prevent them from overbearing that balance of the Constitution which had produced such beneficial results, and had united, in a degree unknown to any other country, the benefits of liberty and order. It was of the utmost importance, therefore, that they should surround that Bill with such elements of stability as might take away all prospect of immediate agitation. For himself he knew how sincere the assertion was which had been made on that (the Opposition) side of the House, that there was no design to make this a party question. Nothing would give him greater pain than to see a course adopted with regard to distribution similar to that which had been pursued with respect to the suffrage—parties bidding one over another to devise, not a scheme which was best suited to the durable interests of the country, but one which would produce the greatest amount of popularity. Was there any one who knew what was said out of doors, or had heard the debates in Parliament, who could doubt that the distribution scheme of the Government was a mere pasteboard scheme? While, on the one hand, they gave to great popular bodies a new and immense power, and any new power always involved some new danger—on the other they proposed a scheme of distribution which could not be defended in argument, and which was the most obvious and ready justification of popular discontent and agitation. Could their Lordships think themselves justified in separating without attempting to provide a remedy for such a state of things? They would be doing a thing the most revolutionary in its consequences, they would be betraying the great principles of which they were the guardians, if they allowed a Bill of this kind to pass with so fatal a flaw, with so manifest and dangerous an error, that ten men could not be found in the country who would say that they did not view it with the greatest apprehension. He hoped their Lordships had remarked that the noble Earl who had addressed the House (the Earl of Carnarvon) was quite as hostile to the scheme of the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) as to that of his noble Friend. The deep interest which he felt in the question would be his excuse for having detained their Lordships at that moment. He could only say in conclusion that he should view any measure which Her Majesty's Government might approve or adopt with a sincere anxiety to see in it a satisfactory settlement of the question. His chief object in rising, however, was to express a hope that Her Majesty's Government would give due weight to the arguments that had been adduced, and would reconsider their decision, or that, if not immediately, they would shortly be able to announce their willingness to do so.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY thought that the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury) in speaking against the Resolution had, in fact, left their Lordships no alternative but to vote in its favour. The noble Earl said that the Government would resist any attempt to alter the scheme of re-distribution—that it had been settled by the other House, and that it was no business of their Lordships to touch it. Yet last year the Conservatives in the other House thought the re-distribution scheme of such importance that they refused to consider the portion of the Bill relating to the franchise alone and without having the re-distribution scheme before them. Were their Lordships then to be told that they must not touch a part of the Bill which by their own account was of equal importance with that relating to the franchise? No doubt there might be some inconvenience in so doing, but the matter was one which lay within the discretion of their Lordships.

Any noble lord who was dissatisfied with the present re-distribution scheme must find great difficulty in voting against the Resolution. In his opinion the Bill placed too much power in the hands of the lower classes in the boroughs, and, for the safety of the country, they wanted increase of representation in the counties. He was sorry on the present occasion to have to vote against the present Government for, on this as on other occasions, his wish was to have supported the Government as far as possible. But, as they had been told that the Government would resist all Motions in this direction, he confessed that he thought that they had no alternative but to express their dissatisfaction with the present scheme of re-distribution, and their determination to have a full and fair consideration of the question.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM: My Lords, the noble Earl who has just spoken may have advanced arguments sufficient to satisfy himself why he should vote for this or some similar Motion, but I do not think he has adduced any good arguments in favour of supporting an abstract Resolution like that which we are now discussing. The Resolution which was negatived a few evening ago condemned the whole Bill. This Resolution condemns a part of the Bill, and declares that the scheme of re-distribution is unsatisfactory. Now, to noble Lords opposite who support the present Resolution, the re-distribution scheme in the Bill of 1866 was satisfactory enough. Yet the difference between that Bill and the Bill now before your Lordships, so far as the question of distribution, is only four seats out of forty-nine; so that four seats make the whole difference between what is right and what is utterly inadequate and wrong. Surely such a difference affords no sufficient reason for passing such a Resolution. Exception has been taken to the remark of the noble Earl who has spoken in the absence of Lord Derby this evening (the Earl of Malmesbury), with reference to the possibility of this House at this period of the Session dealing with the question of re-distribution. Now, I did not understand the noble Earl to say anything more than that, in his opinion, it was not discreet—that was the term he used—for this House to re-open so important a question as that of the re-distribution of seats. In that opinion I cannot but think that there is a good deal with which most of your Lordships will agree. In the position in which this question now stands it seems to me that it would be hardly discreet for this House to re-open the re-distribution scheme on a vague Resolution not specifying any particular blot or pointing out any particular Amendment. That scheme has occupied a considerable portion of the five months during which the Bill has been discussed in the other House, and has probably received even as much attention as that important portion of the Bill relating to the franchise. This is apparent when you look at the reports of what took place in the other House of Parliament. The question was thought, and justly thought, to be one which at first required what was termed a tentative policy on the part of the Government. Of course it was necessary that in forming their opinions as to the probable success of so important a part of their Bill, the Government should look at what occurred in former years. Now there were precedents to indicate to them the probable result of different proposals. They had before them the angry debates which occurred in 1832, the result of all the several Reform Bills subsequently brought forward, and the conspicuous failure of last year. From these precedents the Government had to gather such indications as might guide them on the present occasion, and they were led strongly to the opinion that they ought not to propose such a distribution as was likely to place the representation in the hands of large masses of the people. It was with that view the Chancellor of the Exchequer laid before the House of Commons a scheme which was scanty, perhaps, in its extent, but which was afterwards enlarged in that spirit of compromise which has marked the progress of this Bill. It is from actual decisions given by, and not from mere opinions expressed in, the House of Commons that the details of the scheme now under consideration have been settled. When we look at the discussions which have taken place there we shall see that the opinion of the other House has been very significantly shown. After the proposal of the Government had been brought forward, the limit of population, in the case of towns from which a second Member was taken, was raised to 10,000, and the House would not exceed that limit; Amendments to that effect were negatived. So was a proposal to add two large towns to those which had received a third Member. The suggestion that the system of grouping should be adopted was not approved. Moreover, when so small an advance was proposed as that the second Members should be taken away from four of the next lowest towns on the list in point of population, the House of Commons, by a decided majority, negatived the proposal and declared, "Thus far shall you go and no further!" After these decisions, and this indication of the spirit of the other House, it seems to me that it would in truth be somewhat indiscreet for your Lordships to say, "We will do that which the other House said it would not do." It is of great importance that parties should work in accord in settling this question; it is of still greater importance that the two Houses of Parliament should as far as possible do so, and that we should not unnecessarily, and without some substantial object to gain, fly in the face of the other House. To adopt a Resolution which points out no Amendment would, I think, be open to the charge that we were merely expressing a vague opinion of our own, adverse to the measure which has been accepted by the other House and approved by the country, without any real purpose of effecting a substantial Amendment. My objection would not apply equally to a Resolution pointing to any particular Amendment; but I do think it would be much to be regretted if, upon a measure which has been adopted by the other House, and which is really approved by a large majority of your Lordships, and upon this first real and practical stage, we were to adopt such a Resolution as this, which will neither make an Amendment in the Bill nor intimate to the Committee in what direction Amendment is desired. I thank your Lordships for having listened to me, and I trust the division will not show this House in opposition to the opinion of the other House of Parliament.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE: My Lords, the impending division imposes upon me the necessity of saying a few words in explanation of the vote I am about to give. My opinions upon Reform remain unchanged, and I cannot retract the opinions I expressed on a former occasion. I propose to vote in favour of the Resolution of the noble Viscount. I shall do so, first of all, because of the distinct declaration that the Motion is not made in any party spirit. My second reason for doing so is that I hope and entertain the conviction that the Government will take into consideration the important representations made on both sides of the House, and will not push their present intentions to the extent they have indicated. It would be of immense advantage if they would propose a better scheme of re-distribution. If the matter be pushed to a division I hope there may be as many votes from this side of the House as will give importance to the views which have been expressed and induce the Government to take the matter into their serious consideration.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY and Earl FORTESCUE rose together, and stood for some time amid the conflicting calls of many Peers. Those for Earl FORTESCUE seemed to preponderate, and the Earl of KIMBERLEY gave way.

EARL FORTESCUE: I am always doubly unwilling to obtrude myself since precarious health and impaired eyesight have obliged me almost entirely to renounce the humble part I used to take in public business in and out of Parliament; but in this great crisis I must entreat your Lordships' indulgence for a few remarks in support of the Resolution so temperately moved. I deprecate the party criminations and recriminations, which have added little to the patriotic and statesmanlike character of the debates on this momentous question in either House of Parliament. I doubly regret the absence of the distinguished leader of the Conservative party, when the temperate and moderate speech of the Mover of the Resolution was answered in the manner it has been answered by the noble Earl opposite, who, as he said truly, occupies the Prime Minister's place without replacing him. These party criminations and recriminations remind me of nothing so much as of the internecine conflicts of the Jewish factions during the siege of Jerusalem; and the leaders of the democratic party and the great multitude behind them must have contemplated these party feuds with much the same exultation as Titus and the Roman soldiers did the mutual slaughter of the contending Jews, and their emulous efforts to destroy the inner defences intended for the additional security of the Holy City. I am rejoiced to hear an authoritative statement as to the identity of Lord Palmerston's private opinions with his public professions, and of his declared intention to have introduced a Reform Bill at the right time and place; but that great statesman would have brought in a measure very different from this, and he would have conducted it still more differently. He would not have admitted unknown proportions of unknown quantities to the franchise, nor would he have left such anomalies in the distribution of seats, thereby transferring practically the whole power of the State, from the upper and middle classes to one class only, at one stroke—the wage class, and that not of the whole country, but of the towns. As to myself, I venture to quote a few words addressed by me, nearly ten years since, to a large constituency which I then represented to prove that my present views on this subject are not new. I then said—

> "I have long been in favour of Parliamentary Reform, less however for the sake of removing anomalies in the representative system, than of diminishing corruption and undue influence at elections; of extending the franchise to many hundreds of thousands well entitled to it; and above all of anticipating by timely improvements any clamorous demand for sweeping changes."

Before, however, I was an ardent Parliamentary reformer, or had wished to disturb the settlement of 1832, I was a sanitary reformer, and what I have seen in the alleys and garrets and cellars of towns now fills me with apprehension at the step which has been irrevocably taken with respect to the enfranchisement of some of those who are to be admitted to the borough franchise under the Bill of the Government. I wish to know why, in the settlement of this question, the agricultural labourers are to be regarded as the mere residuum of the population? If your Lordships look at the educational statistics for 1865, you will find that agricultural Devonshire contrasted very favourably with manufacturing Lancashire. The number of persons of both sexes, and especially of the women, who made their mark instead of writing their name in the parish register, forms a much larger percentage of the total population in the latter than it did in the former county. Although 95 per cent of populous parishes receive grants from the Privy Council, and little more than 10 per cent of the rural parishes with small populations do so, yet the amount of public money received by Lancashire for educational purposes is not only actually but relatively immensely greater than by Devonshire. The number of criminals and prostitutes and drunkards, as shown by the official Tables which I hold in my hand, but will not trouble the House with, is proportionately enormously larger in the town than it is in the agricultural population. Besides in the calculation of their comparative wealth and taxation, it has been too generally forgotten that the payments to Schedule A of the property tax ought to be put down to the credit of the counties, and not of the boroughs; which would turn the scale considerably in favour of the counties instead of the towns as it is often stated to be. Borough freeholders have a right to vote for counties, and one-fifth of the county constituencies are composed of electors voting for freeholds and copyholds within boroughs. If this fact were remembered in connection with the circumstance that the borough Members were to the county Members in the proportion of three to two, your Lordships would see how utterly disproportionate to the wealth, importance, and intelligence of the counties was the miserable allowance of representation accorded to them by the compact, or compromise, or arrangement, brought forward by the Government, which seems to me to contain no element of permanency, but to be fraught with promise of an immediate and most pernicious agitation. It is worthy of remark that, despite of the enormous sums recently spent on improved drainage and water supply there, the mortality of the manufacturing districts of Lancashire, Cheshire, and the West Riding has gone on increasing. There can be no doubt that the increased mortality is due to overcrowding; and there is as little doubt that overcrowding paves the way to demoralization. In my opinion a population ought to be civilized and Christianized before it can safely be enfranchised. Under these circumstances I do not concur with the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury) that it would be either indiscreet or unbecoming in your Lordships to make large Amendments in the Bill.

LORD DENMAN: I wish to refer the House to the remarks of my late noble Relative, on 19th April 1831, with respect to a Resolution moved by General Gascoyne, and those remarks apply to every Resolution which impedes either the second reading of a Bill or its going into Committee. It was this, that—

> "By agreeing to the Amendment the House would fetter the hands of the Committee in the most inconvenient manner, the pledge might be found to hamper their proceedings, and was clearly unnecessary into the bargain. The whole House being the Committee, had full power to act upon this opinion [as to certain boroughs being disfranchised] if they entertained it, but suppose a certain reduction adopted the consideration how the whole number should be kept up might involve them in the greatest perplexities. . . . . . He conceived the friends of the measure could not adopt a course more unwise and imprudent than to give the slightest sanction to a proposition which should have the effect of embarrassing the operations of the Committee. . . . Yes, it would defeat

the measure and . . . . such was the object of the Motion."—[3 *Hansard*, iii. 1679.]

I will not attempt to add to the value of this opinion by any remarks of mine, and in those memorable words at least, as to the probable effect of this Resolution, I fully concur.

On Question ? their Lordships *divided* :—Contents 59 ; Not-Contents 100 : Majority 41.

CONTENTS.

Cleveland, D.
Somerset, D.

Normanby, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Albermarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Effingham, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E.
Harrowby, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lovelace, E.
Minto, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.
Zetland, E.

Eversley, V.
Falmouth, V.
Halifax, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.

Chester, Bp.

Belper, L.

Blantyre, L.
Camoys, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Clandeboye, L. (*L. Dufferin and Claneboye.*)
Clermont, L.
Cranworth, L.
De Mauley, L.
Dunfermline, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Houghton, L.
Leigh, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Overstone, L.
Petre, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*) [*Teller.*]
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Taunton, L.
Vernon, L.
Westbury, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Rutland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.

Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cardigan, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Erne, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrington, E.
Home, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lucan, E.

Malmesbury, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

De Vesci, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.

Ossory, &c., Bp.

Abinger, L.
Arundell of Wardour, L.
Audley, L.
Bagot, L.
Berners, L.
Blayney, L.
Bolton, L.
Cairns, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clinton, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]

Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Heytesbury, L.
Hylton, L.
Kingston, L. (*E. Kingston.*)
Lovat, L.
Lytton, L.
Monson, L.
Northwick, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Saltoun, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Tenterden, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Then the original Motion *agreed to.*

House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1 and 2 *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Occupation Franchise for Voters in Boroughs).

THE EARL OF ELLENBOROUGH said, he wished to draw the attention of the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) to the distinction between the wording of this and a subsequent clause—the one referring to "rate for the relief of the poor," and the other to "poor rates." The latter consisted of much more than the former, as it included highway rates, church rates, police rates, and county rates. If it were intended to mean the same thing in each clause, he thought that the same expression should be used.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM said, that rates were differently levied in various towns, and hence, no doubt, the variance in the form of expression.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, that on asking his noble Friend the President of the Council, whether the payment was to be placed at the minimum to entitle a householder to vote, he replied that it was not. If that were so, the clause should be amended by the substitution of the words "poor rates" for the words "rate for the relief of the poor."

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the words, though differing, were identical in meaning. The matter was altogether one of detail.

The DUKE OF ARGYLL said, it was important to know what the Government intended by the clause as it stood, as it would make a great difference whether the qualification for the franchise was to be the payment of all rates, or of the rate for the relief of the poor only.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the intention was that everything included under the words "poor rates" should be paid by the householder. He had no objection to insert the word "poor" before "rates" in the third paragraph of the clause if that would get rid of the difficulty.

LORD CAIRNS thought there might be danger in departing from a form of words which had received a definite and authorative interpretation; and the Reform Act of 1832 used identically the same form of words as the present Bill, including the very change of expression now complained of.

EARL GRANVILLE said, there appeared to be a difference of opinion between two noble and learned Lords on the same side, one opposing, and the other supporting, an alteration in the clause.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the argument of his noble and learned Friend was a complete justification of the insertion of the words; but it was argued that an improvement would be effected by changing them.

EARL FORTESCUE said, that in the time of the Reform Bill of 1832 there were a great many populous extra-parochial places rated to the relief of the poor. The circumstances were no longer the same, and therefore the retention of the original form of was were no longer necessary.

LORD WESTBURY suggested the omission of the word "poor" and the insertion of the words "rate made for the relief of the poor" in line 3 of the 4th paragraph.

EARL GREY preferred the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor) to that just proposed on the opposite side of the House.

After further discussion, Amendment made by omitting the words, "all Rates (if any) made for the Relief of the Poor," and inserting, in lieu thereof, the words "all Poor Rates (if any)."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs).

THE EARL OF ROMNEY moved an Amendment providing that the occupation of the lodger should date from the 25th March, instead of from the end of July.

Amendment *moved,* "to leave out ("last Day of July,") and insert ("Twenty-fifth Day of March.")—(*The Earl of Romney.*)

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that the result of adopting the Amendment would be to require a fifteen months' instead of a twelve months' occupation from the lodger. But if that was the object of the noble Earl it would be better, in his opinion, to make a direct proposal to that effect.

EARL RUSSELL said, he hoped the Government did not mean to sanction such an alteration in the clause.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that he had only suggested a most convenient mode of raising the question.

EARL GRANVILLE was anxious to know what were the views of the Government upon the subject.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, that when the division took place their Lordships would see what was the course pursued by the Government.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY protested against this method of dealing with an important question. He hoped the House would press for some information as to the intentions of the Government. They were told that they must not fly in the face of the House of Commons; but he trusted that they would fly in the face of the Government, and not submit to such treatment as this. When they asked what were the intentions of the Government, they were told by the Lord Privy Seal that if they "waited they would see what they would see." He could remember no occasion on which, with reference to a measure of this importance, their Lordships had been treated in such a manner.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY thought that the noble Earl was unnecessarily warm. A noble Lord having moved an Amendment, his noble Friend, the noble Duke suggested that his wishes might be attained by the adoption of another form of words. He could not understand why that should provoke hostile comments.

The Government would stand by the Bill as it was.

EARL GRANVILLE thought that he and his noble Friends were justified in pressing noble Lords opposite until they got the definite and satisfactory answer which they had just received.

Amendment *negatived.*

LORD CAIRNS moved that after the words "such lodgings being part of one and the same Dwelling-house" there be added "or being One and the same set of Chambers or Rooms not separately rated." The Amendment would apply to cases where the whole House was divided into chambers or rooms of the same kind and which were not separately rated. It would accordingly admit as voters the occupants of a room in a Hall or College, which had no owner letting out lodgings in the usual sense of the term. His object was to place the question beyond doubt.

An Amendment *moved* in line 29 after ("Dwelling-house") to insert ("or being One and the same set of Chambers or Rooms not separately rated."—(*The Lord Cairns.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, the Government were ready to accept the Amendment.

LORD WESTBURY said, that students were not tenants in the sense in which ordinary lodgers were tenants of rooms or chambers. They were there for a different purpose, and the Amendment would create a different class of votes and introduce a new element in University towns.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that at the time the Act of 1832 was passed the Colleges were not rated; but they had since been rated under local Acts, and it would be most inconsistent with every principle of justice, when they were passing a Bill founded upon rating, to exclude residents in the University from the exercise of the franchise. A strong feeling had been expressed in the Senate of the University of Cambridge in favour of residents in the Colleges being registered as electors for the boroughs.

LORD CRANWORTH wanted to know whether these persons were liable to serve municipal offices?

EARL GREY said, it was true the Colleges were now rated, but this was done in the case of Cambridge, and he believed in that of Oxford also, under an arbitration, and after long discussion had taken place. Some years ago a claim was made by the town of Cambridge for the payment of rates by the Colleges, to which they had not formerly been considered liable. This claim was resisted by the Colleges, and having been referred to arbitration, it was ultimately decided that they should pay rates, but only a reduced amount, in consideration of which their members were to be debarred from exercising any municipal privileges. This award of the arbitrator, he believed, had been confirmed by Parliament, and what was now proposed was directly contrary to its spirit. If a graduate was married and lived in the town, he would have a vote; but it would be wholly inconsistent with the arrangement which now existed to allow residents in Colleges to vote for the town. The Colleges had a distinct representation of their own, and had no claim to take part in the representation of the town. The clause might be so amended as to provide for chambers in London while excluding the Universities.

LORD CAIRNS maintained that municipal privileges or obligations had nothing to do with the question; it was because the occupants in question were not rated that the question had come before them. The other House had by a large majority decided that these persons ought to possess the franchise as lodgers, but they had inadvertently omitted to insert words fully carrying out their decision. Moreover at Cambridge something like half the members of Colleges occupied lodgings in the town, and would thus have votes for the town, and those living in the Colleges really paid in their rent the quota of the rate, though the Colleges paid it directly. He could not understand on what principle it was sought to exclude them, unless it was on that invariably acted on by noble Lords opposite of excluding from the franchise every one who might be supposed to be possessed of a more than ordinary share of intelligence and education.

THE EARL OF ABINGDON had to state that as High Steward of Oxford, he had received a deputation from the inhabitants both of Oxford and Cambridge, who strongly deprecated the interference of the Universities in their Parliamentary elections. They urged that the Universities had their own Members, and that, had their Members votes for the town, the independence of the inhabitants would be materially affected, and the public peace endangered.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that not only

were the townspeople of Oxford afraid of being overwhelmed by members of the University, but he had been requested by the Bishop of London, who was prevented by indisposition from attending, to present a petition from members of the University, signed by three Heads of Colleges, nine Professors, and twenty-five M.A.'s of different political opinions, objecting to undergraduates being allowed to vote for the city. They did so on grounds wholly apart from politics, believing that it would distract students from their studies, would revive those "town and gown" rows which so much pains had been taken to prevent, and would be very detrimental to academic discipline.

LORD LYTTELTON suggested that the Amendment should be agreed to, and that the question of the Universities should be raised by the Proviso of which the Bishop of London had given notice to introduce at the end of the clanse, and which he presumed some noble Lord would propose.

EARL GRANVILLE thought it important that the Bishop of London should be present to explain the grounds on which he had framed the Proviso.

LORD CAIRNS hoped his Amendment would be adopted, in order to meet the case of buildings wholly let out as chambers, where the owner paid the whole rate. The question of Oxford and Cambridge might conveniently be discussed on the proposed Proviso at the end of the clause.

EARL GREY very much doubted whether this franchise was wanted by the Colleges themselves. He wished to know whether the principle of the arrangement which had been made between the Universities and the towns was or was not to be maintained. Considering the number of persons who lived in chambers, and that the Universities were sufficiently represented, he did not think it consistent with justice that the words should be introduced.

LORD WESTBURY said, it had always been an object of the Crown in granting charters, and also of the Legislature in its proceedings, to draw a line between the University and the town; and now they were asked to confound both, and allow persons who had come to the town, not as residents of the town, but members of the University, to interfere with the town elections. This was a very important matter, for they were now about to break down the boundary line between University and town, and introduce a mischievous and dangerous element into the life of the student. The student went to Oxford for the purpose of learning, not of voting.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, that the opinions of noble Lords had been fully expressed, and the division could not be taken at a more convenient moment. He understood the case to be this—it was proposed by the right rev. Prelate, not now present, by means of a Proviso, to exclude the members of the University, residing within the four walls of the Colleges, from voting for a representative of the town. Now, the fairness of that proposal appeared open to considerable doubt. Why should a man who was a member of the University be disqualified for voting at the town elections simply because he was also a member of a constituency which had not got a local character? If he were to live within the town, the question would not arise—he might acquire a vote and no one would complain. If he chose to live a few miles from Oxford he was equally entitled to vote for the town and the Unversity. But because he lived within the four walls of the College it was said that he should be allowed to vote only for one of the two constituencies. Noble Lords on the other side had asked whether undergraduates, if of full age, were to have the privilege of voting for the town. But at Oxford the common practice was that undergraduates when of full age should live, not within the Colleges, but in rooms in the town. The number of undergraduates who would be affected by the proviso in Oxford at least would be infinitesimal. It appeared to him a hard and invidious thing to introduce words to disqualify persons who were of full age, and who morally and intellectually might be as well qualified to vote as any other elector.

LORD CAIRNS hoped the House would not be led astray on this matter. It had been urged that those members of the University who occupied rooms in the town were there for the purposes of learning, and had nothing to do with the town. But, suppose a great public work was to be carried on, and thousands of navigators who had never before heard of Oxford in their lives, came and took lodgings there, every one of them might claim to be put on the register; and yet they were there not for purposes of education but for purposes equally unconnected with the town of Oxford. Why should men who went there to labour be admitted to vote, and those who went there to improve their minds be excluded?

On Question ? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 124 ; Not-Contents 76 : Majority 48.

CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.
Bradford, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Coventry, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Ellenborough, E.
Erne, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrowby, E.
Home, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lucan, E.
Macclesfield, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Manvers, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Sandwich, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shrewsbury, E. [*Teller.*]
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Wicklow, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

De Vesci, V.
Exmouth, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V.
Lifford, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Peterborough, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Audley, L.
Aveland, L.
Bagot, L.
Berners, L.
Blayney, L.
Bolton, L.
Boston, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L. [*Teller.*]
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Hylton, L.
Kingston, L. (*E. Kingston.*)
Monson, L.
Northwick, L.
Overstone, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Rollo, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Tenterden, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cleveland, D.
Grafton, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Normanby, M.
Westminster, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E. [*Teller.*]
Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Essex, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lovelace, E.
Morley, E.
Russell, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Spencer, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.
Zetland, E.

Eversley, V.
Halifax, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Sydney, V.

Chester, Bp.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Belper, L.
Blantyre, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Chesham, L.
Churchill, L.
Clermont, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dacre, L.
De Tabley, L.
Dunfermline, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Hatherton, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Leigh, L.
Lovat, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Minster, L. (*M. Conyngham.*)
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Petre, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Taunton, L.
Vernon, L.
Vivian, L.
Westbury, L.
Wrottesley, L.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

Words inserted accordingly.

Lord CAIRNS moved an Amendment to the effect that the limit of the lodger franchise should be fixed at £15 instead of £10. The Amendment, he thought, did not require much argument. This was an entirely new franchise ; from the necessity of the case it must be based upon value ; and his object was to secure a class of lodger voters who would be possessed of a certain degree of intelligence and capacity for the exercise of the franchise. Now, it was only in large towns that this franchise was likely to be of much use. In small towns no lodgers in any numbers would be placed upon the register. In large towns, however, the lodgers would be very numerous, and at the limit of £10 many of them would not be likely to exercise the franchise with advantage to the State. It seemed to him that, by placing the sum at £15, they would secure a more independent class of voters. So far as he could ascertain, *5s.* a week in London was the very smallest rent of a room in which any one could live with any self-respect. That would represent an annual rent of £13. Many persons thought the lodger franchise should be placed very much higher. His noble Friend behind him proposed to fix it at £20. That was, perhaps too high a figure; and, as a medium, he thought that £15 would be a very fair sum to insert.

Amendment *moved* to leave out ("Ten") and insert ("Fifteen.") — (*The Lord Cairns.*)

Lord RAVENSWORTH said, he had given notice of an Amendment, that the lodger franchise should be fixed at £20, and his reason was because this was the sum named in the Bill of 1859. In London the proposed limit of £10 was manifestly too low, and would bring in every description of persons. His desire was to elevate and not to debase the electoral franchise; but he was ready to withdraw his Amendment and accept the compromise of £15 proposed by his noble and learned Friend.

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, that in the Bill of 1859 the Government proposed a lodger franchise of £20, but he was ready to join his noble and learned Friend in asking their Lordships to agree to the Amendment of £15.

Earl GRANVILLE said, that this was a most singular illustration of the adherence to compromise, the necessity for which was almost the only argument urged by the noble Earl against the proposal of the noble Viscount. In the debate upon the second reading he (Earl Granville) had ventured to express his humble approval of this lodger franchise as being in itself a Reform Bill for the metropolis, adding, that in the country, a £10 limit would partake very much of middle-class franchise. Lord Derby on that occasion expressed his entire agreement with him in this opinion; and now to hear the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury), without any argument at all, accepting this Amendment surprised him more than words could express. Lord Derby had ended a very eloquent peroration by declaring that this measure was calculated to settle the question of Reform for a long time; but if they took this opportunity of raising the lodger franchise beyond the amount fixed in the House of Commons the "settlement" was scattered to the winds.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, his recollection was that Lord Derby, while approving of a lodger franchise, had not expressed approval of any particular sum at which it should be fixed.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said, they had been asked whether they were going to fly in the face of the House of Commons? Were not the Government doing so in making this alteration? The acceptance of this Amendment by the noble Earl, without one single reason for that course, must increase their Lordship's regret at the absence of Lord Derby.

The Earl of HARDWICKE said, he had nothing to do with the Bill, but felt very glad when a Motion was made to increase the franchise in any way. He was afraid of this lodger franchise; it was the most terrible part of the Bill, and he rejoiced that the Government had accepted a £15 instead of a £10 limit. In a town with which he was well acquainted the lodgers would be able to outvote the householders. He was not afraid of the householder, who was a man of property and likely to oppose its taxation; but who was the lodger? He was a person who was in no way consistent with the principle of this Bill, for he paid no rates. Was this the man to whom they were going to hand over the government of the country? If lodgers must be enfranchised, let care be taken that they were something like householders in regard to the possession of property and general responsibility; but do not let us hand power over to individuals whose notions with regard to property were not those which ought to influence the government of the country. He therefore seized with avidity upon the opportunity of striking £10 out of the clause.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY said, he honoured the noble Earl for his sincerity and for the frankness with which he avowed his reason for supporting the Amendment —he avowed, in the most straightforward manner, his opinion that the franchise had been fixed too low, and that therefore every opportunity to restrict it should be resorted to. He could not, however, agree with his argument. How was it that the noble and learned Lord opposite a short time ago told them he prefered this Bill to the Bill of last year because it went lower? Now, when they came to discuss the clauses, he regarded the £10 lodger as dangerous. As to property the lodger might easily be as responsible a person as the 40*s.* freeholder. The truth was the Government were afraid of the franchise they were about to create. They were placing it upon a democratic basis; but did their Lordships think that by the paltry expedient of raising the lodger franchise from £10 to £15 they could impose any obstacle to the advance of democracy? The attempt showed what their true opinions were; it showed that the Government had agreed to a clause in the other House, of the operation of which they were afraid.

Lord CAIRNS explained, that in what he said the other evening, he had expressed a preference for a graduated scale in respect of the lodger franchise, and the Amendment which he had moved was the embodiment of that opinion.

The Duke of RUTLAND expressed his astonishment at the conduct of noble Lords opposite who had spoken of the democratic tendencies of the measure, and yet ridiculed as "paltry" an Amendment which would, to a certain extent, limit the democratic tendency of the Bill. If it were paltry, would the noble Lord who used that expression, support an Amendment for a £20 lodger franchise? If noble Lords opposite were really alarmed at the democratic tendencies of the Bill, he hoped they would support this and other Amendments, and thus show that they really felt what they said.

The Duke of ARGYLL said, he admired the straightforwardness of his two noble Friends opposite (the Duke of Rutland and the Earl of Hardwicke) who dreaded the effects of the Bill, but he must deny that he and the noble Lords near him had expressed any alarm at household suffrage or at the lodger franchise. He didnot complain that individual Members of the Conservative party broke out into rebellion against parts of the Bill; on the contrary, he was astonished they had not rebelled before. But in proportion as he admired the strength of their party ties, he wondered at the debility of their political convictions. Much as he valued party ties, strongly as he believed they were essential to the good government of the country, and little as he appreciated the motives which influenced generally those who threw off the discipline of party, he believed that it had been maintained to an unreasonable extent by the present Government in regard to those who had always held sincere convictions adverse to the admission of the poorer classes into the constituencies. But as regards the conduct of the Government, the Opposition had a right to complain of the course pursued by the Government. Their Amendment for liberalizing the scheme of re-distribution was met by the objection that the Bill was a compact with the House of Commons, and must not be touched; but when a Tory Amendment, limiting the franchise which the other House had agreed to, was proposed, it was accepted on the part of the Government without a word of explanation; and a Member of the Government assented to the violation of that compact which was before regarded as sacred. He could tell the Government that this would be regarded by the House of Commons as a breach of faith, and was one of the most serious mistakes they had committed in the conduct of the Bill. He agreed with what had been said, that this was less important in itself than as regarded the spirit which it manifested. It might not be a matter of great importance; he believed that, except as regarded London, a lodger franchise was in the main a middle-class franchise, fixed at the line at which it was fixed by the late and agreed to by the present Government. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) had read them a lecture the other night upon the value to be set upon "hard and fixed lines;" and he said it was much better to come to household suffrage, which he defended as more Conservative. Yet he supported a Bill in which there were two "hard lines"—the lodger and the county franchises, and such was the value the noble and learned Lord set upon "hard and fixed lines," that he broke through a distinct compact made by his party with the House of Commons in order to raise the lodger franchise in this House. He believed that would be taken by the Liberal party in the House of Commons as a distinct breach of faith. The lodger franchise was not originally included in this Bill, although it was proposed by the Conservative Government of 1859, and Mr. Disraeli considered himself the father of it; but it was forced upon the Government and accepted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and, as a matter of compromise, £10 rental was changed to £10 clear annual value, which was somewhat higher. The way in which the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury) had given way without a word of explanation or defence would be regarded by the House of Commons and the country as an indication that a spirit of reaction on the part of the Government had already set in.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY explained that he had not spoken of a compact between the House of Commons and the Government as respected the whole Bill, but had said it was carried in the House of Commons by a spirit of compromise which induced parties opposing, at last, to agree on its provisions. At the time he referred to the question of re-distribution, which was the only one before the House, and he said, not that that was a compact, but a compromise. He explained that statement by reminding the House that though the Government had at first refused to add a Member to each of six large towns, they had subsequently consented to make that addition in four cases, the House of Commons deciding, upon a Motion followed by a division, that the addition should not be made to the constituencies of Sheffield and Bristol. On another point, too, he had been misrepresented. He had expressly stated that their Lordships had the right to alter any Bill that was sent up from the House of Commons; but he also said that that right ought, nevertheless, to be governed by discretion, and it certainly did become their Lordships to act with discretion on a question so important as that of re-distribution, of which a settlement, the result of a compromise, had been made in the House of Commons. But between this and the lodger franchise there was no analogy. It might be very fair to urge the existence of such an analogy in a party spirit, in one of those contests in which the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Argyll) would be perfect if he could only keep his temper a little better. ["Oh, oh!" *and laughter.*] He was glad to see the noble Duke smiling, because he thought that such a frame of mind was happier than the one in which he had just indulged. He was sorry that he did not possess as much self-confidence as the noble Duke did; but not being the possessor of so desirable a quality he should have thought it presumptuous on his part if he had risen to supplement what he regarded as the unanswerable reasons urged by his noble and learned Friend. As regarded the Amendment, he could only say that Lord Derby's Government in 1859 proposed a lodger franchise of £20, and the present Bill proposed £10. Now there was nothing inconsistent in proposing an intermediate sum between that fixed upon by the House of Commons and that proposed by the Government in 1859. In fact, unless such compromises were made they would be carrying on the Bill after the fashion in which the Bill of the late Government was carried on last year in the House of Commons.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, he was sure that none of their Lordships would accuse him of having any excessive or undue partiality for lowering the franchise. There were two classes of Amendments which might be proposed to this Bill. One class was composed of such Amendments as gave a fair promise of permanency, which might be incorporated in, and become an inseparable portion of, the Bill; and the other of such as were merely separable additions to it, which would probably not only be very soon swept away, but would, at the time of being swept away, carry with them other valuable portions of a Bill which, but for them, might have had a chance of enduring. Believing that the Amendment of his noble and learned Friend belonged to the latter class, he could not support it. He had never complained of a £10 rental qualification as such; in fact, he believed such a qualification to be good rather than otherwise—certainly good in comparison with household suffrage. What he complained of in connection with this lodger franchise was that no provision was made for the payment of the rent. He believed, therefore, that a door would be opened for very great abuse and fraud. Under this clause, in fact, he thought they were doing a very right thing in a very wrong manner. Moreover, as he had stated the other evening, he believed the £10 line to be very precarious, and that if that should give way nothing stood between that and manhood suffrage. The demand for this franchise proceeded from the large towns. Clerks and *employés* of large tradesmen, attorneys, and so on, would be equally enfranchised whether the limit was fixed at £15 or £20; but the real demand came from the artizan class in the large towns —the class which they desired to place on the same footing as the householders. If they struck out the clause and get rid of the lodger franchise altogether, the thing would be intelligible enough; though, under all the circumstances of the case, he did not think it would be advisable. But if they adopted the Amendment moved by his noble and learned Friend, and fixed the limit at £15 or £20 they would strike off two-thirds or three-fourths of those whom the House of Commons proposed to enfranchise under this clause, and the proposal would then be regarded by the class for whose benefit it was intended as a simple mockery. Remembering all the circumstances connected with the case, and the action of Her Majesty's Government in the House of Commons, he certainly preferred abiding by the clause as it at present stood:—though, he might add, he heartily concurred in the proposal which was to be made by his noble Friend opposite.

EARL RUSSELL said, he could not understand how noble Lords opposite, whose argument had been that they could find no stand-point in any figure—even in a figure so low as £8, or £6—could at the same time believe that a firm footing was to be found on so high a sum as £15. To strike out the clause altogether would be more consistent with the principles of the old Conservative party; but did they imagine that a £15 franchise would last for a single Session? If this Amendment were carried there would be an immediate agitation for the reduction to £10, while the advocates of manhood suffrage would, of course, attempt to get rid of any limit whatever.

THE EARL OF ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, if this Bill had come up to your Lordships' House with the amount fixed at £15 instead of £10, I should have been much better pleased; but we must look at the circumstances under which it is proposed to substitute £15. As I understand, from what has passed, the circumstances are these. In 1859 a lodger franchise was proposed; but the present Bill, as originally introduced into the House of Commons, did not contain a lodger franchise. A £15 lodger franchise was proposed by a private Member; and the Leader of the Government in that acceded to a Motion for reducing it to £10. Believing it to be a part of the unwritten law of Parliament that what a Government support in one House they should support in the other, I cannot, whatever may be my own view in favour of £15 in preference to £10, support the Government in departing from that law.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY: The Government may be compelled to yield to pressure in one House, but I would ask whether on that account they are to be tied hand and foot in the other House? Are the Government to be precluded entirely from listening in this House to any proposition to amend what has been done in the House of Commons? I think there would be some force in the objection now made against the course taken by the Government if they of their own accord had proposed to raise the lodger qualification to £15; but as the proposition has not come from them, I cannot concur in the observation of the noble Earl who has just addressed your Lordships.

EARL GRANVILLE: I entirely agree with the noble Earl (the Earl of Harrowby) as to the independence of the House and their right to make Amendments; but what I object to is the attempt to tie us down by telling us that we cannot fly in the face of the House of Commons when we propose to make Amendments in the redistribution scheme; and then, as soon as a Conservative and reactionary Amendment is proposed, the representative of the Government should jump up, and without assigning any reason for departing from the compromise to which they had come in the other House, not yielding to pressure, but on the mere speech of the proposer, express an intention of accepting it.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY: My noble Friend (the Earl of Ellenborough) is as jealous of the independence of this House as any of your Lordships can possibly be; but his position is, that an agreement made by the Leader in one House ought to be adopted by the Leader in the other House. I have no hesitation in saying that the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord would improve the lodger franchise. I am convinced that the £10 lodger franchise will bring in many voters who are only just above the condition of paupers; but, whatever may be the view which I take of the lodger clause, the latter is now irrevocable, and if your Lordships make an alteration in it, so far from closing the question, you do but open it. If we wish to keep the franchise up to the present amount, we had better agree to the clause as it comes from the House of Commons; for if it should comes under discussion in that House, next Session, or in the first Session of the next Parliament, the amount will be reduced below £10—perhaps, to 2*s.* 6*d.* a week.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: I wish to understand what the House hold to be the position of the Government. When, in the early part of the evening, I refused on the part of the Government to accede to a proposition for opening the whole redistribution scheme, I was told that was extraordinary conduct on my part. Now, three hours after, I am told that the Government ought not to give way on anything which the Leader of the other House has agreed to.

EARL GREY: I did not understand the noble Earls on the Opposition side to contend that the Government is bound to maintain the Bill exactly in its present shape, nor do I see any inconsistency between their condemnation of the course taken by the Government on this Amendment, and what they said earlier in the evening, when they objected, and I think justly objected, to the statement that this House had no right to exercise an independent judgment at all. The Government and the House must exercise their judgment on the various points as they arise, and I am very far from saying that in no case ought the Government to yield to the arguments urged in favour of Amendments that are proposed; but there are certain leading provisions of the Bill which, once adopted, it would be extremely difficult and most dangerous to depart from, especially when the provisions it is proposed to alter were introduced into the Bill in the other House with the concurrence and approval of the Ministers in that House. This appears to me to be one of those leading and important provisions of the Bill to which the Ministers were thus committed; and therefore I was surprised to hear Her Majesty's Government, without assigning any reason, state to this House that they were quite prepared to adopt the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord. This is a course which they certainly ought not to have pursued. I agree with the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Shaftesbury), that the only result of altering the £10 limit will be to carry the franchise lower. Without going into the question of the lodger franchise, I must say that after what has been done in the matter I cannot support the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord.

LORD CAIRNS: I wish to say a few words before your Lordships divide on this question. The observations made by the noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) and by the three noble Earls on the opposite side raise a point that is deserving of consideration. Is this proposition laid down—that any number of Amendments may be proposed by noble Lords opposite and by noble Lords on the cross-Benches, going even to the overthrow of the whole Bill, and be discussed fully and fairly, no one being allowed to suggest that, as this Bill comes from the other House of Parliament, it ought not to be summarily condemned; but that the moment an Amendment comes from this side of the House it ought to be summarily rejected, on the ground that there has been a compact or compromise in the other House; and that even where no compact or compromise can be suggested everything done in the other House is to be regarded as infallible, and your Lordships are not to agree to any Amendment? I am very anxious that this Bill should become law; I am very anxious that there should not be even the appearance of a collision between this and the other House of Parliament; and therefore I, for my part, should be perfectly willing, though I think Amendments are required, to accept the Bill as it comes to us, and have it passed into law. But we must either accept it in that way or consider it open to Amendment throughout. Her Majesty's Government must either deal with each Amendment on its merits, or apply the same rule of indiscriminate opposition to all Amendments, come from whatever quarter they may;—which latter course would no doubt facilitate very much the discussion of the Bill. Now, as to the compact which is suggested, I think it would be very difficult to find who were the parties to a compact or compromise in this case; but if I supposed that the amount of £10 was deliberately settled by the House of Commons after a full discussion of the different figures I should be extremely unwilling to open the question—especially as the Bill has to go down to that House again. The noble Duke is mistaken, I am informed, in supposing that the figure of £15 was ever proposed and the figure of £10 taken as more acceptable to the Government. I do not state the fact of my own knowledge; but I am assured that there was no dicussion as between different figures—that the only proposition submitted to the House was one by an independent Member, proposing to fill up the blank in the clause with the words "Ten Pounds." I repeat that if it had been a matter of deliberate discussion and determination by the other House of Parliament, I should not have asked your Lordships to re-open this matter, which I quite agree with noble

Lords who have spoken is a small matter, whatever my individual opinion might be. But I believe that no such discussion or determination took place; and, therefore, I do think it desirable, if your Lordships should concur in the opinion that the figure of £15, as against the figure of £10, should be inserted in the Bill, and thereby submitted to the other House of Parliament, who will have an opportunity of considering the Amendments, and of saying whether they think it desirable or not to insist on the lower figure.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: If the noble and learned Lord will allow me to say so, he is not quite right as to the matter of fact. I believe the fact was that a £10 rental was proposed to the House of Commons. It was then suggested, as an Amendment, that either a £15 rental, or a £12 rating should be substituted.

LORD CAIRNS: Rating!

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: Yes, either a £12 rating or a £15 rental.

LORD CAIRNS: There could be no rating in the case of a lodger.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX: At all events, the plan which was ultimately carried by compromise between the two sides of the House, and assented to by the Government, was the amount of £10 clear yearly value.

LORD DENMAN hoped that the Government would not consent to this alteration, which, for the first time, disturbed the text of this Reform Bill.

On Question, That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 89; Not-Contents 121: Majority 32.

CONTENTS.

Cleveland, D.
Grafton, D.
Somerset, D.
Sutherland, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Camden, M.
Normanby, M.
Westminster, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.

Essex, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E.
Harrowby, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lovelace, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Powis, E.
Russell, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Spencer, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.
Zetland, E.

Halifax, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Sydney, V.

Chester, Bp.

Audley, L.
Bateman, L.
Belper, L.
Blantyre, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Chesham, L.
Churchill, L. [*Teller.*]
Clermont, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dacre, L.
Denman, L.
De Tabley, L.
Dunfermline, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.

Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Leigh, L.
Londesborough, L.
Lovat, L.
Lyveden, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Minster, L. (*M. Conyngham.*)
Monson, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Rollo, L.
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Taunton, L.
Vernon, L.
Vivian, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.
Westbury, L.
Wrottesley, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Rutland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.
Bradford, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cardigan, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Coventry, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Erne, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)

Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Home, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Lucan, E.
Macclesfield, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Romney, E.
Rosse, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Wicklow, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

De Vesci, V.
Exmouth, V.
Hawarden, V.
Lifford, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Oxford, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Arundell of Wardour, L.
Aveland, L.
Bagot, L.
Berners, L.
Bolton, L.
Boston, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L. [*Teller.*]
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
De Ros, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Hylton, L.
Kingston, L. (*E. Kingston.*)
Lyttelton, L.
Northwick, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Petre, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L. [*Teller.*]
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Templemore, L.
Tenterden, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wynford, L.

Word "Ten" *struck out* accordingly.

Then it was *moved* to insert the word "Fifteen."

Motion *agreed to.*

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY moved an Amendment in Line 32, after ("*July*") to insert ("and shall not during the same Twelve Months have received or applied for Parochial Relief").

Lord CAIRNS said, there was a general clause in the old Reform Act disqualifying from being registered as voters for a city or a borough, all persons who had received parochial relief within the previous twelve months; and by the 37th clause of the present Bill it was enacted that that section of the Reform Act (the 36th) should apply to the case of a county as well as that of a city or borough; so that no such person should be registered as a voter for a county. It was also provided that the Reform Act and the present measure should be read as one Act. Thus, as the Bill stood, it perfectly attained the object which the noble Earl had in view, and did not require any alteration whatever in that respect.

Earl RUSSELL said, the provision in the Reform Act to which the noble and learned Lord had just referred did not apply to the freeholder, but only to the occupier.

Earl GREY said, it was necessary, not only to prevent persons who were in receipt of parochial relief from voting, but also from being put upon the register.

Lord CAIRNS said, that the 36th section of the Reform Act was directed specifically against the registration of such persons. That section of the Reform Act would be read along with that Bill, and thus become virtually a part of it; and it would also be extended to counties as well as cities and boroughs.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that, once a man's name was on the register he would be entitled to a vote, even though he might have received parochial relief after the time of registration.

Lord CAIRNS said, that if their Lordships desired to make the receipt of parochial relief between the time of registration and the time of an election a disqualification they would, in the first place, be introducing an entirely new principle, and, in the next place, the Amendment of the noble Earl would not answer the purpose, for it spoke only of the twelve months before registration

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Property Franchise in Counties).

The Earl of HARROWBY proposed an Amendment altering the copyhold property qualification from £5 to £10.

Moved, To leave out ("Five") and insert ("Ten").—(*The Earl of Harrowby.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the Government in the other House proposed £10 as the copyhold qualification, and were beaten, and therefore it was quite competent for them to accept the proposal of the noble Earl without being charged with inconsistency.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Earl GRANVILLE put it to the Government, whether it was wise on the part of the House to make a number of restrictions in the franchise as settled by the House of Commons. It was rather a blot in the Bill that it went so low in the borough franchise and so high in the county franchise. Persons living outside the borough boundary would, as it was, feel great discontent at seeing their neighbours vote for so small a qualification, and it would be unwise to increase this difference between the county and the borough franchise. Noble Lords opposite seemed to take every opportunity of restricting the franchise agreed to in the other House.

EARL FORTESCUE said, he should have liked to have seen a comprehensive Reform Bill. He thought it very desirable that the county franchise should be kept up to prevent property being swamped. He feared that the present Bill would be anything but a satisfactory settlement of the question, and he could not help confessing that he took a very gloomy view of the political situation.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX said, that £5 leaseholders and copyholders were clearly richer than 40*s*. freeholders, and ought, therefore, to be enfranchised, if it was desired that property should have influence.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY urged the injustice of allowing the agricultural interests to be swamped by small leaseholders and copyholders living in the large boroughs. He would move to omit the clause.

Moved, to leave out Clause 5.—(*The Earl of Harrowby*).

LORD LYVEDEN deprecated these wretched nibblings at the Bill. To put themselves in collision with the House of Commons on mere questions of a £5 or £10 copyhold franchise, and a £10 or £15 lodger franchise would serve no useful purpose, and would only discredit their Lordships in the eyes of the country. He hoped the Government would adhere to the clause as it stood.

On Question, That the said clause stand part of the Bill? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 56; Not-Contents 118: Majority 62.

CONTENTS.

Grafton, D.
Somerset, D.
Sutherland, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Camden, M.
Normanby, M.

Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E. [*Teller*.]
Camperdown, E.
Cowper, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lovelace, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Sommers, E.
Spencer, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.

Halifax, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Sydney, V.

Chester, Bp.

Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Chesham, L.
Churchill, L. [*Teller.*]
Cranworth, L.
Dacre, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L
Houghton, L.
Leigh, L.
Londesborough, L.
Lyveden, L.
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Northbrook, L.
Petre, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Seaton, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Vivian, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Rutland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M. [*Teller.*]

Amherst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.
Bradford, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cardigan, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Eldon, E.
Erne, E.
Fortescue, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Grey, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrowby, E. [*Teller.*]
Home, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Macclesfield, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.
Zetland, E.

De Vesci, V.
Exmouth, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V.
Lifford, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Oxford, Bp.
Peterborough, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Arundell of Wardour, L.
Aveland, L.
Bagot, L.
Bateman, L.
Berners, L.
Blantyre, L.
Boston, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L.
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Clinton, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Heytesbury, L.

Hylton, L.
Kingston, L. (*E. Kingston.*)
Northwick, L.
Raglan, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Rollo, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Templemore, L.
Vivian, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wharncliffe, L.
Wynford, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Clause 6 (Occupation Franchise in Counties) amended and *agreed to.*

House *resumed;* and to be again in Committee *To-morrow.*

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE BILL—(No. 99.)—THIRD READING.

(*The Duke of Richmond.*)

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Duke of Richmond.*)

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY asked for explanations with regard to the retirement of certain officers in connection with the Board.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND said, that Papers had been presented to the House showing that a Committee, consisting of Mr. Hunt, Secretary to the Treasury, and the Vice President of the Board of Trade, had been appointed to inquire into the organization of the department with a view to see whether any improvement could be effected in it. The Committee, having gone into the whole matter, decided that it was advisable to abolish one of the permanent Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries; to appoint four Secretaries, for the four departments into which the Board was divided; that there should be a Parliamentary Secretary instead of the Vice President; and a permanent Secretary, who should have equal rank with the Parliamentary Secretary. It was impossible to speak in too high terms of the ability of the gentleman who held the office of legal Adviser, or to say how great was the regret with which everyone connected with the Board heard the announcement that that gentleman intended to retire. The Committee recommended that the office should be abolished. The legal Adviser had partly held the Assistant Secretaryship of the Railway Department in connection with the post of legal Adviser, and he was offered that post. He declined it, however, on the ground that the duties were more than he could undertake to discharge satisfactorily. The Committee were also of opinion that the post of Permanent Secretary, which was filled by Sir Emerson Tennent, ought to be abolished. Of course it would not be abolished as long as Sir Emerson Tennent chose to fulfil the duties of it, and he might have remained in the office as long as he lived had he so pleased; but he agreed to give it up in order that the new arrangements might be carried out, and to receive a retiring pension. He did not retire, however, upon full pension, though the recommendation made to the Treasury was, he believed, that in consideration of his services, both in the colonies and at home, he should receive full pension. He was informed, however, that Sir Emerson Tennent was to receive less than he was entitled to. Instead of £1,500 per annum, to which he was entitled, he was only to receive £1,200.

Motion *agreeed to;* Bill read 3ª accordingly, and *passed.*

House adjourned at half-past Twelve
o'clock A.M. 'till half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, July 29, 1867.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* Downpatrick, *v.* David Stewart Ker, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—Dominica Loan.*

First Reading—Skipton Grammar School * [290]; Militia Pay *; Dominica Loan * [291].

Second Reading—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2) * [285]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [288]; Prorogation of Parliament * [277]; Patriotic Fund * [278]; Naval Stores (No. 2) * [289].

Committee—Parks Regulation (*re-comm.*) [273] [R.P.]; Customs Revenue * [238]; Inland Revenue * [239]; Metropolis Subways * (*re-comm.*) [249].

Report—Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* [244]; Customs Revenue * [238]; Inland Revenue * [239]; Metropolis Subways * (*re-comm.*) [249].

Third Reading—Customs Duties (Isle of Man)* [253]; Poor Law Board, &c.* [271]; District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland)* [269]; Admiralty Court (Ireland)* [209]; Indemnity* [280]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* [281], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Parliamentary Elections* (*re-comm.*) [247]; Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment* [124].

IRELAND—POOR LAW MEDICAL SALARIES.—QUESTION.

Sir **FREDERICK HEYGATE** said, he would beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the Government approve of the recommendation of the Poor Law Commissioners for Ireland with respect to the Grant from the Consolidated Fund of "a moiety of the cost of medical salaries and of medical appliances in Irish workhouses and dispensaries"—namely, "that a large portion of the Grant should be applied to improve the medical arrangements of unions on the Western Coast of Ireland;" and, whether such an apportionment of the Grant would not be in distinct opposition to the practice in England of the re-payment of a moiety of the medical salaries and appliances of each union; contrary also to the intention of the Select Committee on Irish Taxation, who first called attention to the subject, and, in fact, involving an application of the principle of a "rate in aid?"

Lord **NAAS** said, that in the early part of this year, when the Grant was voted for the first time by Parliament, he, on the part of the Poor Law Commissioners, submitted to the Treasury some suggestions as to the mode in which it was advisable to distribute the sum. It was finally determined that it would not be desirable to depart during the present year from the rule adopted in England—namely, that the money should be given in proportion to the expense incurred by the Union. The Grant for the year would, therefore, be distributed on that principle. If the proposal made by the Poor Law Commission had been carried out, the county which the hon. Member represented would have been benefited to the amount of £115, and Galway, another county which objected to the proposal, would also have been benefited. He therefore did not think that the question was properly understood in Ireland. With regard to the second portion of the Question, he must remind the hon. Member that this grant was, in fact, a rate in aid given from the Imperial to the local funds; and he hoped that that fact would be borne in mind in considering this question in another year.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL.—QUESTION.

Viscount **ENFIELD** said, he would beg to ask the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge, Whether, looking to the state of public business, the advanced period of the Session, and the importance of the interests concerned in the Public Schools Bill, he intends proceeding with that measure during the present Session?

Mr. **WALPOLE** said, it was important that they should go on with the Bill as soon as possible, as the subject had been two years before the House. He therefore proposed to put the Bill for a second reading for Friday after Supply, and to go into Committee on it on the following Tuesday morning.

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION AND CAPITULAR ESTATES MANAGEMENT ACT.—QUESTION.

Mr. **WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE** said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is intended to make any alteration in the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Commission or of the Church Estates Commission, as to the number or powers of the Commissioners and their Staff; or whether the Episcopal and Capitular Estates Management Act will be prolonged by a simple Continuance Bill?

Mr. **GATHORNE HARDY** said, the Government had no intention of making any alteration in the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Commission, or of the Church Estates Commission; and, as to the second part of the Question, the Capitular Estates Management Act would be continued by the Expiring Acts Continuance Bill.

ARMY—THE 86th REGIMENT.

QUESTION.

Mr. **WHALLEY** said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the detention of the 86th regiment when bound for the Mauritius, at the Cape, Whether it is the intention to make any and what compensation to the Officers for the extra expenses they have been compelled to incur, there being as alleged no preparation for them at Port Elizabeth, the station to which they were so ordered?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, that the 86th had been detained at the Cape on their way to the Mauritius on account of the dreadful fever which had lately prevailed in that colony. He had not heard any complaints of the officers having incurred any extra expense. Till he had an account before him he could not say what course he might be inclined to take in regard to compensation for extra expenses.

FRANCE, PRUSSIA, AND DENMARK.

QUESTION.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the French Government have remonstrated with that of Prussia against their requiring any engagement as to the protection of the German population of North Schleswig from Denmark as the condition of their giving effect to the Fifth Article of the Treaty of Prague; and, whether the English Government have offered any opinion on the subject?

Lord STANLEY said, that communications had passed between the Governments of Prussia and France upon the subject referred to in the hon. Gentleman's Question. With regard to the precise nature of those communications he did not think he should be justified in going into detail, inasmuch as all the information that had reached England was of a confidential character; and the Governments concerned would, no doubt, make it public when they thought fit to do so. Her Majesty's Government had offered no opinion whatever on the subject.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (SCOTLAND) BILL.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN OGILVY: I desire to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to proceed with the Scotch Reform Bill this evening; and, whether he will make any statement to the House respecting that Bill, and the alterations which are proposed to be made in it? Great interest prevails in Scotland respecting what it is intended to do regarding this Bill.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, in answer to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say that it is not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to proceed with the Scotch Reform Bill, either this evening, or any other evening this Session. An hon. Gentleman the other evening expressed a wish that the Bill might be reprinted, in order that the alteration agreed to be made in it should be shown. I see no difficulty on that head, and what I intend to propose is, that the House should go into Committee on the Bill *pro formâ*, in order that it may be reprinted. But it would be clearly premature to go into Committee *pro formâ* to-night, because we do not as yet know what alterations may be effected in the English Bill in another place, and we could not, therefore, adapt the Scotch Bill to those alterations. What I intend is, that the Committee on the Bill should be fixed for this day week.

Colonel FRENCH: I should like to ask, Whether it is intended that there should be any discussion on the Scotch Reform Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I do not contemplate any discussion on the Bill, as we are merely going into Committee upon it *pro formâ*.

Mr. M'LAREN: On Friday night an answer was given on behalf of the Government that an opportunity would be given for discussion of the Scotch Reform Bill, and I should now like the Chancellor of the Exchequer to state when that opportunity will be offered?

Colonel FRENCH: Next Session.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am not aware of the answer to which the hon. Gentleman refers. I thought I had expressed in the most distinct manner that it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to proceed with the Scotch Reform Bill this Session; and, further, I understood that that was an arrangement which was agreeable, if not to the whole, at least to a large majority of the Scotch Members. They will, therefore, make their arrangements accordingly. What I subsequently promised, and what I have already referred to, is, that the Bill should go into Committee *pro formâ*, for the purpose of being reprinted, and to show the alterations proposed in it.

Mr. M'LAREN: I beg to inform the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it was the hon Baronet the Member for Ayrshire (Sir James Fergusson) who gave the answer on Friday night to which I referred. He distinctly said that an opportunity would be given to the Scotch Members for discussing the Bill.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON: I may, perhaps, be allowed to say that what I said on Friday night, with the sanction of my Colleagues, was, that no progress would be made with the Scotch Reform Bill without an opportunity being given to discuss it. But I never understood, or was authorized to say, that any progress would be made.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

RESOLUTION.

Colonel NORTH said, that he had to bring under the consideration of the House the cases of Lieutenant Frederick Nind Woodall and Lieutenant and Adjutant Henry Currie, of the 74th Highlanders, and Lieutenant and Adjutant Romaine F. Stirke, 69th Regiment. The case of these officers was that of those who had arrived at the top of their several ranks. Their regiments being under orders for foreign service—the 74th being increased by two companies, and the 69th by two companies—these officers considered that after their long and faithful services a grievous injustice was done them, by being passed over with respect to promotion. The senior lieutenant of the 74th Highlanders was an officer of fourteen years service, and had been for six years musketry instructor of his regiment, and at the School of Musketry, Hythe. Lieutenant and Adjutant Currie, was an officer of sixteen years service, and had been ten years adjutant of his regiment. Lieutenant and Adjutant Stirke had been nine years adjutant and between three and four years senior subaltern, but they had both been purchased over on several occasions. In 1866 an agreement was entered into between the Secretary of State for War and the Treasury, by which sixty commissions were given away, thirty majors being made lieutenant-colonels, and thirty captains being made majors. In his opinion twenty out of the sixty commissions thus given away should have been awarded to the subalterns. This agreement was not brought under the consideration of the House of Commons; if it had, he (Colonel North) should certainly have objected to it on the ground that it set aside the interests of the old subalterns, who were in no way considered. He, however, did not now mean to find fault with either the present Secretary for War (Sir John Pakington) or the noble Lord opposite, the head of that department under the late Government (the Marquess of Hartington), believing that they were both influenced by their sense of justice in the matter. What he did find fault with was, that officers of such merit and length of service as those in question should be passed over for any money consideration. Since 1861 the Treasury had taken out of the reserve fund no less a sum than £342,000 for the purpose of buying up half-pay commissions. He protested against this course on the part of the Treasury, because both the infantry and cavalry had contributed largely to that fund. If it were considered an advantage to buy up the half-pay of those officers, and save the amount to the country, the money to do so should have come out of the Consolidated Fund, or be made the subject of a special Vote. He found that this year only 143 commissions, including those of quartermasters, had been given away, while 400 had been sold. This was a great hardship upon the cadets at Sandhurst, who had been given to understand that those of them who obtained 1,950 marks would obtain commissions without purchase, whereas, in fact, out of forty cadets who were lately examined and divided into two classes, only seven out of the first and five out of the second received commissions. It was very unjust to have sold one of these 400 commissions while the forty cadets who had obtained the requisite number of marks were unprovided for. He begged to make the Motion of which he had given notice.

General DUNNE said, he seconded the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member, which he regarded as being of the utmost importance to the interests of many of the most deserving officers of the army. The question was one of money only, and though the present cases were strong ones, he knew of many cases of equal hardship with those which had been adverted to by the hon. and gallant Member. He regarded the system of purchase as most anomalous and disgraceful, and as long as it continued he did not well see how any effective remedy could be applied to the present state of things. It was worth noting, perhaps, that the practice had become worse since it had been mooted in that House, and it was carried so far that adjutancies in the militia and Volunteers were sold in the most barefaced manner. Nothing could be more disheartening to a soldier than to know that after he had spent many years in the service and had well earned promotion, he was to be passed over by the system of purchase. He trusted that the evils so justly complained of would be speedily put an end to, especially as this might easily be done by a slight expenditure on the part of the very country.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, no money considerations should delay the promotion of Lieutenant Frederick Nind Woodall and Lieutenant and Adjutant Henry Currie of the 74th Highlanders, and Lieutenant and Adjutant Romaine F. Stirke, 69th Regiment,"—(*Colonel North,*)

—instead thereof.

COLONEL STUART KNOX said, that his hon. and gallant Friend had forgotten to state that these lieutenants had actually seen more service than one of the majors of the regiment. Would his right hon. Friend (Sir John Pakington) say that these officers, who had already been passed over, should for a second or third time be treated in a similar manner? The question was, he thought one of justice and not of money, and he had such confidence in his right hon. Friend as to believe that he had only to have the case brought before him to have justice done. He felt certain that the Treasury would listen to any recommendation on the subject made by the Secretary of State for War.

MR. PERCY WYNDHAM said, that the case now brought under the notice of the House was by no means a singular one. Not long ago, in the 60th Regiment, the two senior majors obtained unattached lieutenant-colonelcies. Two of the captains received the steps to which they were justly entitled, but in order to keep up the reserve fund the two lieutenants who ought to have been promoted were passed over. One of these officers, who had seen a great deal of active service, had been similarly treated fourteen times. It was, moreover, understood that, though there were two fresh companies to be formed, these officers would again be passed over to benefit the reserve fund.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, he must decline entering into a discussion on the reserve fund until the Report of the Committee had been presented, which had been appointed to consider all the circumstances connected with that fund. The case of the 3d West India Regiment, to which the hon. and gallant Member for the Queen's County had alluded, was entirely different from that of the three lieutenants whose case had been brought forward by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Oxfordshire, and he would only say, with respect to that case, that he had already dealt with it in the manner in which justice required it should be dealt with. He had not the slightest doubt that these three officers were fully deserving of the high character that they had received from his hon. and gallant Friend, and he did not yield to him in his regret for the painful position in which officers were placed who had been purchased over and over again. That, however, was an evil incidental to the purchase system. With respect to the immediate case of these three officers it turned upon a change of system in the army which was adopted by the late Government about two years ago. They at that time found it necessary to reduce the strength of the army, and they determined to do that by cutting off two companies from every battalion of the thirty-five or forty then quartered at home. Great inconvenience and great hardship to individual officers had arisen from the policy which was then adopted by the late Government of having regiments abroad of one strength and regiments at home of another strength. It was out of this arrangement—the policy of which he greatly doubted, and the results of which he very much regretted—that the immediate case of these officers had arisen. There were no less than 240 officers—captains, lieutenants, and ensigns—of the battalions so reduced, for whom it became necessary in some manner to provide. The arrangement made was this. The Treasury consented to promote sixty captains, without purchase to brevet rank, on the understanding that all the remaining officers were to continue as supernumeraries in their different regiments to be absorbed into those regiments as vacancies occurred. The present case was the result of that arrangement. The 69th regiment, to which Lieutenant Stirke belonged, was under orders to go abroad, and would, consequently be increased by two companies. When that regiment was formerly reduced one of the captains remained with the regiment as supernumerary, and the other was among the sixty officers promoted. The supernumerary captain would, consequently, be appointed to one of the vacant companies, and the other appointment would be filled by one of the officers who on the former occasion did not receive promotion. In the case of the 74th, also, the same course would be pursued. Thus two of the supernumerary officers were to be brought in from half-pay to fill up the vacancies occurring under the arrangement entered into between the War office and the Treasury. He was extremely sorry if any disappointment had been experienced by the officers in question, but he reminded the House that they would not be in any worse position than they would have been had no reduction of the regiment taken place. They would remain exactly in the same position, and their ill-fortune, if any, arose rather from the system of purchase and the unfortunate fact that they could not buy promotion, than from anything like injustice on the part of the army authorities. But, while he sympathized with the officers, he did not see how he could disregard, in their favour, so distinct an arrangement as that under which their case came. In the case of the 4th Hussars he had prevented the occurrence of unpleasantness, but his hon. and gallant Friend knew that circumstances permitted his dealing in a satisfactory manner with that regiment. The event showed how inexpedient it was to have different establishments at home and abroad. The cause of this disappointment was traceable to what he considered the unfortunate arrangement to which he had referred. It would be his duty before Parliament met again to devise some arrangement by which these cases might be put an end to in a legitimate manner by equalizing the strength of the regiment whether stationed at home or abroad.

MR. MONSELL said, he was disappointed at the answer given by the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for War. It was a cruel thing, because officers of long service and of the highest merit and reputation did not happen to have sufficient money with which to buy promotion, that they should therefore be deprived of that advancement in their profession to which they were legitimately entitled. It was the duty of the Government to mitigate the hardships of the present system, which they could do when opportunities like the present arose. He thought the House ought to adopt the motion of his hon. and gallant Friend, and not reject it for some pitiful saving of the reserve fund. No money consideration ought to interfere with the promotion of these officers.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided* :—Ayes 65; Noes 54: Majority 11.

REVENUES OF INDIA.—QUESTIONS:

MR. OTWAY said, that he rose to put Questions—certain Questions of which he had given notice — to the Secretary for India with respect to the authority possessed by him to draw on the revenues of India for purposes of expenditure in this country. The subject was one which involved grave constitutional considerations. The right hon. Gentleman had some time ago informed the House that he was about to give an entertainment to the Sultan, the expenses of which were to be derived from the Indian revenue. That entertainment was, he understood from those who were present, a very magnificent affair, and he should say nothing more with respect to it beyond correcting an error into which the right hon. Gentleman had fallen. He had spoken of the entertainment as one, which, as a matter of policy, it was desirable to give the Sultan, in consequence of his being the head of the Mahomedan religion, imagining that it would produce a good effect among the Mussulman population in India. He was, however, afraid that the right hon. Gentleman would find himself very much deceived in that regard, for the newspapers in India which would contain an account of the entertainment were almost, without exception, in the hands of the Hindoos. There was not, he believed, a single instance in which one belonged to a Mussulman, and the Hindoo press could not be well disposed towards the Chief of the Mussulmans. He did not wish to say a single word as to the guests who had been invited to the entertainment, beyond stating it to be his opinion that it was desirable, inasmuch as the expense was to be defrayed entirely out of the taxes of India, that the names should be found in the list of those who were more particularly identified with the interests of that country. He quite understood, however, that the right hon. Gentleman had a great pressure put on him, and he had no doubt that if he could have followed his own inclination he would have wished to issue invitations to all those who might have desired to be present on the occasion.

He was perfectly satisfied that the right hon. Gentleman would never seek to spend money belonging to the Indian Treasury for the purposes of his party; but, there was nothing to prevent him from doing so, provided he were so disposed. If he possessed the power to give an entertainment, the cost of which might be £20,000 or £50,000, without the sanction of Parliament, it was a power not possessed by any other Secretary of State or Minister of the Crown; and he might, perhaps be able to draw out the whole £50,000,000 constituting the Indian revenue. The right hon. Gentleman had great power over the revenues of India, and the mode of transacting business was not satisfactory. He (Mr. Otway) had called for a Return respecting the expenditure, and the granting of it did the right hon. Gentleman infinite credit. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to court inquiry, and thereby relieved himself from the censure that might otherwise be cast upon him. The expenditure was not confined to entertainments such as that to which he had just been referring. It appeared that the right hon. Gentleman had the power, if the Commander-in-Chief in India or any of the military authorities got into bad odour, of making matters square by offering considerable sums by way of "hush money." A flagrant instance of that sort occurred in the case of Captain Jervis, which the right hon. Gentleman decided by a short note, stating that he would give him £1,800 if he would call at the India Office. Now, that was not, in his opinion, a satisfactory way of conducting the business of the Department, nor did he think the right hon. Gentleman possessed any such power until he saw the Return which he held in his hands. The Return was a most singular document, and was accompanied by another relating to the bounty of the Crown. The bounty of the Crown, he found, was conferred on Mr. H. J. Toogood, to the extent of £40 a year, for his connection with literary pursuits and Parliamentary reporting, and in consequence of his now being blind and paralyzed. Corresponding with that, in the case of India, he perceived that a pension of £60 was awarded to a lieutenant who had been drunk on duty, and who had been cashiered by court-martial. Then, again, the bounty of the Crown was given to Mr. G. T. Thompson in consideration of his services in connection with periodical literature, he being now afflicted with blindness, to the extent of £40 a year, while £242 was allotted to a major in the Indian service who had been charged with having indulged in abusive conduct towards the authorities. It would appear from the contrast thus furnished that those who committed offences were those who were awarded the largest sums of money. He was informed by a gallant officer (Lieutenant Percy), then within the walls of the House, that the Return having reference to India was entirely inaccurate. Lieutenant Percy was the son of a distinguished brigadier-general. He said that he was charged with "inefficiency," but that he had claimed a court-martial and had indignantly refused, under the circumstances, to accept the sum of £50 a year which was offered him. It appeared his offence was that, having married into an Indian family, he had introduced to the mess of his brother officers his brother-in-law, who was a person of dark colour, and that he was ordered to send in his resignation, but that he refused to do so. Nevertheless, the £50 a-year was offered to him, but he declined by accepting it to be mixed up with fraudulent and drunken men. He had subsequently been induced, under protest, to accept it. He should not enter further into the subject on that occasion, as the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets had signified it to be his intention to bring the whole subject before the House before long, and should conclude by asking the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for India, whether there was any, and, if any, what limit to the sums of money which the Secretary of State for India in Council might expend in this country without obtaining the sanction of Parliament; and, should the balance in the Home Treasury be insufficient to meet any exceptional expenditure incurred by the Secretary of State for India in Council, whether there was any, and, if any, what limit to the sum for which he might draw on the revenues of India; and if the Secretary of State for India could fix the day for the discussion of the Indian Budget?

Colonel SYKES said, that he altogether approved of the ball. We had in India 15,000,000 of Mahomedan subjects, many of whom were of the same sect as the Sultan himself—the descendants, in fact, of the Caliph of Bagdad, who regarded the Sultan as their Pope. A compliment to the Sultan would touch the feelings of these Mahomedans. As a matter of policy, therefore, he highly approved of the compliment paid to the Sultan. The

Secretary of State, autocrat as he might be in most matters, was under the most complete control with regard to money, for, of his own motion, he could not spend a shilling of the Indian revenues. All was in the hands of the council, which consisted of fifteen members.

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he would suggest that it would be more convenient to discuss the subject when the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) brought forward the Motion of which he had given notice. The hon. and gallant Gentleman who had just sat down had stated, with perfect accuracy, that the expenditure was in the hands of the Indian Council—that being the intention of Parliament when the Act of 1858 was passed. Unless they could place the entire expenditure for India under the control of the House, it would be difficult to deal specially with any particular portion of it. They could not control Indian finance effectively "piecemeal." There was a large home expenditure for stores ordered for India. He did not suppose the hon. Gentleman contemplated that when he asked if there was any limit to the power of the Secretary of State over the expenditure of money for home purposes. There was no such limit, because they could not know what the demand for stores might be in any year, and there was no other fund on which they could draw. He did not know of any distinction between the Indian Home Treasury and the revenues of India. There might be a sum of money that came into the hands of the Government of India by payments from railways and others, and by the sale of bills on India, but he could not distinguish any difference between the one and the other. The whole of the revenues of India were at the disposal of the Secretary of State and Council, and they drew upon them for all the expenditure which the service in this country or out of this country required. There was a limit to the salaries of the Secretary, Under Secretary, and the members of the Council, which could not be altered by them. There was also a provision that the Secretary of State and Council should not increase the debt of India without the sanction of the House, and that the return of the expenditure should be laid before the House within fourteen days after the 1st of May. He agreed that they should, as far as possible, let the House know what was going on, and how the power of the Secretary of State was exercised. The allowances referred to were awarded to prevent the scandal that would arise from dismissed officers being left in a state of absolute destitution. The payments assumed the character of compassionate subsistence allowances. He rather approved of the power of making compassionate grants, for they enabled the authorities to get rid of officers where the good of the service required such a step to be taken, without leaving the discharged men to starve. At the same time there was no doubt a great deal to be said against it; but it would be more convenient to take a discussion upon the matter when the hon. Member (Mr. Ayrton) brought forward the Motion of which he had given notice.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £74,621, to complete the sum for the British Museum.

MR. WALPOLE said, he had to move, in the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe), and by his request, the Vote for the British Museum. Upon a comparison of the Estimates it would be found that some items had increased and some decreased. The items of increase had chiefly reference to salaries and purchases. The Estimate for last year amounted to £102,744, while that for the present year was £99,621, or £3,123 less this year than last. He did not mean that this showed an actual decrease of expenditure, which was likely to be repeated year by year; for last year there was an exceptional expenditure of £8,000 on purchases —namely, £2,000 for the Castelani Collection, and £6,000 for Mr. Cuming's remarkable collection of shells. There was an increase in the present Estimate of £1,700 in the item of Mediæval Antiquities, and he hoped that the Committee would approve of what had been done, for the greater attention that was now paid to this subject made it really necessary that the increase should take place. The increase of £600 in Roman Antiquities would be easily understood. There was an increase under the head of Oriental MSS., which he hoped would meet the approval of the Committee. The collection of Mediæval Antiquities was so great and so rapidly increasing that it required the independent attention of a gentleman who was placed at the head of the department. There was also an increase of £1,880 in the printing of catalogues. That was one of the most important items of expenditure. Unless the cataloguing was kept up and in good order the value of the collection would be proportionally diminished. £200 had been spent in the cataloguing of Hebrew books, which had been very defective down to a recent period. He was glad to find that the number of those who visited the collection and those who went there to study was still increasing; and the accommodation provided for them was, he believed, remarkably good. With reference to the Blacas Collection of Antiquities, which had been brought before the House last Session by his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when a very general concurrence and approbation was expressed as to its purchase, he considered it one of the best acquisitions which had been made to the Museum of late years. It would be recollected that last year it was proposed to take a Vote of £50,000 for providing the first instalment towards a building to be erected at South Kensington for the Natural History Collection. During the present Session the attention of his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been so much occupied with other important business, particularly the Reform Bill, that he had not been able to give sufficient consideration to the plans of the new buildings which had been submitted to the Trustees, but had not been finally approved. The whole subject, with the reasons that existed for separating the collections, the necessity of making adequate provision for them when separated, and the ultimate management of them, must be brought under the notice of the House and thoroughly investigated. He was authorized by his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer to state that he proposed at the commencement of next Session to state the views of the Government on the subject, and he hoped the settlement proposed would be satisfactory to the House. He begged, in conclusion, to move that the sum of £74,621 be granted to complete the sum required by the Trustees of the British Museum.

Mr. LAYARD said, the only part of the statement of the right hon. Gentleman which he had heard with some regret was with reference to the separation of the collections, which had been again postponed for another year. But no doubt what he had stated was very true, that so many things had occupied the attention of the Government this Session that it was impossible to bring forward a subject which was important, but which, he believed, divided opinion in that House. He had always been of opinion that until that separation was made it would be impossible to put the British Museum in a condition worthy of the collection and the country. We had the most noble collection of antiquities in the world, as illustrating civilization and the arts. The reason why the British Museum was not properly appreciated and shown was the want of space. The separation of the scientific and art departments must take place. It ought to be determined in what museum the Mediæval Collection should be placed. They ought not to have collections at South Kensington and the British Museum of the same kind going on at once. He wished to know how the cataloguing was going on; he did not grudge the expense of having well-digested catalogues. Such collections as the Blacas Collection was an honour to the country. Curiosities of interest if not purchased here, would be purchased elsewhere. Only recently, when a coin, which was altogether a magnificent specimen—indeed, unique—was offered, the British Museum proposed to give a large sum for it, but it was taken to Paris and the Emperor gave a larger sum by one-third. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the statement he had made, and trusted the Government, would early next Session, bring forward the subject to which he referred with the view of adopting some definite step in regard to it. He should himself, probably before the end of the Session, give notice of his intention to move next year for leave to bring in a Bill for the better management of national collections and museums. He would submit some scheme to the House, and have the Bill referred to a Select Committee. He believed the result would be a great increase in the efficiency and usefulness of these collections.

Mr. AYRTON said, he was glad that the objection he had always urged to the Museum Vote being brought forward by Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House had at length prevailed, and that the present Estimate had been introduced by a right hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench. He regretted that further arrangements had not been made for making the Museum accessible to the public. It was perfectly easy to light the Museum with gas, without any danger from fire, or injury to the collection by the gaslight. This had not yet been done; but it might be useful to bring the subject forward every time the Estimates were moved, in the hope that the Trustees might at last be rendered capable of understanding the subject. When the step of which he spoke had been taken by another institution at the West-end of the town—the South Kensington Museum — it was vain to pretend that it was impossible. The concession made of opening the Museum betwen four aud six on Saturday afternoons had failed, because that was just the period when the working classes were taking their tea, and it would be much better to open the Museum for two or three hours in the evening. He observed that the number of visitors to the Museum had increased 10,000 as compared with the number in the previous year; still it showed a considerable decline as compared with many previous years. He was informed on one occasion that this was partly owing to the want of reasonable accommodation for the visitors, and he did not know whether any improvements had been made in this respect. But there could be no reason why the British Museum should not be open during the evenings, when thousands of visitors would find their way to it who were now virtually excluded. He was sorry to find the Chancellor of the Exchequer had lately been made a convert to a plan which would render the treasures of the Museum still less available—he alluded to the proposed removal of the most popular part of its contents, the Natural History Collection, to a distant part of the town, out of the reach of the great body of visitors. If the collection were to be broken up, the best plan would be to keep by themselves the Egyptian gods and goddesses and the heavy and bulky articles of antiquity now on the ground floor and in the vestibule. It was chiefly the inhabitants of the West-end who took an interest in this portion of the collection which took up much room. It might be right therefore to provide additional ground space in that locality for those heavy articles, which would afford additional room for the lighter objects, and the specimens of natural history which afforded much pleasure to the masses of the people, on the upper floors. This would have the great advantage of keeping the principal part of the collection together in a place the most convenient to the largest part of the inhabitants of the Metropolis, and would prove the most economical in the end. The convenience both of the visitors and the inhabitants of the Metropolis would be best consulted by retaining the collection in a central position. If we were going to dig up the remains of all the ancient cities of Greece, Italy, Asia Minor, Persia, and India, and to bring them to London, considerable space would be required for their proper exhibition. The ground floor of the present building might be easily enlarged for that purpose, and the upper stories of the new building might be appropriated to the exhibition of other collections which were more attractive to the generality of people.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, he thought the result obtained was by no means commensurate with the immense expenditure of money on the British Museum. He found that in 1861 the number of visitors was 779,000; in 1863, 554,000; in 1865, 677,000; and in 1866, 516,000, showing a progressive decrease in that period. In the same way, the number of those who visited the Museum for purposes of study and research, declined from 136,000 in 1861 to 99,000 in 1866. He trusted those to whom the management of the Museum was now committed would exhibit a little more life and energy in the discharge of their duties. He thought such a result was a miserable failure, when it was contrasted with the thousands who daily attended the Crystal Palace.

MR. GREGORY said, that the question of separating the collections had been deliberated for the last fifteen years. A Committee had reported against a separation, but, on the other hand, distinguished Members of that House had expressed their belief that it would be impossible to keep all the collections together. It was clear to his mind that, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government on the one hand, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire, on the other, had made up their minds that a separation should take place, there ought to be no further procrastination and delay in ascertaining whether their opinions were entertained by the majority of the House. He trusted that the Government would come forward with some definite plan at the commencement of next Session. The hon. Member who spoke last evidently thought that, if the British Museum could offer some of the attractions of Cremorne, it would be much improved. If the suggestions of the Member for the Tower Hamlets were adopted, and the Museum was lighted at night, no doubt some of the attractions of Cremorne would be secured. It was, no doubt, possible, as the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets had remarked, to light up the Museum at night but, independently of the risk, many of the objects preserved there could not be properly seen by gaslight. It included a vast variety of minute articles, as well as specimens of natural history, which could only be very inadequately seen by night. As to attracting a larger number of the working classes it was not likely that many of them would care to visit the Museum in the evening after working all day. If they really wished it to be accessible to the working classes they would get rid of some of their Pharisaical notions and open it on Sunday. He wished to make a suggestion that a small sum should be inserted in the annual Estimates for excavations. They had derived some of their most interesting objects from the excavations at Nineveh, Halicarnassus, Greece, and other places. As a mere matter of pounds, shillings, and pence, the specimens obtained by these researches would, if sold, over and over again cover the expenditure.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) had stated that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) was a convert to the new plan for separating the national collections. The hon. and learned Gentleman was in error; for he was, perhaps, the first person in that House who expressed an opinion that it would be impossible to place the great collections in a proper position unless the principle of separation were adopted. Observation and reflection on the subject had confirmed him in his original opinion that the country would never see its matchless collections in a position to do them justice until that principle was adopted. How it was to be applied was another matter, but that the separation should take place, and that they should take advantage of the land which the country had purchased, he had no doubt was the wisest course. The line of demarcation between the collections of literature and art and those of science was so easily distinguishable that he could not understand there would be any difficulty in making the necessary arrangements to bring about results which were so desirable. Last Session, and again in the present Session, it had been found impossible to bring forward the Vote on the original Estimates, which would have sanctioned that policy on the part of the House. So that delay was inevitable. But the course they had then taken had not occasioned any substantial delay. It was impossible on a subject of this magnitude that the House of Commons would be satisfied with passing a Vote on Acconnt without a clear idea of its application. The subject must be thoroughly investigated and fully placed before the House, so that a correct opinion could be formed upon it. The time had come when such a course was one of the urgent duties of the Administration. If he had the opportunity, he would at an early period of next Session lay before the House the course which they thought ought to be adopted, and he should be perfectly ready to avail himself of the excellent suggestions which might be offered by the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Gregory), and other Gentlemen who took an interest in the matter. But what the House wished was not the proposal of a Vote, but a clear plan. A Bill would probably be necessary to insure the separation of the collections. They wanted the site of the new building to be indicated, and to have plans placed in rooms where they would be fully considered, so that they might clearly understand what was proposed, and how it was to be accomplished. It would be the duty of the Government to undertake that office ; and he trusted that next year they would be able to bring the question, which had so long occupied the attention of so many able and accomplished men, and in which considerable national interests were involved, to a happy conclusion. It was to him a matter of conviction that the collections never would be appreciated until they were exhibited in a manner in which their matchless beauty and value could be known. He quite admitted the propriety of the suggestion made by hon. Members opposite relative to making these collections more generally available for inspection, and he trusted that, through the measure to be proposed by the Government, this as well as other objects would be accomplished. Some persons, represented by the worthy Alderman (Mr. Alderman Lusk), thought that the object of a national collection was to establish a popular and agreeable exhibition. No doubt, when a country possessed rare illustrations of art and antiquity, it was most expedient that the great body of the people should have an opportunity of studying them. It was very desirable that the great body of the people should have an opportunity of refining their taste, and he believed, if they had the opportunity of properly visiting the collections at the Museum, they would understand in time that there were objects quite as interesting as stuffed birds, which some hon. Gentlemen seemed to think were the only objects of attraction. The exhibition of works of refined art would have a beneficial effect on the public taste ; but the object of these collections was not to make a popular exhibition. If no single individual visited these collections it would still be the duty of the nation to spare no cost in obtaining the finest libraries, the most valuable galleries and choicest subjects of art. To turn from the abstract question. The state of affairs in the British Museum was such that some change could no longer be delayed. Not only were our splendid collections unknown to the people, from being packed almost in warehouses, but there were no inducements to private individuals to add to the collections by contributing from their own stores. It was a most unfortunate circumstance, but one well known to those interested in these matters, that there were at this moment individuals in possession of matchless collections, especially as regarded libraries, who would be most happy to add their stores to the national collection ; but who thought, in the present state of affairs, that such arrangements could not be made, as they had a right to expect. That was a great evil, and it was in his own experience that very rich collections which might become part of a national collection were not so, because there was not space or order to justify or encourage those gifts. He thought, therefore, the time had come when this great duty ought not to be neglected by Government or the Parliament. He did not wish to bind the House in detail to any arrangement, but he thought the principle of separation ought to be recognized with a view of its being acted upon. Knowing that the country possessed a considerable portion of land which was unappropriated—one of the rarest possessions in this metropolis—he trusted, at the commencement of the next Session, the Government would be able to place before the consideration of the House such a scheme as it could adopt, and bring about those results which were so desirable.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he believed the feeling of the House and the country was decidedly against separating the collections, which, like the British Constitution, although raised up without any definite plan, formed a magnificent whole. The difficulty which existed—preventing persons from leaving their valuable collections to the country — was to be attributed to the different Governments which had had to deal with the subject, which had prevented the purchase of sufficient space for the erection of proper buildings. The British Museum was located on part of a large square, which was offered on moderate terms by the Duke of Bedford. Everybody but the Government of the day had desired to accept the offer of the Duke of Bedford, which would have enabled a sufficient enlargement of the British Museum in a manner satisfactory to the country at large. But he supposed there was an end to such proposals now, as he observed that several hon. Gentlemen had suddenly been converted to the separation proposal. Every Government since 1850 had set their faces against all the collections being exhibited on that spot. He deeply regretted the course which had been taken, and supposed they had now heard from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the death-knell of the British Museum. It was a great mistake to suppose that the collections when divided would be anything like what they were when united. With regard to the natural history collection, the hon. Member for Galway was formerly eloquent on the site in Bloomsbury, and was one of the great champions for keeping the collections together. A change had now come over him, and he had turned his back on his former opinions, having apparently been initiated into some secret reason for separation. [Mr. GREGORY: Quite the contrary.] He was glad to hear that no Vote was to be asked for until the House knew what was to be done. He believed it would be possible to make the collections far more accessible to the public than they were at present. The danger of fire had been alluded to. Only two years since the place was on fire in the binding department. That was not from showing it to the public. Fires were kept up for the attendants and for certain purposes in the Museum, and they were far more dangerous than any lighting with gas for the purposes of exhibition. The Kensington Museum, the Jermyn Street Museum, and many other public institutions were illuminated with gas. The British Museum was the least inflammable of all these exhibitions, a great portion of the building consisting of stone. At Rome the Vatican was lighted up at night, and displayed the sculpture to the greatest advantage—artificial light being most favourable for such a purpose. He thought that some system of lighting the Museum might be adopted without any danger to the Museum itself. He believed there was a very strong feeling in the country against opening the Museum on Sundays. He was, therefore, decidedly opposed to any such proposal. Finding year after year that neither the Trustees nor the Government would deal with the subject, he should take an early opportunity of calling the attention of the House to it. He could not move an Amendment now, as he had no desire to move the reduction of the Vote.

Lord ELCHO said, that far from being a recent convert to the breaking up of the British Museum, he recollected that in 1859, when he accompanied the present Chancellor of the Exchequer on a visit to the different collections, he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman in his expression of astonishment at the state in which they were found, and in his view, that it would be impossible to properly exhibit them without further accommodation. He felt confident that if the right hon. Gentleman had remained in office he would have brought forward some plan to put it in a better state. It was impossible to go on placing the collections one on the top of the other; and that the different objects could be seen while they were stowed away in attics or cellars, or remained in the cases in which they had arrived. He entirely approved of what had been said by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that if not one single individual visited these collections it was still the duty of a great country like England to lose no opportunity of possessing herself of the most complete collections in every branch of science and art which she possibly could. For ten years he had considered that the best thing to do would be to divide the collections. He rejoiced to hear that the Chancellor of the Exchequer intended to grapple with the subject.

Colonel SYKES said, he regretted to find that the Natural History Collection was to be removed, as it brought nine-tenths of the visitors to the Museum. If it were required there would be no difficulty in purchasing additional ground in the immediate neighbourhood. He strongly recommended the lighting of the Museum at night, to enable the working classes to visit it. All danger from fire might be avoided by the adoption of sun lights, and the keeping of the gas entirely in the exterior of the building. He wished to ask, whether the antiquities in the Museum were intended for the instruction of a particular class of the community or for the community at large? At present the operative classes had no opportunity of visiting the Museum. The same facilities which were given at Kensington ought to be given for viewing the British Museum. He believed more good was done to the working classes in the way of enlarging their minds and giving them new ideas by visiting the Museum at Kensington than was ever accomplished by any act of legislation which the House had passed.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, he did not agree with those who held that the only way of making the Museum generally accessible was by opening it on the Sabbath. He was surprised to hear the hon. Member for Southwark object to its being lighted up. He expressed his belief that the remarks which had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be read with great satisfaction. The right hon. Gentleman promised next Session to propound a scheme which he felt satisfied would be of a comprehensive character.

Mr. LAYARD said, that as far as he was at present informed he hoped the Trustees would not be induced to light the building with gas until the subject had been more seriously considered. If he were a Trustee nothing would induce him to agree to such a course. He did not believe that the working classes visited either the Kensington Museum or the Royal Academy at night after a hard day's work. The classes who did go there were persons who could equally avail themselves of the morning. The introduction of gas into the British Museum would not only be attended by danger, but would injure the objects exhibited. The Trustees of the National Gallery had considerable doubts whether the pictures deposited by them at Kensington had or had not suffered from the lights. He thought himself that they had suffered, and the question was one of such importance that it was now under the consideration of the Trustees. Gas made the atmosphere so dry, that articles were injured in consequence. By the use of gas the binding of the books at the Athenæum Club had suffered considerably. [Colonel SYKES: Before the sunlights were introduced.] He believed that the books had suffered since the use of those lights. Nothing would induce him to run the risk of the Museum being destroyed, for it contained many objects which could never be replaced. They should remember that the Museum was a trust, not only for this country but for all civilized countries in the world, and for all time. Any unnecessary risk incurred through the indulgence of a merely sentimental feeling would be highly blameable.

Vote *agreed to.*

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU, in moving the Education Vote, said, he would briefly explain the expenditure which had taken place during the past year, and the Estimate with regard to it. The Estimates of this year showed an increase upon the expenditure of last year owing to the enlarged sphere of operations in the encouragement of education. Last year the expense of building, enlarging, and improving schools and teachers' residences, was £24,267. The Estimate for the present year was £30,000. The grants of the past year had called forth voluntary contributions to the extent of £91,555. The sum expended for the maintenance of elementary schools had been £416,582, and for the maintenance of night schools £13,302. In the present Estimate they asked for £427,345 for the former, and £16,000 for the latter. Altogether the expenditure in the maintenance of schools last year was £429,884, and the Estimate for the forthcoming year was £443,345. The voluntary contributions for the maintenance of schools had been £369,253, and the endowments £56,318. There were thirty-eight normal schools, on which the expenditure last year was £75,792. The Estimate for the forthcoming year, he was sorry to say, was somewhat smaller, being only £74,500; that reduction was owing to the decreased number of male pupil-teachers educated there. The cost of administration, inspection, and offices was, last year, £78,895, and the Estimate for the forthcoming year was £81,790. The balance remaining in hand last year was £9,328. He had stated the cost of the means which had been used; he would now turn to the work which had been done. During the year 1865-6 eighty new schools or departments had been built, fifty had been enlarged, and sixty-one teachers' residences had been raised. They had afforded during that year, new accommodation for 20,546 scholars. The schools under inspection numbered 13,586, showing an increase over the years 1864-5 of 636 schools. The children on the books of the inspected schools at the end of last year numbered 1,510,871, and of those 1,287,604 were present at inspection. The number of night scholars at the end of last year was 42,872, showing a large increase over the number in the previous year, which was 35,846. That increase, therefore, was 7,026 children of twelve years and upwards; the increase in the number of the night schools was 240. That, however, was not altogether a matter for congratulation, for, to a certain extent, night schools had taken the place of day schools. In Lancashire and certain other parts of the country it was, he feared, a growing custom to farm out the schools to the schoolmaster, whose only object was to obtain the grant with the least possible trouble and with the greatest possible certainty. Although the schoolmaster did not obtain so large a grant for each scholar in a night school as for each child in a day school, yet there were fewer conditions imposed on the former, and therefore the grant was more easily and certainly obtained. For instance, in a day school, if a child was examined in one standard one year it had next year to be examined in a higher standard. But that was not the case in the night school, where the children might be examined, for the grant, year after year in the same subjects; the master was therefore more certain of obtaining his grant in a night school. The schoolmaster was therefore liable to take charge of the night school himself and to pay more attention to it, leaving the day school to an assistant. One of the inspectors (Mr. Stewart) mentioned the farming out of schools in rural districts also (Report p. 212), while Mr. Koe (p. 120) asserted that night schools were growing up in the rural districts, because that the farmers who employed labour would not engage the parents unless they took their children with them; the children therefore could not go to day schools, and had to go to night schools instead. He believed that in themselves night schools were excellent and likely to do much good; but if they at all supplanted the day schools, then the increase of them was not altogether a matter for congratulation. He would now explain the results which had been obtained by this expenditure and work. The children presented for examination in the year 1865-6 were 664,005, showing an increase over the preceding year of 6,247. The number of night scholars presented for examination was 32,399, showing an increase over the previous year of 24,591. The number of passes obtained for reading was 596,886 ; for writing, 573,224 ; and for arithmetic, 500,103. That showed a very good state of learning in the schools. The subject of Education had of late been exciting much attention throughout the country. In subsequent years, it would be likely, because of political objects, to do so still more. An argument had lately been used by the right hon. Member for Calne, and repeated by many others since, that as they had extended the franchise they were constrained to enlarge the sphere of the educational system also; they educated children; they gave the franchise to men. If this was to be regarded as the final cause of State education, they must bear in mind that the end would not be reached for fifteen years after the education had been begun. Yet he was glad to hear the argument; for it was the acknowledgment of a great truth—namely, that the end of all education was to make men good citizens—that the only ground on which State interference in the matter of education could be defended was, that it was a duty of the Government to make men good citizens. This object, then, was always to be kept in view to regulate the action of the Government in promoting education ; it was necessary to adapt the means always to this one end. It was well, therefore, this year to take stock of what had been done. This was all the more necessary, for it appeared from a Return which had been included in the Report of the Committee of Council, that there were 7,780 parishes in the country, each with a population below 500, that had no schools receiving aid from the State. These were not ecclesiastical parishes, but Poor Law districts, and not conterminous with ecclesiastical districts; there were 12,000 of the latter and 15,000 of the former. One reason why there were no schools in some of these parishes was, that they were mountainous districts, or that the population was scattered; it must be borne in mind that the area of these parishes might be large although the population was small. Nevertheless, the system was permeating even into these parishes; for 216 more of them received aid from the State than received aid four years ago. It must be remembered, also, that these parishes were not all educationally destitute. The Privy Council took account only of those schools to which annual grants were given by the Committee of Council; and then persons exclaimed, contemptuously, that 7,780 parishes were without education. In some of these parishes there were schools of a very high class, which had no grants from various causes. In some, the managers did not apply for them. Some of the parishes found it cheaper to employ an uncertificated teacher and forfeit the grant, than to take the grant and have a high-priced certificated teacher. Frequently, landlords entirely supported the schools on their estates, and did not desire to receive aid from the State. Then there were certain clergymen who refused the grant because they desired to be independent, and keep their schools free from government inspection; these schools also did not appear in the list. The following was a copy of a letter which had been put into his hands only that day :—

"July 1, 1867.

"Rev. and dear Sir,—Do not pronounce me discourteous for declining to receive you on the 23rd instant in your capacity of Government school-inspector. I deprecate official visits, from any quarter, to clergymen's schools, deeming them inexpedient and intrusive ; and, although pecuniary assistance would be most acceptable, I prefer the alternative of complete independence."

But supposing he yielded all that was said on this head, the utmost it proved was that their work had not yet been completed. Yet it must be allowed that the system was gradually permeating the country : they were making advances sure and certain, and educational destitution was retiring before them. It is well then to take stock of their progress, and to examine minutely the amount of educational destitution which there really was at present. There were three kinds of educational destitution—the want of school buildings, the insufficiency of attendance, and the deficiency of teachers. Now, with regard to the want of school buildings, there the charge of destitution could not be sustained. It had been stated, in the Duke of Newcastle's Report in 1861, that "parishes are seldom unprovided with school buildings," although many of them were small and ill-ventilated. But what had been done since that time in the matter of school buildings? The year 1866 showed a great increase over the former year. In the year 1865 building grants of £18,882 for schools had been made, of which £15,458 had been made to Church schools. In 1866 the grants were £24,222, of which £20,445 were to Church schools. The local subscriptions called forth by these grants in the former year were £62,247, of which £52,620 was for Church schools. In 1866 the amount of local subscriptions was £91,555, of which the Church schools received 77,374. The new schools and teachers' residences built in 1865 were 111, of which 91 were Church schools and residences. In 1866 there were 141 new schools and residences built, of which 123 belonged to the Church. In 1865 new accommodation was provided for 15,302 pupils, of which accommodation for 12,518 was in Church schools. In 1866 new accommodation was provided for 20,456 children, of which the Church schools provided 17,311. The number of schools or departments under inspection in 1863 was 11,230; in 1864, 11,818, showing an increase of 588 schools and departments; in 1865, 12,950; showing an increase of 1,132; and in 1866, 13,586 schools and departments of schools; showing an increase of 636. The significance of this fact would appear stronger if they considered the number of preliminary statements made in each year. Preliminary statements were applications from schools to come under the Privy Council system. In 1863 the preliminary statements were 520; in 1864, 553; in 1865, 578; in 1866, 644; and in the first half of the present year, 364, which was at the rate of 728 in the year. Now let him turn to the second species of educational destitution, the attendance of the children; and let it be borne in mind at the same time what were the obstacles with which they had to contend. Those hindrances were the claims of labour, the indifference of parents, and sometimes the apathy of the rich. There were also natural causes, such as sickness or bad weather, which prevented the attendance of the children. The Report of the Committee of Council for that year stated at page xxi.—

> "The progress of education is retarded by circumstances outside the school-room rather than by faults within it. The age at which school is left and the amount of actual attendance are influenced by causes beyond the control of managers or teachers."

Yet it would be seen what advances had been made in this particular. In the year 1863, the number of children present at inspection was 1,092,741; in 1864 there were 1,133,291 present at inspection, showing an increase over the former year of 40,550; in 1865, 1,246,055 were present at inspection, showing an increase of 112,764; in 1866, 1,287,604, showing an increase of 41,549. Last year the rapidity of increase was not maintained; but the reason was that in 1865 (Feb. 8) a new Minute was issued, permitting children in night schools to be examined in the absence of the inspector. In 1863 the average attendance of children was 998,925; in 1864, it was 1,011,134, showing an increase in average attendance of 12,209; in 1865 the average attendance was 1,057,745, showing an increase of 46,611; and in 1866 the average attendance was 1,082,055, showing an increase of 24,310. From this it was apparent that the increase had all along been satisfactory, and that there was a steady augmentation of numbers. Now, with regard to the deficiency of masters he must acknowledge that, to a certain extent, this charge of deficiency was just. There were certificated masters enough to fill all the old vacancies, but scarcely sufficient to fill the new schools, which were every year springing up. If they considered the case of the pupil-teachers the deficiency would appear still worse. In 1863, there were 13,849 pupil-teachers; in 1864, they had fallen to 11,712, showing a decrease of 2,137; in 1865, the number was 11,383, showing a decrease of 329; and in 1866, they were 10,955, showing a decrease of 428. That was to say, in 1863 there was one pupil-teacher to 69 scholars; in 1864, 1 to 81; in 1865, 1 to 85; and in 1866, 1 to 96 scholars. This decrease was chiefly confined to male teachers, not to females. In 1862 there were 7,963 male pupil-teachers, and 1,016 were presented for admission into normal schools; in 1863 there were 7,043, and 726 were presented for admission; in 1864, 5,725, and only 506 were presented for admission; in 1865, 5,207, and 511 were presented for admission; and in 1866, there were 5,032 pupil-teachers, and 508 were presented for admission into normal schools. The force of pupil-teachers had therefore been undergoing constant diminution. One reason for this was that it was the interest of managers or of those who farmed the schools, to do with as few pupil-teachers as possible, consistently with obtaining the grant. Another cause was the competing claim of labour. The following statement would be found in the yearly Report, p. ix. :—

> "The principal reduction continues to be in the number and quality, or both, of male pupil-teachers. This reduction is not due so much to deficiency in the number admitted, as to removals in the course of apprenticeship. The boys, as they grow up, are tempted with higher wages in other employments, and the managers are disposed to let them go, as they become more expensive. Thus a considerable part of the apprentices never get beyond the third year."

What was to be done? The examinations had already been made as easy as was at all consistent with efficiency. Thus Mr. Cowie, in his Report (p. 395), said—

> "The present certificate examination is as low as it can be with any claim to be sufficient, or to be a test of power and knowledge, and men who cannot satisfy this criterion must generally be unfit for the office. The extension of the system which is so loudly called for is impossible without a ready supply of teachers."

That year a Minute had been passed by his right hon. Friend (Mr. Corry) which he hoped would have the effect of augmenting the number of the pupil-teachers, and increasing the efficiency of the schools. But they must wait another year to see its effect. In the meantime, he thought more might be done to increase the number of teachers and to extend the benefits of education. What if they were to make the claims of labour an additional motive and incentive to induce the children to attend school? What if the indifference of parents to the value of education were to be overcome by putting a money value on the goal to be reached? What he alluded to was a system of technical education, which might be gratuitously offered as a reward for those pupils that distinguished themselves in the elementary schools. He would presently explain what he meant. But first he would show the amount of technical education which the country already possessed. There was, first, the School of Naval Architecture and Naval Engineering; this had last year thirty-seven students, of whom twenty-four were from the Admiralty. Then there was the Royal School of Mines, which had altogether 108 students, thirteen of whom had entered with a view to becoming Associates. There was the Chemical Laboratory, with 116 students, and the Metallurgical Laboratory, with twenty-three students during the past year. There were also three courses of lectures on mines, &c., to working men; these were attended by about 600 students. There were the Science Schools with 601 certificated teachers. Last year there were 153 schools; in May, 1867, there were 212 Science Schools. Last year they contained 6,835 students; in May the number had risen to 10,108 students. There was the Art Training School, which contained 511 students. Of thirteen students who had been trained as designers last year, three were now in business. Then there were ninety-nine Schools of Art, giving instruction to 17,210 students; and there were 560 schools for the poor at which drawing was taught, and in which 80,084 children were under art-tuition in 1866. That was the amount of technical education which the country possessed. It might be greatly extended. There might be schools for civil engineering, for navigation, for mechanical engineering, for chemistry and chemical manufactures; there might be trade schools, or schools in which trades are taught, and mercantile schools. The latter he would explain by example. At Leipsic there was such a school where the pupil was taught to correspond in all the modern languages, the weights and measures and coinages all over Europe were expounded, and the students were trained in the theory of Exchanges, in Political Economy, and in all that was requisite for mercantile life. Let the Committee consider what was done in the matter of technical education abroad. In Switzerland, for instance, there was an elementary school, and a trade school in every village, he believed. In every town there was a Higher Technical school; and at Zurich there was a Technical College for the education of the heads of the various branches of business. A boy who showed capacity in the elementary school was sent, at the expense of the canton or parish, to the trade school; and if he distinguished himself there, he was sent to the Higher Technical school. Thence he could rise by study to a studentship in the Technical College. So that technical education was made the spur and incentive to bring children into the elementary school, and to force them on while they were at school. If they could do that in this country they would find the benefit not only in the extension of technical education, but in its reflex influence upon elementary schools. Let them consider the effect, for instance, upon a single village where there were 100 children, and where only one distinguished himself by his exertions, and was sent on to the higher technical schools, so that in after years, by his learning and studies, he raised himself into the upper ranks of society. What would be the effect of such an example upon the youthful population of his native village? If they multiplied that effect by all the villages in England, they might estimate in some degree the benefit this scheme would confer upon the country. He had shown that two of the three kinds of educational destitution could not be charged against the system, as it had already made great progress, and was year by year making rapid advances. With respect to the third kind, he thought that an extension of the technical education, which the country already possessed, would do much to remove it. He moved the Vote of £705,865 for the furtherance of education in England.

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £531,865, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1868, for Public Education in Great Britain."

Mr. GRANT DUFF: Before this Vote passes, I wish to put a question to the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council. In the Report of the Committee of Council for 1865-6, it is stated, and, I think, not only stated, but demonstrated, that, in the case of large schools, numerously attended, a very small amount of local and voluntary effort suffices to meet the moderate requirements of the Education Department, and to call down in favour of the managers of such schools the golden shower of the Government grant. Again, in the Report of the Committee of Council for 1866-7, it is not only stated, but demonstrated, that, even in the case of small schools, with an average attendance of sixty-five—nay, in the case of schools with an average attendance of only forty, a very moderate annual subscription in the locality, not exceeding, under any circumstances, £23, is quite sufficient to open the floodgates of Government liberality. Nevertheless, in spite of its being so easy to enlist the department over which the noble Lord presides in aid of local effort, I observe, on turning to a Table in the last Report, that, out of 14,877 parishes or districts maintaining their own poor as parishes in England and Wales, the Government grant only reaches between 3,000 or 4,000, while it leaves unaided between 10,000 and 11,000. Now, I want the noble Lord to tell me the explanation of this. It cannot be that the department is in any way to blame, because there is a general *consensus* that it discharges its difficult duties very ably. How, then, is it that the system is so utterly inadequate to the wants of the country? How is it that it fails to reach three-fourths of the parishes of the country? How is it that it leaves about 100 parishes in Berkshire, close to the very centre of intelligence—under the very eyes of the department—unhelped and uncared for? Is there some mysterious reason which is known to the noble Lord, and which he can tell us, or is the *primâ facie* explanation which suggests itself to the outer world the only one which the noble Lord can give? Is the system now administered by the Committee of the Privy Council a mere temporary expedient, good as far as it goes, but quite unable to do what is wanted—namely, to educate the whole people; and must we, despairing of success by its means, come to rating and a national system after all?

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he wanted to see more results for the money spent on education, and then he should desire to see that amount largely increased. He trusted that the time would soon come when the House would see that it would be right to educate the people, whether they would or not. The objection to the present scheme was that it was too elaborate; some of its regulations would tend to retard rather than advance education.

Colonel SYKES said, he had always been a strong advocate of night schools. Considering the early age at which children went to work, it was impossible for them to acquire much knowledge, or to retain what they had learned, unless they could be induced to return to their teachers till they had quite grown up. Children were generally withdrawn from day schools at the early age of twelve years in order to earn for their parents a few shillings a week by their labour. He would be inclined to go the length of advocating a compulsory system of education, and of making the parents and guardians of children responsible for sending them to school. In Prussia, where compulsory education had been adopted, nearly one in six of the population was at school. We had nothing like that proportion in England. There was something very like it in Scotland, where there was a school in every parish, and where the masters, even of the smallest, were, in a great majority of instances, graduates of a University. The result was that Scotch peasants took such an interest in the knowledge they had gained, that they kept up their studies after they had left school, and thus Scotland had taken the highest rank in science and art.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he was glad to learn that the present system was making tolerable progress. He had heard with great pleasure what had fallen from the noble Lord respecting technical schools. He believed that such schools would afford what was so much wanted, an incentive to children to pursue their studies to a more advanced age. Such an incentive had, to a great extent, been supplied by the pupil-teacher system, and the opening of several branches of the Civil Service to open competition. In the West of England a plan which had been adopted of assembling large numbers of children for examination, and giving prizes to the most deserving, had also had a most salutary effect. There was a positive want of educated workmen; and there were many branches of industry which were obliged to be handed over to foreigners simply because there were no Englishmen qualified to undertake them. The Arundel Society, for example, on the Council of which he had had the honour to serve for many years, were obliged to get their chromo-lithography done in Berlin, or Paris because the Prussian and French Governments had long ago instituted technological schools; whereas private enterprize had not yet supplied them in England. As to the schools which enjoyed no Government aid, it would be a mistake to suppose that they were all bad. He was intimately connected with four parishes in Somersetshire and Wiltshire, in only one of which there was State aid; but there were very good schools in the other three. But it was not only the schools of the poor that needed attention. There was a most pressing want for better middle-class education. Small shopkeepers and farmers really did not know where to find good schools for their children, even if they were willing to make the necessary sacrifices. He had for years thought that it was the duty of the State to do something for the middle classes in this matter. After the Report of the Commissioners of 1860, he thought that the subject had been very inadequately dealt with; and he was disappointed that the Government at that time had introduced no measure for utilizing the educational endowments of the country, which had been estimated by Mr. Senior at £500,000 a year. He hoped the time would come when all the children of a parish would be able to receive elementary instruction together in the same schools. As to compulsory education, he did not think it by any means so impracticable as was supposed. It had already been adopted in a modified form; and there was evidence on record that children who spent half their time at school and half at work, in many cases, beat those who remained all day at school without working. He hoped this hint would not be lost on the Government, and that they would extend the principle of the Factory Acts to the agricultural districts, in which were employed nearly half the population of the country. The fact was, that, without some such arrangement, the children of the peasantry would never be properly taught. Farmers would naturally employ those whose labour was cheapest, and parents would as naturally send their children to work as soon as they could, so that employer and parent entered, as it were, into collusion, to deprive the child of his schooling. Our parochial system needed re-adjustment. It was quite necessary that some steps should be taken to increase the pace at which education was being extended in the small parishes, and there were several minor steps which might, he thought, with advantage be taken with that object. Some parishes were much too small, and greater facilities should be given for their ecclesiastical and civil union. In the next place, the civil duties of a parish should be separated from the religious, so that all its business should not be left to the exclusive care of the rector and the churchwardens. The Church would not, in the least degree, suffer from such a change. He fully admitted that the clergy in the agricultural districts had been, hitherto, the great bulwarks of our present system of education; but the parishes and their secular affairs ought to be governed by something analogous to a *maire* and a *commune.* The Church would not suffer by the division of the civil from the ecclesiastical government, and education ought to be regarded as belonging to the former. At present, however, civil affairs were so entirely subordinated to ecclesiastical in small villages, that if the clergy did not take an active interest in the schools, they would, in many cases, be neglected altogether.

MR. POWELL said, there was on ordinary occasions difficulty in interposing suggestions during the consideration of the Vote for National Education. But that difficulty was greatly enhanced on the present occasion from the circumstance of the discussion extending beyond the subject of the common schools of the country to that of schools of technical education and of schools for the middle classes. He wished to know whether the Committee was to understand, from what the noble Lord had said with regard to technical and other schools of that character, that the Government were prepared with, and intended to submit to Parliament any plan relating to their establishment. In every county middle-class schools were springing up, by the free action of the people, with a success that went beyond the wishes of their enlightened founders; and there was every expectation that the want in that respect which had been so long felt, would soon be supplied. His desire was that the voluntary action of the people should supply that want. It was impossible, he thought, to have in England a great system of middle-class education without its being under Parliamentary control; under a minister in London, or functionaries distributed over the country. To the reduction of the grants for schools of art was to be attributed the absence of technical education in this country. He hoped the Government would take advantage of the improved feeling of the House in this respect, and increase the grants for art education. They had now escaped from the jealousy, anxiety, and dread which had so long existed, that some of the money so granted would be expended for the benefit of those who were able to pay for that branch of education. He therefore hoped that in some future year many of those rigid laws which at present bound the grant might be relaxed, so that those above the labouring classes might be able to obtain benefit from the Government grants for art and science education. He hoped the day was far distant when an education rate should be proposed; it would be both rash and foolish to disturb a system which was producing great advantages. Although they might escape some evils by rating, they would fall into others not less grave, and the example of America where the rating system existed, showed that it would not remove those evils which they all regretted should exist. Compulsory education was repugnant to Englishmen, and the best way to enforce education was to act on the conscience of the parent. The Government were, however, largely extending the factory system. They were not therefore open to the charge of languor or indifference on that head. He regretted to find that in Lancashire the system of farming out schools was so extensively adopted as to require official notice from the noble Lord. Such a course was a complete abdication of every duty imposed by Parliament on the executive government and managers of schools. He could hardly consider anything more detrimental to a system of public education than the farming out of schools. He hoped the noble Lord would take advantage of the new Minute of this year, and carry forward the education of young children into the higher branches. If taken advantage of by the classes to be benefited, he hoped the grant would be further increased. He objected to the system on which the examination of night schools was conducted, especially with respect to the manner in which the examination papers were returned to the Government, which prevented any accurate comparison being made between the state of education in such schools in different years. As to the schools in Manchester, there was a want, not of buildings, but of scholars. Efforts should be made to draw in the scholars to the existing schools; the obstacle to success being the unwillingness of the parents to send their children to those schools. A large number of the schools in Berkshire were in a healthy state, and by no means so deficient as they had been represented. The managers of many of them, from a false sense of delicacy, did not apply for Government assistance, but the schools were in a very efficient state. In Reading there were eight schools receiving the Government grant, and in Windsor seven or eight. There was no reason why many small parishes should not receive Government assistance. There were 7,295 parishes with a population below 500; 5,641 parishes with a population below 300; and 3,923 parishes with a population below 200, in which the schools received no Government assistance. To obviate that, it had been suggested that several parishes should be amalgamated for the purposes of education. He thought that objectionable, because it would be impossible for parents to take their young children two or three miles to the school. It was far more desirable to keep them in their respective parishes, and assist them with Government aid. It had been said that the money granted by the Government was most spent where it was least wanted; but it must be recollected that in large and populous places where there was an accumulation of wealth, there was a large fund from which to draw the means for building schools, and to assist in supporting them. It could not be too often repeated and recollected that if they had a large number of children attending the schools, there must be a considerable sum accumulated by the weekly pence. He was afraid, after all they could do, they would still find there were parts of the country—sparsely populated districts—into which it was scarcely possible to carry the education which they so ardently desired to diffuse.

Mr. BRUCE said, the Committee would have heard with great satisfaction the statement of the noble Lord opposite that the number of children attending schools assisted by the State during the past year had largely increased. He wished, however, he could share the noble Lord's belief that the prospects of continued increase were such as would warrant them in coming to the conclusion that, in a reasonable number of years, the assistance of the State would be extended to schools throughout the whole country. The noble Lord had stated that the increase of the number of children present at inspection during the past year had been 41,549 only as against 112,764 the previous year. The past year, however, he (Mr. Bruce) candidly admitted was an exceptional one. These figures could not in any way be taken as representing the increase in the number of children receiving education in schools aided by the Government grant. The only way to arrive at a just estimate of the latter increase was by taking the annual amount of the building grant. In 1865 the building grant amounted to £18,882, and in 1866 to £24,222. This would give accommodation for an average annual increase of 17,000, instead of 33,000, which was the proper number that school accommodation should annually be provided for. So far from the present state of things being satisfactory, it would be found on examining the statistics furnished by the annual Reports that while 3,500,000 ought to be on the books of the schools of England and Wales there were, in fact, only 2,400,000 on those books, there thus being upwards of 1,000,000 children in England and Wales receiving no education; while, of these 2,400,000 children, only half were in schools assisted by the State, the other being educated at schools, public and private, far the greater part of which were stated by the Royal Commission presided over by the late Duke of Newcastle, to be of a very inferior description. So that of our labouring population it would be no exaggeration to say that one-third were receiving education for only too brief a period at good schools, one-third at indifferent schools, while one-third were at no school. His noble Friend had not stated the result of the examination of the children during the year. If he had done so he would have been obliged to state that only one-third of the children who left the best of the aided schools passed an examination up to the third standard—in other words, received a degree of education likely to be of service to them in after life. Still, his noble Friend drew a hopeful picture of results. He (Mr. Bruce) had listened with astonishment to the assertion that the rate of progress was satisfactory, for that whereas in 1862 there were 7,960 parishes with populations below 500 without unaided schools, within the last four years the number of those unaided parishes had been diminished by 216. At this rate, it would take nearly 150 years before the remaining parishes were brought within reach of the aid of the State. Under these circumstances, he thought the existing system had been proved to be utterly insufficient to supply the educational wants of the country. The failure of the system was even greater in the large towns than in the rural districts, seeing that, notwithstanding there might be ample school education in such places as Manchester and Birmingham, it was most unevenly distributed. While there might be a number of schools in the eastern portions of those towns, there would be none at all in their western parishes. The hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell) had expressed a strong hope that we should not be driven to adopt the rating system. But why should not a system of local rating, which had been found to work well elsewhere, work well in this country? In Prussia, in Saxony, in France, in Belgium, in Holland, and other places on the Continent of Europe, as well as in the United States of America, there was no system of State assistance to schools at all approaching in liberality our own. The schools there were all supported by local taxation. All our other institutions excepting schools were already supported by local taxation; and that exception with regard to education must be removed, if we wished education to be entirely successful. The noble Lord drew attention to the want of technical education in England. Such education was certainly much wanted among our middle classes. Manufacturers were, in many instances, obliged to look to Germany in consequence of the inefficiency of English workmen. General elementary education must, however, in all cases precede technical education. Something had already been done, and a great deal more than was generally thought, by the Science and Art Department; but the operation had been very irregular. It flourished, for instance, in Lancashire, while it languished in the West Riding of Yorkshire. The falling off in the number of pupil-teachers was a circumstance that demanded serious attention, and threatened in an alarming manner the future supply of schoolmasters. It appeared that the female pupil-teachers were stationary in number, but those of the other sex were declining. In the case of the young men, there were no doubt many competing professions; but he could see no reason for the unsatisfactory prospects as regarded the female teachers, nor did he doubt but that, if proper measures were taken, the supply could be increased. A remedy for the falling off of male teachers might be found in the introduction of women to an increased extent. In this they would be following the example of America, where there was a great preponderance of female teachers in elementary schools with most satisfactory results. They would also be finding employment for women, and would thus be securing two much desired ends by one act. The successful effect of the Revised Code in reducing expenditure, might be gathered from a few figures. This year's expenditure amounted to £622,000. The expenditure in the year before the introduction of the Revised Code amounted to £813,000. It was a great thing that we should be educating 350,000 children more than in the year before the Revised Code passed, and yet that the cost of the education should have sunk from £813,000—at which it stood in the year before the Revised Code—to £622,000, and that it should be still in process of diminution. But this great economical result was not an unmixed good. It had developed tendencies against which precautions ought to be taken without loss of time. The tendency of the present order of things was to concentrate the attention of the schoolmasters upon reading, writing, and arithmetic, to the exclusion of the other and higher branches of education. Again, the value of the work done in the schools depended on a proper supply of educated masters. These could be got by a system of liberal payment only; and, if this system were not practised, the result would certainly be grievous harm to the schools sooner or later. If hon. Members had read the Reports of the Inspectors which had been on the table during the past three weeks, they would find the Inspectors unanimous in giving credit to the Revised Code, but qualifying their Report by the observation that there was a retrograde movement in respect of the higher branches of education. It was hardly necessary to say that some remedy should be found for this evil, which robbed education of the chief advantages it was intended to confer—namely, the strengthening of the faculties, and the enlargement of the range of knowledge.

MR. HUBBARD said, he thought the discussion showed that much information was still wanted by the House on the question of education. The assumption that none but Government schools were good schools was one that required verification. He trusted that the Government would cause to be prepared, during the Recess, ample and reliable information on the nature and extent of elementary education in England. In many unaided schools admirable instruction was given, and if it were so unsatisfactory as was represented by some, he could not see why a Return, for the purpose of ascertaining the nature of the education in those schools, should not be procured. Until that was done, no one had a right to assume that the education was defective. The farming of schools he looked upon as a great evil, but it was the inevitable result of confining the Government aid to schools conducted by certificated teachers. But, admitting for the sake of argument that the present system was faulty, where was to be found the system by which it was to be superseded? Were we to go in search of that system across the Atlantic? To anybody who advocated that course he would recommend the perusal of the Report of Mr. Fraser, an intelligent Inspector, who had been sent out to report with respect to the schools both in Canada and the United States. Nothing could exceed the frankness and ability with which that gentleman discharged his duties. He found that the schools in the United States—which at their origin took the religious system as their basis—had been obliged to resort to the ratal and subsidizing system for the purpose of maintaining themselves. The consequence was that, having to consult the wishes of every ratepayer anything like religious teaching had been gradually eliminated from the American system—a similar result having been produced in the Canadian colonies. And what had been the result on the morals of the people ? Mr. Fraser having compared the police returns of a large town in the United States with those of one of our own—he believed Wolverhampton—ascertained that, while both had nearly the same number of inhabitants, the American system, which was supported by a lavish supply of funds, failed to secure a more orderly, sober, and industrious population than our own. With regard to the social condition of the people, it was stated on unimpeachable authority that the moral sense of the scholar educated in the American schools was of a far lower description than could have been expected where a system of discipline and order was to be enforced. And how had family education been affected ? It was admitted that parental authority was almost lost, and that filial reverence was hardly to be found in the rising generation. These facts ought to induce us to pause before introducing a system which must, sooner or later, lead to the extinction of the religious element and carry with it all the consequences he had described. With regard to the question of rates, Mr. Fraser stated that the establishment of a rate-supported system must lead to merely secular education ; and unhappily there was no middle course between a purely secular system and a purely denominational one. He further stated that even where religious instruction was professed to be maintained, no provision was made for it in the American school system, and that anything like sectarian or dogmatic teaching was emphatically forbidden in the American schools. With respect to the schools in this country, he said there ought not to be so many of which those who had the control of them had reason to be ashamed. He entirely concurred with Mr. Fraser, that our system founded upon the religious convictions of the people, and continued for so many years, was one which ought not to be set aside. We ought to endeavour to improve that system, and to ascertain whether the failure of it might not be ascribed to a system which year by year diminished the building grants, and refused to pay for results. He trusted before the next meeting of Parliament that the Government would place before the House such information as would lead the House to consider the subject with a more perfect knowledge of it than it at this moment possessed.

Mr. M'LAREN said, that when the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) replied to the observations which had been made in the course of this debate he should be glad if he would give some information with regard to a point which he desired to bring under his notice. It appeared from these Estimates that a sum of £344,000 was to be granted for education in Ireland, while only £73,000 was to be granted for Scotland. Again, for science and art, while Ireland was to have £26,000, Scotland was only put down for £5,800. In going through these Estimates he found that the sums granted to Ireland for the various Colleges, hospitals, schools, and establishments of all kinds, were enormously greater than any similar payments made to Scotland. Now, from a Return recently laid before the House, he found that the revenue derived from Ireland was £6,015,000, while the revenue from Scotland was £7,740,000, so that while Scotland put one-fourth more into the national purse than Ireland did, Ireland took about four times more for educational purposes than Scotland did. But this difference was not observable only in matters relating to education ; take, for instance, the police grants ; while Ireland had £707,000 for this purpose, Scotland had only about £50,000. Taking education and the police together, he found that Ireland got about £1,000,000, or about one-sixth of all it put into the national purse; while Scotland, which contributed to the revenue one-fourth more than Ireland did, only got back about £130,000. There was hardly a charitable institution or hospital in Dublin which was not supported out of the public purse, while nothing was given to Scotland for any such purposes. He did not wish to assimilate Scotland to Ireland regarding this class of grants, but he did wish to assimilate Ireland to Scotland. He considered it was wrong in principle to give all this money to Ireland, at the expense of the sister country, and he very much wished to know how the noble Lord accounted for this great disparity between Ireland and Scotland; and, in particular, whether the department over which the noble Lord presided, would, in next year's Estimates, make an increased grant for science and art in Scotland, to complete the Industrial Museum in Edinburgh? Doubtless, he might account for the difference in one respect, and it was in that respect that he desired to see Ireland assimilated to Scotland. In Scotland there were about 1,000 parish schools maintained by a tax upon the land of the parishes. Now, why should not Ireland be taxed upon the land the same as Scotland—if not for the whole expense of schools, at least for one-half? Her Majesty's Government appointed a Commission to inquire into the state of education in Scotland, with a view of making important changes. That Commission had recommended a tax of $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ in the pound, to be levied upon all property in Scotland, to go towards the establishment of additional schools. He thought this proposal very unwise in present circumstances, because if adopted it would only increase the present disparity between the burdens of Scotland and Ireland. The fact was, that at present Scotland was paying for nearly the whole of its own education. It also paid a portion of England's, and contributed largely towards that of Ireland; and yet Scotland only sent half as many Members to this House as Ireland did.

MR. BARROW said, he agreed in what had been said with regard to adult and infant schools by the hon. and gallant Colonel opposite (Colonel Sykes). He concurred with the hon. Member for Buckingham, that religion was a necessity in the education of the people of this country. Religious responsibility ought to be impressed on the mind, for, where it was wanting, mere secular education was of little value.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, he wished to express a hope that the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) might be able soon to lay before them the Minute of the Council of Education, laying down some definite rule for carrying into effect the very great—that inestimable improvement which he had announced in the educational arrangements. He meant not merely the introduction of technical education, which was in itself an important addition to our present arrangements, but above all the adoption of the plan which had been found so useful in many foreign countries—that of making the advantages of technical education a reward for the good use of the advantages of elementary education—holding out an inducement to the pupils of elementary education to distinguish themselves so as to obtain the benefits of technical education. He could not conceive anything more calculated to alleviate a great deficiency in our present system—namely, the strong inducement to take children away from the schools before there had been imparted to the pupils all that those schools were intended to teach. It was true that it was not only the clever and apt pupils who had to be thought of; but that it ought also to be a great object to retain those who did not attain such proficiency as would entitle them to the reward he had referred to. Consequently, the proposal could not be regarded as one that would remove the whole difficulty. But it was judicious and well judged, and, he believed, was likely to be an effectual measure for removing the difficulty in part. He congratulated the noble Lord on what would be so important an improvement.

MR. HENLEY said, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bruce) had drawn a very gloomy picture, which seemed to be the result of some pre-conceived feeling in his mind. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 children ought to be at school in England, but he had not told them, as was the fact, that that number had been arrived at by taking the ages from three to thirteen, which was hardly the proper mode of calculation. The right hon. Gentleman had told them the number of children at the assisted schools, and the increase in these, but he did not tell them what had been the relative increase in the numbers of the children at the unassisted schools. That was not a fair mode of arriving at results. The right hon. Gentlemen had pointed out that, from the increase of the population, they ought to allow an increase in school room for 30,000 odd in the year, whereas the Privy Council only allowed for an increase of about 17,000. The right hon. Gentleman, however, took no heed of the increase in the unassisted schools. It was not unnatural to presume that the unassisted schools advanced in the same ratio as the assisted schools. With regard to quality, no doubt the Commissioners reported that the unassisted schools were inferior to the assisted. But they also reported that, in a good many of the assisted schools, the children could not read or write. The

Privy Council acted upon that, and determined to pay only upon results. But when the unassisted schools applied to be paid by results the Privy Council said, "No, you do not use our means,—which have failed,—in arriving at your results, and we say that you are good-for-nothing, and will not pay you a farthing." They had heard a great deal about the desirability of technical education. He hoped it would be successful. But when he heard so much about the deficiency in the education of our middle class he could not help remembering that there were two kinds of knowledge—the knowledge of things, and the knowledge of how that knowledge could be turned to advantage. He was not quite sure that they were not running away with the notion that, because a man obtained his knowledge in a different manner from another, he was therefore necessarily ignorant, although, in fact, he might know a great deal more than the other, who perhaps did not know how to apply the knowledge he had obtained. Men who could not read and write might know a great deal more than those who had learned to do both and had never turned either to account. What nation on earth had advanced more rapidly than we had; or in what nation had so many men raised themselves from the ranks? As to skilled labour, where did nations on the Continent who wanted skilled engineers go for them but to England? It seemed hardly creditable for us to call "stinking fish" of our people in this manner. Certainly no nation had ever shown greater capacity for adapting to its use the wonderful inventions and discoveries of modern times. The right hon. Gentleman had a great crotchet in favour of State education, which he (Mr. Henley) believed must do away with religious education. There was a considerable party in the country who wished to do away with it altogether, but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman was not going to put himself at the head of that party. If he did he would have a hard battle to fight. The great body of the people would rather have their knowledge based on religion. They would be content with a little less secular knowledge if they could have it with sound morality based upon religion.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the right hon. Gentleman had objected to the figures used by his right hon. Friend (Mr. Bruce). His right hon. Friend had said that there ought to be 3,500,000 of children in England and Wales on the books of the elementary schools, whereas there was only 2,400,000. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Henley) said this calculation had been made by taking the ages of children between three and thirteen years, and urged that that was unfair. The calculation, however, was not made in that way. As head of the Education Department, his right hon. Friend found there were certain districts well educated, where the proportion of children attending school to the population was one-sixth. That was the proportion the Educational Department fixed as the proper standard. Applying that standard to the population of England and Wales—namely, 21,000,000—one-sixth would give the number stated by his right hon. Friend as that which should be on the school books. But only half of the 2,400,000 were at assisted schools, and his right hon. Friend had assumed that another half would be at the unassisted schools. But the increase in the unassisted schools was not in proportion to the increase in the assisted ones. A great deal of the increase in the assisted schools was obtained from the unassisted ones, owing to the fact that year after year fresh unassisted schools were submitting themselves to the requirements of the Privy Council and obtaining assistance. He (Mr. Forster) did not think any Member of the House would like to leave the education of the country to be conducted by the unassisted schools, and even in the assisted schools in five years hence we should require a much higher standard. The Committee would agree with his right hon. Friend that we had no occasion to flatter ourselves that we had yet arrived at anything like the proper standard. The observations which were thrown out by the hon. Member for Buckingham with regard to education in the United States were not borne out by the very admirable Report on the education of that country that had lately been published. He (Mr. Forster) could only hope that if, after hearing the hon. Gentleman's speech, any one thought we were in a better position than the United States, he would himself read Mr. Fraser's Report. He was sorry to hear the very strong remarks which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hubbard) had made respecting the results of the American system with regard to religious teaching. He could hardly suppose that the hon. Gentleman meant what his words implied—namely, that there was not only no religious teaching in American schools, but that the moral sense of the children brought up in them was extinct. Comparisons were odious, and we ought to do the best we could for our country. But if the hon. Member would compare the moral sense and religious practice of the population of New England, where the American school system was chiefly enforced, with the moral sense and religious practice of his own county of Buckingham, he did not think he would be induced again to give the strong opinion which he had just pronounced against the American system. The hon. Gentleman had quoted some extracts from the Report of Mr. Fraser. But that gentleman had distinctly stated that the main difficulty he found in influencing the people of his parish in a religious sense, by reading and preaching to them, was their slowness of apprehension, their scanty vocabulary, and their inability to appreciate, or even understand his arguments, in consequence of their want of general mental culture. That reminded him (Mr. Forster) of an anecdote told by a hard-working clergyman in the north of England. He had devoted all his life to the religious teaching of his parishioners. In order to maintain his influence among them as a minister he felt himself obliged to attend to the secular education of the children as well. He was visited by an American episcopal minister, who on seeing him engaged in secular teaching expressed his wonder at his being so engaged. On being informed that it was absolutely necessary to do so, he told him that if the American system of secular teaching were introduced he would find a perfectly different state of things to that which existed, and that the minds of his parishioners would be found perfectly fitted thereby to receive religious instruction. The impression left on the mind of his friend the clergyman was, that if he could change the English for the American system, so that the children should be well instructed in secular knowledge on the same principles as the children of New England or New York, there would be a much better chance of their being able to receive and appreciate religious teaching. It was most unfair to charge him, and those who thought with him, with being desirous to substitute a system of secular education for a system of religious education merely because he was anxious that a large portion of the country should not remain untaught. A few years hence it would be regarded as a most extraordinary thing that that House should have gone upon the principle of leaving utterly neglected the districts which did not contain any persons wealthy enough to be able to afford money to give voluntary educational assistance to their poorer neighbours. He knew very well that mere reading, writing, and arithmetic were not sufficient to form the mind; and that they could not instil into the minds of the people a desire to do their duty in this world without having recourse to the highest motives, and bringing them to bear on the ignorant. But what he objected to was, that a large portion of the population should remain untaught because in many districts the aid of the Government was unsought, although the inhabitants of the districts themselves were willing to subscribe for the promotion of the education of their poorer neighbours. At the present moment they witnessed the monstrous anomaly, that while the Government grant was given in those parishes in which wealthy people subscribed, the education of those who lived in parishes which contained no wealthy people, or where people subscribed and did not ask the aid of the Government, was utterly neglected. He begged to congratulate the noble Lord upon his willingness to take steps towards introducing a system of technical education into this country. At the same time, he must remind him that the mere expression of good-will would not be sufficient, and that he must take practical steps to bring about the desired result. What was required was that we should have good technical schools in order to enable this country to preserve its position in the markets of the world in its competition with other countries. It was an undoubted fact that we did not possess in this country the good technical schools that were established over the Continent. The subject was too new to the Committee for him to make any definite proposals to the noble Lord; but he trusted that, before the debate concluded, the noble Lord would state more exactly what it was that the Government intended to do with regard to extending technical education in this country. The time was coming when the middle classes of this country would not, like the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire, be content with saying that, stating that we had not a sufficiently good education was crying "stinking fish." They would have done so up to a short time ago, but they were now becoming aware that this country was suffering in its trade and in its competition with other countries because our people were not so well taught as their continental competitors. Not only were the middle classes of Switzerland better educated in technical knowledge; but they were consequently enabled to compete successfully with England in the markets of the world. Our middle classes were looking forward most anxiously for the introduction of a better system of technical education. They knew that they were paying much for the education of their poorer fellow-countrymen; but they were willing to pay even more, to tax themselves for the education of the middle classes. This feeling was growing stronger throughout the country, and he hoped the noble Lord would respond to it.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: In answer to the hon. Member for Edinburgh, who had asked him why the Scotch received a smaller grant for education than the Irish, must remind the hon. Member, in the first place, that the population of Ireland was greater than that of Scotland. Moreover, the Scotch had passed various Bills which governed their education grants. They were also blessed with a *quasi*-rating system; so that large sums were locally raised and locally spent on education in Scotland; these sums never appeared upon the Votes of the House; while, on the other hand, all that was spent in furtherance of education in Ireland was voted by the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Merthyr (Mr. Bruce) had laid great stress on the Returns which appeared at p. cviii of that year's Report of the Committee of Council, and then supposed that he had legitimately arrived at the conclusion that the present system was not sufficient for the wants of the country, but should be exchanged for a more national system. All he could say was that Rome was not built in a day. They had commenced this system in 1846, and within the twenty years that had since elapsed they had undeniably made considerable progress. Was it nothing, he asked, to have 700 preliminary statements of new schools which came under the Privy Council system every year? Was it nothing to take in, year by year, fifty-four of those very unaided parishes, with a population less than 500, on which the right hon. Gentleman himself had laid so much stress? The right hon. Gentleman said that it would take about 150 years at that rate to bring them all under the Privy Council system. But was it to be supposed that those parishes were utterly destitute of education? Had not many of them schools to the full as good as the Privy Council schools? The hon. Member for Poole had alluded to four parishes in the district with which he said he was connected, in only one of which there was a school aided by the Privy Council; while the three others had schools which were indeed unaided, but still most excellent. The other day he was speaking of the subject in society, when one landowner who was present stated that he entirely supported, in the highest state of efficiency, two schools adjoining his own place; that he never had asked for Government aid, but bore the expenses himself, and made the schools his hobby. Another gentleman did the same. These were gentlemen who had met by chance? Was it to be supposed that there were not many others like them throughout the country? If so, this would account for many of the parishes being unaided. It should be recollected that there were many gentlemen in the country who established schools in their own parishes, and felt a pleasure in supporting them independently out of their own resources. Such schools, he thought, might often be considered as good as aided schools. But the right hon. Gentleman refused to recognize such schools; he would not take them into account; he said contemptuously that there were 7,700 parishes of less than 500 inhabitants which were utterly destitute of education; he regarded the unaided schools as utterly worthless. But if so, what became of another position of the right hon. Gentleman. When he (Lord Robert Montagu) had said that the Privy Council had brought 112,000 more children under their system in 1864-5, and 50,000 new children in the year 1865-6, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bruce) exclaimed that this was no gain, it was no acquisition, it was nothing upon which they could congratulate themselves, because that those children had been merely abstracted from the unaided schools and transferred to the aided schools. No gain? No gain, of course, if the unaided schools were fully equal to the aided; but otherwise a matter for great congratulation. The Government system was a voluntary system, and must be allowed to permeate of its own accord all over the country. It had already began to percolate through the richer parishes, and was beginning to pervade the poorer. Yet he would confess that in some parishes they could never expect to see good schools established no more than they could expect to see a good tailor or a good shoemaker in those same parishes, for it was contrary to the nature of things. But if the system was essentially voluntary, any remedy which was to be applied to it must be a remedy applied to the wills and desires of the people. That was what he meant by the suggestion which he had made regarding technical education. Their great enemies were the claims of labour and the indifference of the people. If they could overcome those two obstacles to the progress of their scheme, the success of the system would be complete. Nay, let them make those very enemies fight on the side of education. The claims of labour abstracted children from the elementary schools. Then let them offer to the children a higher and more remunerative labour which they might attain by remaining at school. The parents were apathetic and indifferent to the value of education. Then let education be the means of their reaching the higher walks of life. Let them take the case of Switzerland. There were elementary schools and trade schools in every village. There were the Higher Technical schools in the larger towns, and there was a Technical College in Zurich. When a boy had completed a course of study at the elementary school he might rise to the trade school. If he there distinguished himself he was sent, at the expense of the Commune, to a Higher Technical school. Thence, by successful study, he might reach the Technical College, and be started in life at the head of some business. Let them conceive what an allurement was there to enter the elementary schools! What an incentive to study! Let them imagine the effect on a quiet village if they learnt that one of the boys of the village, by a few years of industrious study and application, had been launched into the world full of honour, with a competence to support it, and his path in life smoothed before him. That was the use which he thought might be made of the desire for technical education and the complaint that elementary education was neglected and undervalued.

GENERAL DUNNE said, he believed that the statistics from which the hon. Member for Edinburgh had drawn a comparison between Ireland and Scotland were erroneous.

MR. M'LAREN: I hold in my hand the Return. It is dated March, 1867.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he must complain of the elaborate and artificial machinery adopted to the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic to children under ten years of age. They had an army of inspectors of the highest classical rank, at a cost of £57,000 per annum, to go into village schools and examine these children. There could not be a greater perversion of the talent of these gentlemen than the task so imposed upon them. The Training Colleges, which were kept up at a cost of £75,000 per annum, had failed because they had produced a class of men who were above their work. Much public money was thus thrown away. The system was most unfair and partial. The encouragement given to male teaching over female teachers in these elementary schools was a great mistake.

Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock ; Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

PARKS REGULATION (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Mr. Attorney General.*)

[BILL 273.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. LOCKE said, he rose to move by way of Amendment—

> "That this House deems it inexpedient to proceed further at the present moment with any Bill touching the regulation of the Parks."

He was induced to make that Motion from the fact that throughout this Session, and the greater portion of last Session, this question had been continually before the House ; but, notwithstanding so many attempts had been made to legislate upon this subject, they had all signally failed. On the 3rd of May a Bill was brought in for the better and more effectually securing the use of certain Royal Parks and Gardens for the enjoyment and recreation of Her Majesty's subjects, and that Bill was called "Meetings in the Royal Parks Bill." The Bill now before the House was one different in its enactment and title, and was called the "Parks Regulation Bill." There had been, no doubt, great difficulty felt by the Government in dealing with a question which in a great measure affected the liberty of the subject and the privileges enjoyed up to the present moment. That they found great difficulty in dealing with the subject was apparent, because no sooner was the first Bill read a second time by a great majority than the Government dropped it immediately, from a feeling, gathered probably from the tone of the debate, that it would be impossible to carry it. [Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: The Bill was not read a second time.] If not, why not? The Bill was brought in, and he thought it was read a second time—that something happened to it. Some one told him it was abandoned, and now another Bill had been brought forward on the same subject. That was a Bill, as they said in the City, that "won't float." The provisions of that Bill were so unacceptable to everybody that the right hon. Gentleman abandoned it. By the first clause that Bill was made to apply to all the Royal Parks, Gardens, and possessions, the management of which was vested in the First Commissioner of Works. The present Bill was much more extensive, as it applied to all the parks in London, including those recently made and placed under the management of the Metropolitan Board of Works. The 3rd clause of the first Bill proposed to enact that no meetings of a public character should take place in the parks without the permission of Her Majesty. That clause had been abandoned in the present Bill. The first Bill went on to enact a penalty, and, in addition, there might be imprisonment for a calendar month. That Bill had been abandoned by the Government because they knew it could not work. He was not going into the question of pulling down the palings in Hyde park on a recent occasion and other matters. It might be advantageous that some regulations should be made with regard to the parks; but this should be borne in mind, that they were approaching the end of the Session, and that the Government had had full time to draw up a Bill to meet the necessities of the case, and he would ask, in what respect did the present Bill differ from that which had been abandoned? The present Bill proposed to enact that—

> "No Meeting shall be held in any of the said Parks or Gardens for the purpose of making any political or religious demonstration, or for holding any political, religious, or other public discussion."

It went on—

> "Any Meeting held in contravention of this Section shall be deemed to be an unlawful assembly, and any person joining or taking part in such Meeting shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and may either, on summary conviction, be adjudged to pay a penalty not exceeding £10, or, in the discretion of the justices or police magistrate by whom the case is heard, may be committed for trial for the misdemeanour."

This clause introduced an entirely new principle into the law with regard to the punishment of persons who were engaged in any religious or political discussions in the parks, by giving to a magistrate the power of inflicting a penalty of £10. No number of persons was indicated as necessary to make a meeting. If persons entered the parks to talk over such questions they were to be treated as an unlawful assembly. Hitherto such persons had never been fineable by magistrates. This was quite a new principle of our law. Up to the present time the law had been that a person charged with a political offence must be tried by a jury. Nothing could be more unconstitutional and dangerous than to allow a political offence to be adjudicated upon by a magistrate appointed by the Crown and liable to dismissal by the Crown. Hon. Members ought to be tenacious of passing such a Bill, if they wished to uphold the liberties and privileges of the people, which they had been sent to that House to protect. There was an option given to the justices, if they did not choose to convict summarily and fine the offender, to commit him for trial for a misdemeanour. According to *Russell on Crimes*, an unlawful meeting was an assembly of persons for a purpose which, if executed, would make them rioters. Consequently, if persons met in the parks for the purpose of talking over the subjects mentioned in the Bill they would be regarded in the same light as if they met to commit a riot. The next clause allowed the Ranger or Keeper of a park to make such regulations as he might choose, and the First Commissioner of Public Works and the Chairman of the Board of Works might do the same where they had authority; and penalties were imposed for disobedience of the regulations made by the Ranger or the Chief Commissioner. By the Act of 57 *Geo.* III., c. 19, people were prohibited from meeting near the Houses of Parliament or Westminster Hall while Parliament was sitting, and it was there laid down that upwards of fifty persons assembling for the purpose of making any alteration in Church or State would constitute an unlawful assemblage. But that Act did not state that those who so met might be taken before a police magistrate and summarily dealt with, as was now proposed. At the time of the discussion about the attempts at preaching in Hyde Park, it was said it would be a dangerous thing to entrust the police magistrates with the power of saying whether a man was preaching irreligion or sedition, and in the present instance the House ought to stand by the old landmark of trial by jury. Who were to be the witnesses against those infringing the rules and regulations of the Ranger or Chief Commissioner? Policemen were certainly not educated up to the point to enable them to listen to a speech in the parks and to give an opinion before a magistrate that should decide the question. He called upon the House to stand by the old landmarks of the Constitution. Government would gain no advantage by going on with this Bill at the present period of the Session. They had passed a Reform Bill which had given great satisfaction to the vast bulk of the country, and he was sure it had given satisfaction to the metropolis. A great source of public irritation was thus removed. Yet this was the period chosen for bringing forward a Bill imposing regulations unknown before for controlling the people in the use of the parks. The peculiar circumstances that occurred last July were not likely to be repeated. The surest way to revive those disturbances would be to pass this Bill, for it was a natural instinct with the populace to thwart what they would consider to be the unjustifiable attempt of the Government to encroach upon their privileges. There had been no enactment of this kind for centuries. The parks had been protected by the people and by their own good conduct when they went into them; why, then, irritate the public mind by bringing forward a measure which could not be put in force without creating the strongest ill-feeling throughout the metropolis? There was not the slightest desire to create disturbance: but, if this Bill were passed, it was extremely probable that, owing to the strong feeling thereby created, persons would be desirous to go to the parks who would never have entertained such an idea if the Bill had not been passed. There would be the greatest disaffection, and the complaint of the people would be just. He, therefore, would suggest to the Government that it would redound greatly to their honour if they would give up the Bill. If on some future occasion it should be thought necessary to introduce a measure on this subject framed in a different spirit, the House would doubtless give it a hearty support. He was sure that the majority of hon. Members present would not give their sanction to a measure which was not only unnecessary, but was actually dangerous, since it would create heartburning and discontent in the minds of the people.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House deems it inexpedient to proceed further at the present moment with any Bill touching the regulation of the Parks,"—(*Mr. Locke,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL said, he thought very decided reasons for proceeding with the Bill might be found in the circumstances of the day. By an account of a meeting of East End tradesmen held at the Cutlers' Arms, in the papers of that day, he found that a gigantic Hyde Park demonstration against the Sunday Trading Bill was threatened, so that it appeared there was an intention to use the Park for such purposes. There were two sides to all such questions, and he thought respectable people were at least as much entitled to protection and favour as the roughs. Surely Hyde Park should not be made the battle-field for such questions as these. Meetings of a political character were certain to attract a number of roughs, and compelled the presence of troops and policemen, not for the purpose of preventing free discussion, but to protect Her Majesty's subjects from injury. It was easy enough to get up what were called demonstrations in which "the three B's" —bands, banners, and beer, predominated, but unfortunately it was not always so easy to suppress them. Under these circumstances a law should be passed which would make it clear to people that in attending such meetings they were doing an illegal act, and therefore he should support the Bill.

Viscount AMBERLEY said, that the hon. Member who had spoken last had failed to show that any great public inconvenience resulted from such meetings being held in Hyde Park. They were not altogether without experience upon the subject. On the occasion of the first meeting in

Hyde Park, which the Government opposed, great disturbances undoubtedly occurred. But on the occasion of the second meeting, when the Government only issued a threatening notice which they did not follow up, no inconvenience or interruption to traffic took place. [" Oh, oh ? "] Well, at all events, not to any serious extent. [" Oh, oh ! "] He never heard it said that either property or life was injured upon that occasion. All that the newspapers in favour of the Government said upon the occasion was that the meeting was not very large and that no enthusiasm was manifested. If a time of excitement really came, the Bill would prove of no practical value, for either money would be raised to pay the fines, or if the magistrate sent the offenders to prison,every one of them would be made a popular hero, and the greatest possible mischief would thus be done. He presumed that the right hon. Gentleman opposite would not wish altogether to prevent public meetings being held, and he could not imagine any place so convenient for that purpose as Hyde Park. It might be said that, in times of great excitement, meetings in that place would be attended with danger ; but would the provisions of this Bill be respected during times of great excitement ? He was rather surprised at the present Government introducing such a measure, which was intended in some measure to limit the right of public meetings. If ever a Government had derived assistance from public meetings, it was the Government now in office. They had heard the declaration of the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day, that the Cabinet of Lord Derby in 1859 would have adopted household suffrage, only that the public feeling of this country was not sufficiently strong to enable them to carry it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer therefore would never have been able to have carried that principle had it not been for public meetings and popular agitation. He thought that the Government, having in this case co-operated with the Reform League very much to the benefit of the country, were somewhat ungrateful now to turn round upon those who had given them so much help and had enabled them to carry a great measure of Reform, from which the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and that of the Reform League would be for ever inseparable. He should support the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Southwark, believing, as he did, that the right of holding public meetings in the parks would not be abused, and that it had been exercised with great advantage to the country.

MR. COWPER said; that he valued as much as the noble Lord could do, the advantage of public meetings, which he regarded as most useful in the manifestation of the general feeling, and in informing the public mind. It was, however, just because they were so useful to the community that he did not wish them to be held in Hyde Park. In every public park there must be some authority to make by-laws and regulations against what would interfere with the public enjoyment. There must, however, be regulations against the holding of such public meetings as would interfere with the enjoyment of the inhabitants. Parks had been given by Sir Francis Crossley to Halifax, and by Mr. Strutt to Derby. In neither were public meetings allowed. Even in the case of the Central Park at New York the free Americans knew too well the value of the full enjoyment of the public parks for recreation and exercise to permit public meetings to be held there. If the opinion of the majority of those who frequented Hyde Park was obtained, it would be in favour of preserving the parks for recreation, and as a place where fresh air could be obtained without their being interrupted by meetings assembled to discuss political subjects. Meetings should be held in their proper places, and not where they could disturb or prevent the quiet enjoyment of the parks. The history of the parks showed that no right of the public to hold meetings there had ever been admitted. If the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Southwark were carried, the inference would be that the parks were for the future to be open for carrying them on. When Lord Llanover was first Commissioner for Works public discussion took place in Victoria Park, and so much scandal was occasioned by the discussions, that the noble Lord issued directions to the constables to put in force the regulation against holding meetings there. During the time that he himself was in office discussions arose in the parks. He hoped that, as a mental exercise, it would produce good results, and that truth would prevail ; but the speakers were ill-fitted to instruct or guide, and rushed into exasperating controversies to the annoyance of sensible people. The practice led to a battle between the friends of Garibaldi and the supporters of the Pope, so that the regulations prohibiting meetings had to be put in force. It could not be presumed that meetings would be confined to demonstrations of large proportions. If they threw out this Bill, did they suppose that smaller men and smaller communities would acquiesce in a law against them which was not to be enforced against larger bodies of the people? They could not suppose such a thing. The result would be that anyone who had a nostrum to proclaim, or an appeal to make to the public on any subject whatever, would have a platform and make his speeches in Hyde Park, which would become a general arena for discussion. They could not say that the Reform League should have the privilege of holding meetings in Hyde Park, and that temperance orators and socialists should not. They ought, therefore, to have an Act to enforce the regulations made by the authorities to prevent disturbance or annoyance to the public in their enjoyment of the parks. This was no hardship on the people; they had far better places to hold meetings. There could not be a worse place than the parks. Meetings should be held in buildings where the speakers could be heard and business transacted in an orderly manner, and not in public parks. The House had voted large sums of money for the purpose of beautifying them and rendering them places of quiet enjoyment, and could not consistently open them as arenas in times of political excitement to excited and angry multitudes, who must necessarily damage these gardens.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, he was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Cowper) had forgotten to mention, in the list of meetings which he had enumerated, a meeting in one of them at which he himself was present and harangued the public on a religious question. He was not surprised to find the right hon. Gentleman advocating this Bill, for he found that Gentlemen who had been in office always joined with those who were in office in restraining the liberties of the people. The Bill was most outrageous. The Government had sanctioned the principle of holding public meetings in the parks by appointing a Review to take place there, which was a much more objectionable thing, and gave more dissatisfaction to the public, who were largely excluded from witnessing it, than any ordinary meeting. The Bill was very ill-drawn. It was highly objectionable that magistrates should be removable by the Secretary of State, and at the same time should be appointed to adjudicate on political matters. The Bill would make any two men meeting in the Park and discussing a political question liable to be taken before a magistrate and punished for doing so. There would be no difficulty about getting a conviction, because the police always gave evidence against those whom they took into custody. ["Oh!"] It was all very well to say "Oh!" but they knew what Tory administration had done before—they could recollect Peterloo. How were they to know that the yeomanry might not again be called out against them? It would not be safe to entrust the Government with such extensive powers. In the same way a clergyman and his clerk might be convicted for preaching a sermon or conducting a religious service in the Park, or any other place mentioned in the Bill. He strongly objected to the power of summary conviction given to the magistrates, and indeed to the Bill altogether.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, there is nothing in the Bill which interferes with the right of public meeting, or political or religious discussion. All that is proposed by it is to forbid the holding of meetings for such purposes in particular localities. Perhaps the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Serjeant Gaselee) will allow me to tell him that there is nothing in the Bill to interfere with the right of private meeting. When the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Locke) speaks of this Bill as interfering with the rights of centuries, I must inform him that it is only since 1855 that any attempt has been made to hold meetings in the parks. The first meeting was not a political meeting. It was a meeting on the subject of the Sunday Trading Bill introduced into this House by the then Lord Ebury. One meeting followed another on the subject until at length much violence was committed, and a collision took place in which it was sought to cast blame on the police. A Commission was then appointed to inquire into the subject of the holding of such meetings in the Royal Parks, and the result was a unanimous recommendation that those meeting should be put a stop to, as they were attended with evils of the worst description. If one party were allowed to hold their meetings, the opposite party could not be prevented from doing the same, and scenes of open violence and disturbances would be the consequence, as occurred in the case of the Garibaldi meetings some years ago. When I succeeded to my present office I told the House, that, in consequence of the excited state of public opinion, it was not then my intention to go on with the measure, but that I would wait until after Whitsuntide before presenting it again to the House. Do not suppose that these meetings are confined to Hyde Park. But a short time ago an attempt was made to hold a meeting in Kew Gardens, which are especially dedicated to the recreation of the people. The right of the Crown over these parks has been fully established. It has never been disputed. I am informed that the Reform League has taken the Opinions of eminent counsel on the matter, and that those opinions are directly contrary to what they contend. While upon this point I may say that Mr. Willes, who had expressed his Opinion against the legality of those meetings—an Opinion in accordance with that of Chief Justice Cockburn and Lord Westbury—is not the learned Judge of that name but his brother. I am anxious to keep this subject free from political bias or party feeling, and shall not therefore notice the good humoured but biting remarks of the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Amberley) as to the action of the Reform League upon the Government. If that were the case a still better effect would have been produced had they held their meetings in a legal place instead of where they were wholly illegal. I myself have presented Petitions signed by large numbers of respectable persons residing in the thoroughfare through which those persons passed on their way to the parks, complaining of the interruption to the general traffic in consequence of those processions, and praying for protection. I deny that this Bill throws an undue power into the hands of the police. It gives the police a greater power than they already possess—namely, to take any person whom they find actively engaged at one of those public meetings before a magistrate, while at present they can only remove such person from the Park. The Bill is not directed solely against political meetings in the parks. It is equally applicable to religious or other discussions, all of which are prohibited by this measure. It is to prevent an act being done which, though legal in itself, is nevertheless illegal by its being done in a particular place. The magistrates under the Bill will not have the power of sentencing a party to imprisonment. If he should think that the offence deserved imprisonment, he would be obliged to send the case before a jury. The question of unlawful assemblage is put by this Bill precisely on the same footing as the 51st *Geo.* III. There is no intention whatever to infringe the rights of any of Her Majesty's subjects. The Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Southwark goes against any Bill of the kind. It is only a Sunday or two ago that certain preachers in the Park were interfered with and stopped by the police, notwithstanding their protest against the interruption. They said that when large meetings had been allowed in the parks they could not see why they should be prevented preaching. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Locke) referred to the number of persons who should be held to constitute a meeting. That is a question for Committee, as are also several other points to which allusion has been made in the course of the discussion. As to putting a stop to the smaller meetings, that has been done, because the proper officers are able to do so without creating any disturbance, whereas it has been deemed a lesser evil to allow the larger meetings to be held. The right of the Crown to prevent those meetings has, however, always been maintained by the Government for the time being, and we ask for further powers simply because the law as it stands is inefficient for the accomplishment of its object. I hope the House will go into Committee on the Bill, not with the view of putting down the right of public meeting, with which we have no wish to interfere, but to prevent, in certain localities, the pleasures and rights of others from being interfered with.

MR. GLADSTONE: I think this subject is one of very considerable nicety, and one in which a false step at the present time may lead to consequences far graver than some may imagine. I have nothing to complain of in the tone which has been adopted by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, and I shall endeavour to exclude from the few remarks which I have to offer a single word which could savour of an approach to bitterness. There are two questions before us. One with regard to the substance of the Bill; another with regard to the time at which it is introduced. As respects the substance of the Bill, supposing there were no objection to the time and the manner, I should not be prepared to refuse to legislate on the subject. It has been shown that legal rights of a certain character exist, and that the remedies for the enforcement of those rights are defective. Consequently, I was not prepared to vote against the second reading of the Bill; but my own opinion is that it would have been wiser for the Government to have asked for a discretionary power than for an absolute prohibition. I think it proper, with regard to all these places in London or elsewhere, of which the Government are the appointed keepers, that they should have power to determine what are the requisites of public order within those places, from time to time, upon their own responsibility, and according to occasions as they arise. I do not doubt that any Government would act impartially in the exercise of such powers. But I do not think that this matter has been sufficiently considered, or that it would be possible at this time to settle it. My right hon. Friend the Member for Hertford (Mr. Cowper) construes the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Southwark as equivalent to a Motion that the Government should go into Committee on this Bill the day three months; but does it not occur to my right hon. Friend that the hon. and learned Member for Southwark must have had a reason for adopting a totally different form of Motion, and that if he had wished not to go into Committee until this day three months he could easily have made such a Motion? If he had made such a Motion it would have been a declaration capable of being construed as pledging the House to resist all legislation on the subject. But the Motion we have now before us is carefully worded. It expresses the opinion that neither the present time nor circumstances are such that it would be wise and judicious to entertain this subject, and consider what law ought to be enacted. That is a proposition I am prepared to maintain. I do not think an adequate sense has been shown of the extreme delicacy of questions of this nature, when general principles relating to public order come to be applied to the enormous masses of population comprised within the metropolis. Consider the physical difficulties in the way of public meetings in London; consider the immense distances the working men of London have to travel from their homes in order to reach one part. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) has spoken of collision; but if his argument is sound in principle, it would apply to meetings on Primrose Hill as well as to those in Hyde Park. If collisions might take place in Hyde Park, might they not also take place on Primrose Hill? Yet the right hon. Gentleman suggests Primrose Hill as a fitting meeting-place. We are then told that processions through the public streets are very inconvenient; in my opinion this Bill would prove an incentive to such processions. You do not prohibit processions, you do not attempt to interfere with them, but you select some dozen places in which you say no meetings shall be held. Is this not making a suggestion, to those who desire to make demonstrations, to make them in the form of processions through the streets? It is undesirable to forbid these things. In these meetings there is a certain desire of demonstration which I believe to be perfectly innocent and entirely devoid of any ulterior intention of the use of force. There is then this desire for demonstration, and I know of no place where a demonstration is so inconvenient as in the crowded thoroughfares of London. While I am not therefore prepared to lay down that it is convenient to have meetings of this kind in the parks, or that such meetings, frequently held, would be expedient anywhere, I am apprehensive of a measure the effect of which will be to limit the power of holding open-air meetings. Surely the right hon. Gentleman does not think it wise or safe to do. If the people wish to make a demonstration they may hold meetings in the streets, in Trafalgar Square, and in the open spaces within the metropolis other than the parks, which will be more inconvenient to the public than the holding of such meetings in the parks. The results are these; in the first place, the subject requires more preparation than it has had; in the second, at the present moment there are circumstances in connection with the remembrance of certain events with which it is most desirable that this Bill should be dis-associated; in the third place, it is a very grave question if legislation of this kind is required, whether the provisions of the Bill ought not to be made to assume a much more general character, and not to be limited to the parks of London? As a matter of policy and prudence, I think that it would be wise to have the state of the law with regard to public meetings in the country examined without prejudice by a Committee of the House, and, with the aid of that Committee, we might be able to make some proposal on the subject. If this Bill is proper to be passed for London, why should it not be made applicable to such places as Edinburgh and Dublin? Is the state of the law as regards the parks of Liverpool, Salford, and other places in a more satisfactory condition? I think the entire question deserves examination, and that there is very good reason for further investigation before the House is called upon to legislate. Without complaining of the Government, I am not prepared to legislate on the question at this moment, and I am not prepared to grant new powers to the Government without further consideration. There are certain events still remembered which it is most desirable should be allowed to pass into oblivion; and here I cannot help expressing my deep regret and extreme surprise that those unhappy palings should be allowed to remain as a monument of those unhappy events, not merely with respect to the breach of public order, but likewise with regard to the position in which authority was exhibited on that day. I say again it is impossible for us to legislate on the subject at this moment without a serious risk of producing in the mind of the people of London a sense of wrong. ["Oh!"] This is my conscientious opinion, and it is my duty to state that opinion to the House. The aspect which the matter would take would be an appearance, on the part of Parliament and of the Executive Government, of an attempt to obtain something like revenge for what was something like defeat in the attempt to stop the public meeting before. ["Oh!"] I am sorry if I am giving offence, but let it be understood that I have no desire to make any such charge against the Government. I am not charging the proposer of the Bill, but am merely speaking among ourselves. Such an impression may not be just—is not, but the probability is, that such will be the construction put upon our legislating on the subject. It is impolitic to run any such risk. We have to consider the question of the adoption of a permanent system of action. I fear that the most haste will be found to be the worst speed. I fear that inconvenience will result—not, I hope, from any attempt to resist the operation of the law, but from a sense of grievance and a diminished respect for the law—that law which it should be an object to surround with veneration in the minds of the people, and especially in the minds of the people of the metropolis. To legislation at this time, therefore, I am opposed upon grounds simply of prudence and of policy. That advice I humbly and respectfully lay before the House without at all making any imputation upon the Executive for the proposal they have made, though I differ from them in part as to substance, and wholly as to time. I think we shall act wisely if we adopt the Motion of my hon. and learned Friend, which declares that at the present moment it is inexpedient to enter upon the consideration of this subject.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think that any Government which sets its face against public meetings, especially on political subjects, would do an unwise act. They are the safety valves of a free country, and I do not know that anybody benefits more by these public meetings than those responsible for the government of the country. There can be no doubt that the people of the metropolis are placed in a very unfavourable position as to their opportunities of meeting and the locality where they can assemble to express their opinions; and this is an inconvenience that will increase yearly with its increasing size. But I cannot agree with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) that the suggestion thrown out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Hertford (Mr. Cowper) as to the best remedy under the circumstances, is to be treated in a spirit of depreciation. I do not agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire that public meetings must necessarily and generally be held in the open air. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Hertford has expressed an opinion that the habit ought to be encouraged in a great metropolis of public meetings being held in buildings. I think this is the principle that must be adopted. We have had references to the celebrated meetings held at Manchester half a century ago, some of which were attended with very calamitous and deplorable results. Manchester was at that time, comparatively, of importance, but of no colossal size. Manchester must have trebled itself in size since that time, probably more than trebled itself. But you have since had great meetings at Manchester very frequently; and meetings that have given great colour to public opinion. And where have those meetings been held? They have been held for the most part in the Free Trade Hall. These buildings are constructed with no great amount of expense—no amount that is at all a grievance to a flourishing community. Buildings can be raised that will easily accommodate 10,000 people; and thus a mode has been provided of meeting, discussing, and expressing opinions. Marylebone might surely be accommodated as well as Manchester. I admit that meetings are not always called for discussion. Sometimes they are held to make demonstrations of the opinions prevalent among the people. But there are places now —such as Primrose Hill, and Hampstead Heath, easy of access—where such demonstrations could take place, which can now be reached by masses of the people with a facility and economy which could not be enjoyed five-and-twenty years ago. Therefore, when there is an occasion when such a demonstration should be held, even in this metropolis, we are not absolutely deficient in the means of holding it. But I still believe that the proper mode by which these expressions of opinion—which are to my mind, highly salutary in a society like ours—should take place, are in buildings and in covered places. With regard to the present measure, I would recall the attention of the House to the fact that it is intended as a matter of social and police arrangement. What the House have to consider is, whether the parks of London, which at great expense have been established and appropriated for the amusement, recreation and general advantage of the community, should be preserved for those purposes, or whether recourse to them should be allowed for political meetings, which have at all events a tendency to disturbance. These parks are most important as a means of premoting the health of the metropolis. Their preservation for that purpose concerns to a greater extent the more humble and moderate in circumstances than ourselves. It is not the superior classes of society who are so much interested in the improvement and maintenance of the parks as the humbler classes of society. The people who have not country houses, who have no gardens of their own, who never or rarely go out of London, are the people who cherish and value these parks as places of recreation. What we have to do in the matter is entirely to dismiss from our minds all reference to past scenes, those scenes to which the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) has adverted and which he elaborated in such a manner that though I give him the credit which he claims for wishing to introduce kindly feelings into this discussion, the effect was rather to create impressions of a different kind. We should dismiss all this and come to a conclusion on this question: do we think that the parks of London should be devoted to the purposes for which they were established or granted, and not made the scenes of political excitement? If we are of that opinion—and I believe the majority of the House and of the inhabitants of the metropolis are of that opinion—then is the measure before us adapted to accomplish that end? The hon and learned Member made a mistake when he said a magistrate would have to decide on questions of sedition or profanity. Nothing of the kind can occur under this Bill. But this is not the moment when the language of the clause ought to be canvassed or weighed. What we have to decide now is, whether the parks shall be preserved for the enjoyment of the population of the metropolis, and whether we will go into Committee to see whether the language and purpose of the Bill will accomplish that purpose which we agree it is desirable should be accomplished? We ought to confine ourselves to that. It is our duty, a duty which we ought to perform to the people of the metropolis before we break up and leave this scene, and it will be an act of cowardice on our part if, confessing our duty, we do not now endeavour so to adapt the measure.

MR. BRIGHT: The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer began his observations by referring to a great meeting which took place in the open air at Manchester many years ago. Doubtless he referred to the meeting that was held on the 16th August in the year 1819, and which was followed or attended by calamitous consequences. But the right hon. Gentleman might, from that special example, have derived a very useful lesson in regard to this question which is now before the House. That meeting was at the beginning, and would have been to its conclusion, as peaceable as any public meeting ever held in this country—if it had not been, unlawfully—as I believe—interfered with by the magistrates and yeomanry, who were brought out for the purpose of dispersing it. The meeting was assembled for the purpose of petitioning Parliament to repeal the Corn Laws, and to pass a Bill for the reform of the House of Commons. The objects were clearly wise and salutary, and they were objects which have since been accomplished by Parliament. I believe there is hardly a single person in the Southern Division of Lancashire who does not now believe that that meeting was a lawful meeting, held for a lawful purpose, and that the calamitous circumstances which attended it were imported into it by the authorities doing that which, according to the principles of our Constitution, they had no right to do. But the right hon. Gentleman says that since that meeting there have been meetings held under cover in Manchester. He refers to the meetings held in the Free Trade Hall. But the right hon. Gentleman must know that the meetings held in the Free Trade Hall did not produce any great effect on his mind or on the minds of his followers. It was meetings where the people assembled in numbers that would fill the Free Trade Hall twenty times over that created in the minds of the right hon. Gentleman and of his party the feeling that has brought us, I hope, to a happy termination of our labours during this Session. Let the House consider what has happened. The right hon. Gentleman says these great meetings are safety valves for the arrangement and conduct of affairs in a free country. Nothing can be more statesmanlike than that expression — nothing more true. But what has happened ? With all these great meetings we cannot point for many years past to any occasion upon which the people attending these meetings made any serious disorder, or created any circumstances which made legislation on the subject necessary. During the last Session—I called attention to them at the time, and the circumstances are still fresh in our minds —great meetings took place at Glasgow, Edinburgh, Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, and London. Nothing greater in the shape of public meetings can be expected to take place on any occasion, at any time, in any part of the country. Yet, in all these meetings, the conduct of the people was such as to make it evident that there was no danger of a disturbance of the public peace. With the exception of one meeting at Hyde Park, there was no disturbance or turmoil of any kind. I may say of that meeting what I said of the meeting in Manchester in 1819 that if the Executive Government had treated the people with moderation—if they had adhered to the strict letter and spirit of the law—that meeting would have been just as tranquil as any of the other meetings to which I have referred. I need not call the attention of the House to the results of these meetings. There is a certain stolidity in the House which requires occasionally a little shoving forward. There are, we know, clocks and watches which do not quite keep time. You have occasionally to put the figure-hand forward and move the regulator a little ; if you do not do that, by-and-by, according to your clock, day would be turned into night. Now, these meetings have been productive of very great benefit to the people, to Parliament, and to the country. The man who denies the occasional necessity for such meetings must, I am sure, differ entirely from the right hon. Gentleman who is the Leader of the party opposite. I understand that the proposal is that Primrose Hill should be used for these meetings. The right hon. Gentleman says that is a place which is not very distant and is quite convenient. Now, if you want to suppress these meetings on account of any tumult or collision of any kind, it is quite clear that this tumult or collision is just as likely to happen at Primrose Hill as at any other spot; but there is this difference, the larger the piece of ground is where the meetings are held, the less possible is it for any small number of ill-disposed persons to bring about any tumult or disorder. There can therefore be no doubt that a meeting in Hyde Park, which is so many times larger than the ground at Primrose Hill, would afford a better security for peace. I myself think that the danger is *nil* in both places, but if I suppose there is any at all, it will, as I have shown, be less in Hyde Park than on Primrose Hill. This, however, must be obvious, that for the purposes of a meeting—for the purposes of a demonstration seeking to stir the minds of a great population in the direction of a settlement of a great question — the effect produced in Hyde Park must necessarily be greater than the effect of a meeting at Primrose Hill, because the demonstration will be witnessed by a much larger number of the influential population of the metropolis. Those who are desirous of carrying the public along with them will be more likely to be informed of what the public will is by a meeting held in Hyde Park than by one held in a more remote place. And what is the reason why these meetings cannot be held in Hyde Park ? Some persons are afraid of the consequences, but I venture to express the opinion, after the experience of this year, that these fears which have been so generally entertained will to a great extent disappear. Newspapers, writing in a very sensational manner, frighten all the old men and the old women in the West End of London, by telling them of the terrible things that would happen if meetings were held in Hyde Park. I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion, that we shall soon see persons who live in good houses in the West End entertain less apprehension regarding great demonstrations in Hyde Park than they have unwisely entertained during the past year. The meetings you propose to prevent are very rare. How long is it since there were any great meetings in the metropolis before those of last year? You will not deny that the subject-matter of discussion for the public, and which caused these meetings, was a great subject for the people. We have spent six months in discussing it here, and have now brought it to what I and many others hope and believe will, to a considerable extent, be a happy termination. And how long, let me ask, will it be before it will be again necessary for another such demonstration? I hope it will be very long. I hope Parliament may act more easily in the direction of the public will and interest, and that it may not be necessary in our lifetime to hold great meetings of this kind. But if these great meetings have not been attended with any evil results, is it worth while, or statesmanlike, or sagacious, to introduce such a measure at this moment —having in view what took place last year —and to close the door against the people at the very time when you have generously and liberally conceded what they asked from you? I believe, moreover, that the Bill will fail in times of excitement. Your 40*s.* fine, your £10 fine, your police magistrate, all this will go down in a period of great excitement among a great population. The effect of your passing this Bill now—when you are sending to the House what may possibly be a more liberally elected Parliament—will be that this Parliament will leave behind it a grievance which, in my opinion, will rather stimulate the minds of 100,000 people in the metropolis, and will make them long rather to go to the Park in order to show their resentment against such a measure. I suppose it will not be possible, even after this Bill has passed, if unfortunately it should pass, to prevent 100,000 people going into Hyde Park. It is not necessary that the Park should be advertised as a place of meeting. It need only be understood that the people are to assemble at that place. There are many gates and entrances by which the people can make their way into the enclosure, and being in, they may make what is called a demonstration, which some may think a violation of the principle of this Bill. But even if the measure passes, there is a probability that it will not affect the peculiar class of meetings sought to be put down. It may be effectual for dealing with some of the smaller class of meetings —preachings, and so forth—which have been held in the parks on Sundays, though these are meetings which might fairly be left to the police. I do not object to the parks being kept with great care for the free enjoyment of the people, but I hold that there is no enjoyment, there is no duty, there is no assemblage more becoming a free people to take part in, than such meetings as have been held on questions like that of last year, and these meetings I do not believe you will be able to put down in times of excitement. I think the House will feel that unless there be a very strong, urgent, and unanswerable necessity. it is not our duty, or our interest, to make more stringent laws with regard to the holding of public meetings. There is no country in Europe in which public meetings are held in greater numbers with greater tranquillity or with greater advantage than in this country. All the experience of the past proves to us incontestably that we may trust our countrymen with regard to this matter. They do not assemble for purposes of discussing trifling things. They have not discussed the questions which came before them in an unbecoming manner, and the general result has been, in my opinion, almost without exception, highly beneficial, and such as we can look back to with satisfaction and even with pride. Trust the people then in future as you have in the past. Make no new laws on the matter. Ought we to shut the gates of the Park in order that the nerves of certain genteel classes may not be shaken by the ungenteel presence of the people? I would not bolt the doors of the Park, and say to the millions who are not of the genteel class that they shall not come into the Park because they are apt to disturb the nerves of those who are more genteel. My own impression is, that the result of the Reform measure which we are passing this Session will be greatly to cement all classes in one common and good feeling with each other. Therefore, I say, whatever necessity there may have been in past times, if ever there really was any, for legislative interference, it will be somewhat less in future. The question before us has been introduced by the hon. and learned Member for Southwark. He says you are passing this measure at the very end of the Session, and he asks you not to deal with it now, but to leave it for more full consideration in the next Session of Parliament. It may be necessary that the Government or the police shall have more powers respecting disturbances or little meetings in the parks; but there can be no such necessity for obtaining those powers until next February that we should interfere in this matter. Perhaps the people of London might deem it desirable to meet in the Park and pass resolutions thanking Parliament for what it has done during the Session. It would not I suppose be thought injurious to Parliament or to the public interests that such a meeting should take place. I have not heard of any intention to hold a meeting of the kind, but if it should be contemplated I hope no one would prevent it. Our confidence in the people is always returned amply by their good conduct towards Parliament and the Government. The right hon. Gentleman opposite and his Colleagues should allow this Bill, like others more useful, to drop, and go on for six months. If at the beginning of the next Session the Home Secretary shall still think it necessary he will introduce it with more likelihood of our coming to a wise decision. There will then be much less chance of producing a feeling of resistance amongst all classes of the people, than if he were to proceed now with a Bill to shut out from the free expression of their opinions those to whom during this Session some Members of the House have been obliged reluctantly to bow.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that by making an exception in the case of the parks, to the general right of public meeting enjoyed by the people elsewhere, deference was really paid to that right. Unlike the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire, he should deprecate an attempt to invest the Home Secretary or any functionary with power of discretionary interference between the people and the right of public assembly. He, therefore, approved the absolute prohibition contained in the Bill. The Bill did not refer to Manchester, or Birmingham, or Glasgow, but simply to the parks of the metropolis. The language of the hon. Member for Birmingham on that, as on many other occasions, had been consistent in representing that it was desirable for the country that Parliament should be coerced by the power of numbers. But, for his own part, he desired to guard with equal vigilance both the right of the people to meet and of the Parliament to deliberate in freedom. He therefore regretted that the Government had not adopted the precedent set, in this respect, by the United States, where demonstrations such as won the admiration of the hon. Member for Birmingham were prohibited from taking place within the Federal district of Columbia and within reach of the Legislative. The hon. Member for Birmingham was constantly expressing his approval of these demonstrations, and virtually suggesting the revival of them by his assertions of the influence he supposed them to exercise over the deliberations of the House. He felt with the American people that the Legislature of a country ought not to be overborne by local mobs, and he hoped that the next House of Commons, however it might be constituted, would resist every attempt at dictation on the part of a London mob. The freedom of France had been sacrificed to the coercion of the Paris mob, and the coercion of a London mob might prove fatal to the liberties of England. He was a strong supporter of order, but he would not guarantee that the people of the Midland counties would quietly permit the Legislature to be dominated by London mobs. He believed that if the hon. Member for Birmingham were to consult his own constituents, he would find that was the feeling which they entertained upon the subject.

Mr. BRIGHT said, that an official gentleman from America had, within the last few days, informed him that he had recently seen a meeting of 30,000 persons at Washington.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 133; Noes 88: Majority 45.

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

DOMINICA LOAN BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hunt, Bill to authorize an alteration in the mode of Re-payment of a Loan made by the West India Relief Commissioners to the Island of Dominica, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Hunt and Mr. Adderley.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 291.]

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, July 30, 1867.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Business of the House.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Royal Military Canal * (269); Customs Duties (Isle of Man)* (270); Poor Law Board, &c.* (271); District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland)* (272); Admiralty Court (Ireland)* (273); Indemnity * (274); Bank Post Bills (Ireland) * (275).

Second Reading—Dundee Provisional Orders Confirmation * (257); Galashiels Jurisdiction * (260).

Committee—Wexford Grand Jury * (258); Tyne Pilotage Act (1865) Amendment * (157); Representation of the People (227); Industrial and Provident Societies * (253).

Report—Wexford Grand Jury * (258); Tyne Pilotage Act (1865) Amendment * (157); Railway Companies * (276); Railway Companies (Scotland) * (277); Industrial and Provident Societies * (253).

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—(No. 227.)—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

COMMITTEE.

House again in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 7 (the Occupier to be rated in Boroughs, and not the Owner).

EARL GREY rose to move the omission of the clause. He would venture to remind their Lordships that this clause was introduced into the Bill in the other House of Parliament almost without discussion, while the matter was one of so much importance as to demand that legislation should not be adopted but with great deliberation. The system of rating the owners instead of the occupiers of small properties, which the clause now before the House would summarily abolish, was only adopted by Parliament after full inquiry, and in order to correct evils which experience had shown to be very serious. The system was first introduced in some large and populous parishes where the inconvenience of rating the occupiers of small tenements became more and more felt as the population increased, and a great number of such parishes obtained local Acts to enable them to rate the owners instead of occupiers. The earliest of these Acts were passed soon after the beginning of the present century; and when they had become very numerous, the question was raised whether the object they had in view ought not to be provided for by general instead of private legislation. The subject was repeatedly inquired into by Committees of both Houses of Parliament and by the Poor Law Commissioners, and all these authorities came to the conclusion that the former state of the law was inconvenient and required amendment. It was shown that it had been found impossible to levy the rates upon the occupiers of the lowest class of tenements, and that the expense of collection was frequently so great that the attempt to get in the rates was abandoned. It was also found that the practical exemption of such houses from the payment of rates gave no real relief to the occupiers, because the rents were in consequence raised by the landlords, while an increased burthen was thrown on all other property. These facts, as to the working of the old law, having been ascertained by the inquiries made by Committees of both Houses of Parliament, and by the Poor Law Commissioners, the Bill of 1850, regulating compounding, was passed with the assent of both Houses, and after very little opposition or objection. We are now called upon, without any inquiry at all, to repeal, not only the general law thus deliberately adopted, but also the multitude of private Acts which, during more than half a century, Parliament has passed at the instance of particular parishes. And the House should remember that this clause, enacting that henceforward in boroughs the occupier and not the owner should in all cases be rated, was not adopted on the recommendation of the Government; it was proposed by a private Member of the other House, and agreed to almost without discussion, and without any opportunity to those most affected by it of preferring objection. It had caused great alarm, and the parochial authorities of the metropolis had represented to the Government that the existing system had worked well for all parties. From the 29th of September it would be compulsory to rate the occupiers instead of the owners of small tenements; a comparatively small proportion, however, of such rates would actually be collected, and the effect would be to increase the burdens of those who did pay. The change, moreover, would be made at a singularly unfortunate time. Owing to the stagnation of trade, from the financial crisis of last year, great distress prevailed in the eastern part of the metropolis. The rates had consequently risen to a frightful extent—amounting at this moment in one parish to 7*s.* in the pound—and, as nearly two-thirds of the houses would be practically relieved from rates, the pressure on the remaining third would be largely increased. In many of those parishes, it must be remembered, there were no wealthy residents, the population consisting of small shopkeepers, clerks, and persons in a humble position. They were now, it was stated in one of the Petitions against this clause, barely able to keep their heads above water, and they would be completely depressed by this change. The object of the clause was to extend the number of persons by whom the franchise would be enjoyed; but since, to a great extent, it would be impossible to collect the rates from the poorer class of occupiers, the very object of the Bill would be frustrated by this clause. The poor rates could only be collected quarterly, and when the parish officer demanded them these weekly tenants would remove from one parish to another, and thus evade payment. These persons would not, of course, be enfranchised; but in all these parishes there would be a certain proportion of the poorer inhabitants who, being industrious and frugal, would have a little property on which a distress might be levied, and these would be compelled to pay. The burden would fall on them with great severity; for, in the opinion of all acquainted with the former state of the law to which we were about to revert, rents would not be reduced on account of the rates being charged on the occupiers. The practical exemption of the greater part of this kind of property from rates would enable the owners to keep up their rents; so that the effect of the change would be to impose a burden hitherto unfelt upon that small proportion of the weekly tenants who would actually pay the rates. Much ill-will and heart-burning would also be produced on the part of the poorer population against the parish officers, whose duty it would be to levy the rate by all the means in their power. Warrants of distress would be frequently applied for against the class about to be enfranchised, and he would put it to their Lordships whether it was prudent to start our new system by giving such ground of complaint to both the old and new voters. The old voters would have just cause of complaint in being compelled to pay a double proportion of rates on account of the default of others; and the new voters would be subjected to a burden which they had not hitherto felt, and would be subjected to annoyance on the part of the parish officers, which would be even more grievous, perhaps, than the pecuniary impost. Moreover, the Government placed their whole confidence on the personal payment of rates, and if it were swept away we should arrive at universal suffrage; but, could it be expected that when a predominating power was possessed by the new class, this security would last even for a few months? The new Parliament would open with a universal clamour from those aggrieved by the change, and before many months we should be obliged to abandon the system of rating the poorer occupiers. It was to prevent these evils and dangers, and not from a desire to restrict the measure of enfranchisement, that he proposed the omission of the clause, and if this were agreed to it would be open to the Government to introduce clauses such as those originally contained in the Bill, or to make any arrangement they might think fit for enabling the occupiers of houses rated to the owners to obtain votes; but he hoped their Lordships would not, without inquiry and in defiance of the remonstrances of those most interested in the question, affirm a proposition which would at once and summarily abrogate the whole system of parochial management—a system which had been deliberately adopted by Parliament, and which had worked very satisfactorily. For his own part he should be happy to concur in any arrangement for preventing the omission of the clause from restricting the franchise.

Moved, "To omit the clause."—(*Earl Grey.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he had no doubt that the noble Earl (Earl Grey) had not the slightest intention of disfranchising the compound-householder; but it was perfectly clear, as he had almost confessed at the end of his speech, that unless the omission of the clause was followed by the adoption of other clauses, that would be the effect of his Motion. Now, if he could satisfy the noble Earl that such would be the case, he was quite sure, with the candour possessed by the noble Earl, he would not be disposed to press his Amendment. He wished to call their Lordships' attention, in the first place, to the condition of the franchise as established by the 3rd clause of this Bill, which required as a qualification that the voter should have "*bonâ fide* paid an equal amount in the pound to that payable by other ordinary occupiers"—which, of course, meant that he should have paid the full amount of his rate. Their Lordships had been made familiar by discussion with the case of the compound-householder, as he was called rather improperly. They would remember that there had been an arrangement sanctioned by Parliament, and established by several local Acts, by means of which the owners of small tenements were enabled to compound for the rates of their tenants; and that, in respect of the benefit which the parish derived from not having to collect the rate from house to house, saving them both trouble and expense, and also protecting them from the loss that might be incurred by unoccupied houses and insolvent tenants, an advantage was given to the landlord by allowing him to pay only a portion of the rate which was assessed on the ordinary occupier. Under these circumstances, at the time of the passing of the Reform Act of 1832, the compound-householder would not have been entitled to vote, because he would not have been assessed, had not the 30th section of the Act provided for his case. And it provided for it in this way —that he might claim to be rated, and, upon tender of the full amount of the rate, he should be entitled to vote. So matters remained until the 14 & 15 *Vict.*, to which the noble Earl alluded. By that Act the compound-householder was enabled to vote upon claiming to be rated and paying merely that proportion of the composition of the landlord which would be the quota upon his particular house. Now, he (the Lord Chancellor) must confess that he could never understand the principle of that. The reason why the landlord had an advantage given him was, as he had stated, that the parish was saved the expense of collecting from house to house, and incurred no loss by reason of the difficulty of collecting the rate from very poor persons. Now, there seemed no reason at all why the compound-householder who desired to vote should not be required to pay, as under the Reform Act, the full amount of his rate, as in the case of any ordinary occupier. As this Bill provided that the party to be qualified to vote should pay the full amount of his rate, it was quite clear that the 14 & 15 *Vict.*, stating that the tenant should only pay his proportion of the composition, would, in fact, disfranchise him, because he would not then pay the rate of the ordinary occupier. No doubt, the best mode of getting rid of the difficulty would have been to repeal the 14 & 15 *Vict.*; but, unfortunately, as that did not come within the scope of the Bill, it was necessary, in order to prevent the disfranchisement of the compound-householder, to introduce the 7th clause, by which composition in all boroughs was prevented for the future. That, no doubt, was an inconvenient mode of proceeding; it would have been infinitely better to have repealed the 14 & 15 *Vict.*, and after this Bill had passed it would be competent for anybody to propose its repeal. The noble Earl said that it would be necessary, in case this clause was retained, to introduce other clauses by which the compound-householder might be put in the same position as he was in under the 14 & 15 *Vict.* But that would be entirely contrary to the whole principle of the Bill, which was that every person entitled to vote should pay the same amount of rate as the ordinary occupier. He did not understand what the noble Earl meant by talking of the pressure which would be put upon the tenant by the overseer. He could not understand that there would be more pressure put upon him to pay the full amount of the rate than there was at present with regard to the composition rate. The Government considered the clause a very important one, and they must resist the proposal for its omission.

THE EARL OF ROMNEY said, that the noble and learned Lord who had just sat down had stated that if anybody had moved the repeal of the 14 & 15 *Vict.* there would have been no necessity for this clause, and also that he did not see any advantage whatever in that Act. Now, the noble and learned Lord appeared to labour under the misapprehension that the 14 & 15 *Vict.* was passed for the benefit of owners.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR begged his noble Friend's pardon—he had said no such thing. The Act was passed for the benefit of the compound-householder, to enable him to vote upon paying his composition.

THE EARL OF ROMNEY understood the noble and learned Lord to ask what principle was there in the Act? What had led to the Act was this — that a great grievance was felt to exist, inasmuch as parishes lost hundreds and hundreds of pounds because they could not get the rates from the fluctuating body of persons they had to deal with, the time for levying a distress often passed by, and the money could not be recovered. Therefore, after a great deal of trouble, several local Acts were passed, enabling the parish to charge the rates upon the owners. At length Parliament dealt with the question as a whole, and gave a general power of arranging with the owner instead of the occupier, as the money could always be got from the former; and Parliament said that, inasmuch as the owners had the risk, they would allow them to pay a composition instead of the full rate. That was the object of the Act, and it had operated with great public advantage. It seemed to him very objectionable that it should now be proposed to repeal that Act, not with the object of improving the law, but to meet a political necessity. That course, if adopted in private affairs, would be thought very foolish. He would therefore support the Amendment of the noble Earl.

EARL RUSSELL said, he agreed with the noble and learned Lord that the clause should stand part of the Bill; but he did not think that the explanation which the noble and learned Lord had given with respect to the facts was quite satisfactory. He did not believe it to be true that the system of compounding was adopted only by virtue of its being very troublesome to collect the rates from a great number of small tenants. It often happened that these persons only occupied their houses for six weeks or two months, so that the collector was not able to call for the rates. The landlord, therefore, in compounding, very fairly paid 75 per cent of the full rate, the remaining 25 per cent being retained by him not only for his trouble, but for the risk he ran. By the Reform Act any person who claimed to be rated and paid the whole amount of the rate was entitled to be placed on the register; but at that time a parish in which the practice of compounding existed was rather uncommon. The noble Earl seemed to think that after the Act of 1851 was passed it was not sufficient that the occupier should pay the amount of the compound rate; but that the whole amount should be paid. He (Earl Russell) would not enter into this question further than to say that it was only on account of the trouble and risk that the landlord was allowed a deduction of 25 per cent; but in the rent the small tenement holders no doubt paid the whole amount of the rate that was due, for, unless they did, the landlord would be a loser. The reason why it was possible for the landlord to adopt this system was because the custom was to collect the rents of these small tenements every week. If you said that the tenant should himself pay the whole amount of the poor rate, the result would be that the parish would suffer. The present system, therefore, was as advantageous to the parish as it was to the landlord. It was likewise advantageous to the tenant, because many of these persons were so poor that they did not save any money and were not able to pay quarterly that which they were able to pay every week; while the landlord, collecting his rents weekly, was able to collect the rates as part of the rent. If, however, a change were to be made in this system, which would compel every occupier to pay the whole amount of his rates, the result would be that in many towns the collectors would be unable to obtain the rates from at least 20 per cent of the smaller occupiers; and the result would be that not only the poor rates would suffer, but that great hardship would be inflicted on a numerous class of occupiers. He admitted, that if the vote were based on the personal payment of rates, there must be payment of the whole amount of the rate. But the adoption of such a principle would cause much suffering among the class of small tenants. For his own part he could not see what was the essential difference between personal payment of rates and payment through some other channel. *Qui facit per alium facit per se.* As a householder in Westminster he had always paid his rates through an agent. [The LORD CHANCELLOR: But out of your own money.] Of course; but so did the small tenant, who paid the rate indirectly through the landlord.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND doubted whether it was competent for the House to deal with this clause at all. In Mr. May's work on "Parliamentary Practice" it was laid down that in Bills of this kind their Lordships could make any Amendment provided that they did not alter the intentions of the other House with regard to the amount of rate or charge, the various modes of levy and assessment, or the persons who should pay, receive, manage, or control such assessment. Assuming that the doctrine was correct, their Lordships would find, on referring to the 7th clause, that where the owner was rated to the poor rate at the time of passing this Act the occupier was to be rated instead. That was to say, the House of Commons decided by this clause that the owner, who now paid, should no longer pay the rate. Now, if you altered the incidence of taxation under this clause, putting on the back of the occupier the burden now borne by the owner, their Lordships would interfere with that incidence of taxation which, according to the doctrine laid down by Mr. May, they were incompetent to deal with. In that case they could not deal with the clause in any manner whatever. Passing, however, to the effect of the Amendment, it would introduce into the franchise all the compound-householders of the country, and there would be no power to secure that they would in any one case pay rates themselves. Now, the very essence of the Bill was contained in the personal payment of rates coupled, of course, with the term of residence. Sir William Clay's Act enfranchised compound-householders above £10. Clause 7, as it stood, virtually repealed that Act by providing that in future all occupiers should be rated, and should pay the full rate. If the clause were struck out of the Bill, the existing law would come into force; and by Clause 51 of this Bill, which extended all the laws, customs, and enactments now in force to the new franchise, Sir William Clay's Act would become applicable to all the franchises created under this Act. All the existing compound-householders would, therefore, be entitled to the franchise, and you would have no power of deciding whether they paid rates or not. Such an Amendment would entirely alter the whole character of the Bill. As to the oppression which, according to the noble Earl (Earl Russell), would be exercised upon the tenants if they were called upon to pay rates, there were many towns — among them Sheffield, Oldham, and Stoke-upon-Trent — in which no Compound-Householders' Acts existed, and he was informed that no great difficulty occurred there in collecting the rates. He differed from the statement of the noble Earl (Earl Grey) that the question had not been discussed in the other House. On the contrary, he believed it had been debated during the best part, if not the whole, of one evening. It was introduced by Mr. Hodgkinson, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Gladstone took part in the discussion. On that occasion Mr. Gladstone stated that if the terms proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer were embodied in a new clause, to be brought up afterwards, he and his friends would be satisfied with that arrangement; and Mr. Gladstone added that he considered it would be a good mode of meeting the difficulty. Under these circumstances he (the Duke of Richmond) trusted their Lordships would not concur in the noble Earl's Amendment.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that with regard to what had passed in the other House, the fact was that if Mr. Gladstone's proposal had been adopted the present difficulty would not have arisen. He thought the argument of the noble Earl (Earl Grey) perfectly unanswerable, and, indeed, no attempt had been made to answer it. It showed that the effect of the clause would be to extend to the whole country the inconvenience which already existed where compounding was not resorted to. He agreed with the noble Earl that this question ought to be dealt with as a whole. If the system of compounding was a good one, it seemed hard that certain parishes should be denied the privilege of adopting it because they were within the limits of a Parliamentary borough. If the system was not a good one, the law relating to it ought to be dealt with independently; but he should regret to see the system abolished. With reference to the boroughs referred to by the noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond), in order to show that no difficulty was met with in collecting the rates, although the compounding Acts were not in force, he (Earl Granville) believed that in most of those boroughs the custom was to excuse the poorer class of compound-householders from payment of the poor rates on account of their poverty, while in others Parliamentary powers existed which were very similar to those of the compounding Acts. Thus, without Parliamentary powers much was done in effect that might be done under the Small Tenements Act. If the Government had shown any inclination to allow the omission of the clause, and to rectify the matter in any manner which would not have restricted the franchise, he should have voted cordially with the noble Earl; but as they had refused to do this, and as they had pointed to the adoption of the clause in the other House and alleged that its retention was a matter of vital consequence, had insisted upon the adoption of the clause, it was impossible for him not to vote for its retention; and after what had passed it would be well that the noble Earl should consider the propriety of withdrawing the Amendment.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, that this was a very difficult social question, and it was no light matter to take off rates that had been paid weekly in the form of rent, and re-impose them in another form upon the tenants of small houses. In large towns, such as Liverpool, it was found necessary to excuse many from the payment of rates on the score of poverty, and arrangements had been made with landlords, which had incurred the censure of the Poor Law Board, as being done without the sanction of the law. As to the right of their Lordships to touch this clause, suppose it had formed a separate Bill, would their Lordships have been entitled to reject it? [The LORD CHANCELLOR: You may reject it, but you cannot amend it.] The Amendment of the noble Earl rejected the clause; and surely there could be no difference between rejecting it as part of a Bill and rejecting it as the whole. If you could reject the Bill you could reject the clause. He was not quite sure whether it was prudent to divide on the Amendment, as a division might have the appearance of that which was not intended; and he thought, perhaps, it would be better that the noble Earl should withdraw his Amendment.

LORD CAIRNS said, their Lordships would hardly agree to observations that had been made—no doubt, inadvertently—as to the competency of their Lordships to deal with clauses of this kind, or any other clause in any other Bill. Their Lordships had always maintained their privilege to deal in any way they thought fit with every clause which came up from the other House of Parliament. No doubt the other House might raise a question of privilege on their part; but with that their Lordships had nothing to do. If their Lordships rejected this clause they would interfere in the question of the incidence of taxation; but their Lordships were not the judges of the privileges of the other House, or what they would do in such a case. All he asked their Lordships to do was not to admit the principle that their power to deal with a Bill was fettered by any of these considerations. The expediency of altering or rejecting the clause was, of course, a wholly different question.

EARL GREY said, he felt so strongly on this matter, and had received so many representations of the injustice of the clause, that he felt it to be his duty to press his Amendment to a division. Having already so fully stated the grounds on which he proposed this Amendment, he would not repeat what he had said in reply to the arguments which had been urged against it; but there was one objection made to it which he had not anticipated, and which was so entirely untenable that he was bound to notice it. He referred to the objection which had been made to his Motion, as being an invasion of the privileges of the House of Commons, and he appealed to the noble Lord near him (Viscount Eversley) whether he ever heard the notion of the privilege of the House of Commons pushed to so utterly extravagant a pitch as it had been by the noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond) and the noble and learned Lord opposite that evening. It must be remembered he did not propose to amend the clause, to which he admitted there might have been an objection on the score of privilege, but simply to omit it. Now it was perfectly certain that their Lordships could have rejected this clause if it had been an independent Bill; *à fortiori* they could reject it as part of another Bill. Indeed it might be a question whether it was not so entirely beyond the proper scope and compass of the Bill that they ought to reject it upon that ground, entirely independent of the objections to it on its merits. It had nothing whatever to do with the franchise or with Parliamentary Reform; but it was proposed in order that a very inconsiderately-framed franchise which the Government had chosen to recommend to Parliament might have a wider effect than they intended it should have. The clause proposed to abolish a whole set of laws, general and local, which Parliament had been passing for more than fifty years with the greatest deliberation. It was absurd to say that their Lordships were not able to deal with the clause. If the noble Duke and the noble and learned Lord were correct, their opinion would have this absurd consequence, that the whole Bill must not be amended at all. But the Government had already supported various Amendments, some of them injudicious ones; and therefore the doctrine they had just laid down could not be for a moment maintained. Having sat a number of years in both Houses of Parliament, he said, with the utmost confidence, that he never heard the privilege of the House of Commons put at so extravagant a height as it had been by the Members of the Government who had addressed their Lordships this evening. He could not help saying it was significant proof how completely the Government felt they had no ground to stand upon, and that the clause was indefensible on its merits, that they had gone out of their way to take this utterly untenable ground of Parliamentary privilege. It was proved to demonstration that this clause as it stood would inflict great hardship and injustice upon many parishes and individuals, and the discontent it would create would tend to shake the foundation of our system of rating, and lead to the speedy downfall of the security which it was supposed to provide. Not even an attempt had been made to dispute the fact that it would work the injustice he had asserted, or to show that this would not lead to the consequences he anticipated. He therefore called upon every noble Lord who did not wish to see household suffrage without payment of rates—without long residence—without one security—who did not wish to see this extravagant extension of the franchise, to concur with him in objecting to this clause.

VISCOUNT EVERSLEY said, in answer to the question put to him by the noble Earl, that he was the last person to question the power of their Lordships to make Amendments to any Bill sent up to them by the House of Commons. But that House might reasonably object to Amendments affecting rates or taxes as interfering with their privileges. In the present instance however it was not proposed to interfere with the amount of any rate or with its disposition or management, but simply to omit the clause under discussion; and, in his opinion, this omission could not be objected to by the Commons on the ground of privilege, as it related to a subject separate from the main object of the Bill, and it was quite as competent to their Lordships to reject this clause as to reject a Money Bill which they could not amend without infringing the privileges of the other House of Parliament.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL desired to draw attention to the discrepancy of the two statements that had proceeded from the Government Bench as to the effect of omitting this clause. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack asserted that the practical effect, in conjunction with the previous clauses, would be to disfranchise the compound-householders; whereas the noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond) said that it would bring the whole of the compound-householders on the register. He was anxious to know which was the explanation given by Her Majesty's Government—though, for his own part, he had no doubt that the interpretation of the noble and learned Lord was the correct one; and, indeed, the noble Earl on the cross-Bench (Earl Grey) had avowed that his object was to deprive the compound-householders of the franchise.

EARL GREY said, that he had been entirely misunderstood by the noble Duke. What he said was that when the new Parliament assembled not six months would be allowed to elapse before the whole system of personal payment of rates would be done away with.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL said, he was certainly inclined to concur in that opinion; if, however, it were correct, it only showed the rottenness of the principle of personal payment of rates. When that principle had broken down, a very considerable portion of what Mr. Bright called the "residuum" would obtain the franchise; and this was a result to be regretted, because, though he had not the slightest fear of revolutionary consequences, he believed that there would be increased corruption in many of the constituencies. He would test this by stating the probable effect in Scotland, where there was no compounding system, but one-half of the rates was paid by the occupier and the other half by the owner of the property, while below a certain figure varying in different parishes, no rates were collected at all in the large towns. In the City parish of Glasgow, the number of houses between £5 and £10 rental was 13,000, and yet more than 7,000 of the occupiers of those houses had applied to be excused from payment of rates on the ground of poverty. Of those 7,000, no fewer than 3,100 were wholly exempted from payment; only 133 were required to pay their rates in full, and the remainder were required to pay them in part. It was probable that a similar class existed in the great cities of England, and if they were brought upon the register they would not form a very desirable addition to the constituencies. He should vote for the retention of the clause in its present form, because he believed it was an essential part of the Bill as it had come up from the House of Commons.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD said, that though he thought that great difficulty would be caused by the clause as it stood, he was not prepared to vote for striking it out, unless some definite plan for removing the difficulty were proposed. The noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond) had referred to the borough of Stoke-upon-Trent. Now, he had himself made inquiries in reference to that district, and had been informed that the number of summonses issued last year for the recovery of rates was 3,879, and that in 1,580 of these cases the costs were not recovered in consequence of the inability of the parties to pay them. He thought that if a remedy could be found for this without disfranchising the poorer class of occupiers, it would be very desirable. He had no plan to propose on the subject, but would suggest that the principle of making the qualification for the franchise dependent upon the voluntary payment of rates without any legal proceedings having been taken might not be unworthy of consideration.

THE DUKE OF MANCHESTER suggested that their Lordships should strike out this clause, and that the Government should bring in another in the House of Commons, admitting of optional composition in all cases, and making it compulsory in cases of short tenure, where the house was held by the week or the month, or possibly even by the quarter.

On Question, that Clause 7 stand part of the Bill? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 148; Not-Contents 43: Majority 105.

CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Cleveland, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Rutland, D.
Somerset, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Ailesbury, M.
Camden, M.
Exeter, M.
Normanby, M.
Westmeath, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cardigan, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
De Grey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Ducie, E.
Effingham, E.
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Erne, E.
Essex, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Granville, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Home, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Kimberley, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Manvers, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Russell, E.
Sandwich, E.
Spencer, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Wicklow, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

The Earl of Lichfield

Exmouth, V.
Halifax, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Chester, Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Peterborough, Bp.

Abinger, L.
Audley, L.
Bagot, L.
Berners, L.
Bolton, L.
Boston, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L.
Camoys, L.
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clermont, L.
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Clinton, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Dacre, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Denman, L.
Digby, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Foley, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Leigh, L.
Londesborough, L.
Lovat, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Monson, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Mostyn, L.
Northwick, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Petre, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Rollo, L.
Romilly, L.
Saltoun, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Templemore, L.
Truro, L.
Vernon, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wenlock, L.
Wharncliffe, L.
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Grafton, D.
Manchester, D.

Bristol, M.
Salisbury, M.

Amherst, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Dartrey, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Harrowby, E. [*Teller.*]
Lovelace, E.
Mansfield, E.
Morley, E.
Morton, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Zetland, E.

De Vesci, V.
Eversley, V.
Hardinge, V.
Lifford, V.

Sydney, V.

Belper, L.
Blantyre, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Clonbrock, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Houghton, L.
Methuen, L.
Overstone, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stratheden, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Taunton, L.
Wentworth, L.
Wrottesley, L.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

Clause ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 8 (the Occupier to be rated in Boroughs and not the Owner: Provisoes) *agreed to.*

VISCOUNT HALIFAX moved the insertion of a new clause repealing Sections 24 and 25 of the Reform Act, and enacting in lieu thereof that no person shall be entitled to vote for a county Member in respect of any premises situated in a borough if he would be entitled to vote in respect of such premises for the borough Member. The noble Viscount said that the object of his proposition might not be clear to their Lordships without a few words of explanation. The purpose of the clause was to place the leaseholder and copyholder in the same position as the 40*s.* freeholder in respect of the franchise which his property would confer. As their Lordships were aware, before the Reform Act the qualification for the county vote was the possession of a 40*s.* freehold; leaseholds and copyholds conferring no vote. The Reform Act altered that, by giving a vote to leaseholders and copyholders of the value of £10. But there was a distinction made in one particular for which he could see no good reason. Before the Reform Act a man who had a 40*s.* freehold in a Parliamentary borough could vote for the county as a freeholder and for the borough as an occupier. By that Act he was deprived of this double vote, and could vote only as a freeholder for the county if he did not acquire a vote for the borough in respect of the occupation of his freehold within the limits of the borough. By the Reform Act the owner of leasehold or copyhold property within a borough was put in a worse position than the 40*s.* freeholder, inasmuch as he could not vote for the county in respect of his leasehold or copyhold qualification, if it gave a vote to any other person for the borough. The object of his clause was to put both kinds of qualification on the same footing by enacting that if the qualification gave a vote for the borough, it should not give a vote for the county. He (Viscount Halifax) could not understand on what ground a non-resident leaseholder should be deprived of his vote for the county more than a non-resident freeholder, and, therefore, his object in moving this Amendment was to place the leaseholder and the copyholder in precisely the same position as the freeholder, in respect of their property within the limits of a borough, which did not give to them the right of voting for the borough. He proposed in point of fact to give him a vote for the county, unless he acquired one for the borough by reason of his occupation. He was exceedingly sorry to see any attempt made to draw distinction between two different classes of owners of property where no real distinction existed. It was generally felt that all distinctions between towns and counties were put an end to by the repeal of the Corn Laws; that in the main their interests were the same, and therefore they should all act together, and be placed upon an equal footing as respected electoral rights. An objection might be urged to this Amendment that two votes for the county would arise out of the same property—namely, the vote of the freeholder and that of the householder: but those depended upon altogether different rights, and there was no inconvenience in that, because no influence could be exercised by the freeholder over the occupying tenant—certainly no such influence as could be exercised by the employer over those whom he employed. But those who raised the point must be prepared, to be consistent, to repeal the Chandos clause, which conferred two votes, practically, on owners and occupiers, and thus created a double vote for the same place. In some cases it might even confer three out of the same property. He was not one of those who joined in the clamour against the Chandos clause, and therefore was doing nothing inconsistent in making his present proposition. A great deal of land, and especially of Church property in towns, was let upon long building leases; and the first effect of the Bill would be to give to the leaseholders of such property—wealthy and independent men—votes for the county in which the boroughs were situated. It was altogether a property qualification. Dangers to property were apprehended by some persons, from the present Bill, owing to the extension of the franchise in boroughs. Surely, if those apprehensions had any foundation, it was wise to strengthen the point exposed to danger, instead of disfranchising many persons in counties, as this measure in its present shape would inevitably do.

After Clause 8, *moved* to insert the following Clause:—

That Sections Twenty-four and Twenty-five of the Act of the Second Year of William the Fourth, Chapter Forty-five, be repealed, and that in place thereof it be enacted, No Person shall be entitled to be registered as a Voter for a County Member or Members in respect of any Premises situate in a Borough if he would be entitled to be registered in respect of such Premises as a Voter for a Member or Members of Parliament to serve for such Borough.—(*The Viscount Halifax.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND said, he concurred in the general principle that it was desirable to place the leaseholder, the copyholder, and the freeholder in the same position; but he thought he should be able to make it clear to their Lordships, on a close examination of the clause, that it went a great deal further. The subject was in itself a most difficult one, and the Amendment which the noble Viscount had placed upon the paper was one of the most difficult to comprehend that he had ever seen. At first sight it appeared so Conservative a proposition that several noble Friends, on his side, had asked him whether he intended to oppose it. But, on a more minute examination, he discovered that it, in reality, had a tendency very different from what appeared on the surface. By the law, as it stood at present, a freeholder in a borough, not occupying his freehold, is entitled to vote for the county; and his tenant, if paying sufficient rent, votes for the borough. The object of the noble Viscount's Amendment was said to be to place the leaseholder and the freeholder on an equality; but, in fact, if this Amendment was carried, leasehold property would be placed in a better position than freehold. The noble Viscount proposed to repeal the 24th and 25th sections of the Reform Act, which gave to the freeholder a vote for the county unless he possessed an occupation vote in the borough. The 25th clause provided that no leaseholder or copyholder should vote in respect of any leasehold or copyhold property in a county within the limits of a borough if the lessee of that tenement possessed an occupation vote for the borough. The Amendment of the noble Viscount repealed those clauses, and enacted that no person should be entitled to be placed on the register in respect of any property in the borough if the occupying tenant were already entitled to vote. By the noble Viscount's proposition three votes might be given in respect of the same property. The ground-landlord might let to the leaseholder property to the value of £10 per annum, which would entitle him to the possession of a vote for the county; the ground-landlord, himself, would remain in possession of a vote for the same property by virtue of being a 40*s.* freeholder; while the tenant of the leaseholder would vote for the borough in respect of his occupation of the premises. There would, in fact, be three persons qualified to vote for the same property—namely, the ground-landlord, the leaseholder, and the occupier, the two former voting for the county, and the latter for the borough. If, however, the property was freehold, there could be no more than two votes registered—one in virtue of the ownership, and the other in virtue of the occupation. He contended, therefore, that he was justified in asserting that leasehold property instead of being placed on a position of equality with freehold property, would in reality be placed in an improved position. The effect of the Amendment, if adopted, would be to increase the town element in the counties to an extent which would be injurious to the county constituencies. A similar provision was, he believed, originally inserted in the Bill introduced last year by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell). That provision, as he was informed, was subsequently withdrawn, but it was said that the effect of it at Birmingham alone would have been to have given county votes to 5,000 leaseholders in the neighbourhood of that town. Believing that it was not advisable, either for the counties or boroughs, to have so strong an infusion of that town element in the county constituencies, he trusted their Lordships would reject the Amendment.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX asked, whether the case was not precisely the same at this moment, where the owner in fee, the long leaseholder, and the occupier, could all vote for the same property?

EARL RUSSELL said, that he expected the noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond) would only have been too happy to consent to the Amendment, seeing the large number it would add to the county constituency. As the Bill stood it actually deprived many persons of a vote who now possessed it. The Bill gave to £10 occupiers a vote for the borough; but a large number of persons who, before the Act had the right of voting for the county would lose their right, because they did not possess a vote for the borough. The Bill would, therefore, deprive them of rights which they now possessed.

On Question? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 41; Not-Contents 135: Majority 94.

CONTENTS.

Ailesbury, M.
Normanby, M.

Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Morley, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.

Halifax, V. [*Teller.*]
Sydney, V.

Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Cranworth, L.
De Mauley, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Houghton, L.
Leigh, L.
Lovat, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Methuen, L.
Mostyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Cleveland, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Rutland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.
Westmeath, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cardigan, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Effingham, E.
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Erne, E.
Essex, E.
Fortescue, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Grey, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harrowby, E.
Home, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lovelace, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Minto, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Wicklow, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Lifford, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Peterborough, Bp.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Bagot, L.
Berners, L.
Bolton, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Clinton, L.
Cloncurry, E.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Denman, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Kingston, L. (*E. Kingston.*)
Londesborough, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Monson, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Northwick, L.
Overstone, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Saltoun, L.
Seaton, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Templemore, L.
Vernon, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wentworth, L.
Wharncliffe, L.
Wrottesley, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Lord LYTTELTON rose to propose the clause of which he had given notice, enacting that no person should be entitled to vote at any election of a Member of Parliament who could not write a legible hand, and that the Privy Council should frame and issue regulations for giving effect to that provision. He would admit that he had not much hope that this clause persons, from the present Bill, owing to the extension of the franchise in boroughs. Surely, if those apprehensions had any foundation, it was wise to strengthen the point exposed to danger, instead of disfranchising many persons in counties, as this measure in its present shape would inevitably do.

After Clause 8, *moved* to insert the following Clause:—

That Sections Twenty-four and Twenty-five of the Act of the Second Year of William the Fourth, Chapter Forty-five, be repealed, and that in place thereof it be enacted, No Person shall be entitled to be registered as a Voter for a County Member or Members in respect of any Premises situate in a Borough if he would be entitled to be registered in respect of such Premises as a Voter for a Member or Members of Parliament to serve for such Borough.—(*The Viscount Halifax.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND said, he concurred in the general principle that it was desirable to place the leaseholder, the copyholder, and the freeholder in the same position; but he thought he should be able to make it clear to their Lordships, on a close examination of the clause, that it went a great deal further. The subject was in itself a most difficult one, and the Amendment which the noble Viscount had placed upon the paper was one of the most difficult to comprehend that he had ever seen. At first sight it appeared so Conservative a proposition that several noble Friends, on his side, had asked him whether he intended to oppose it. But, on a more minute examination, he discovered that it, in reality, had a tendency very different from what appeared on the surface. By the law, as it stood at present, a freeholder in a borough, not occupying his freehold, is entitled to vote for the county; and his tenant, if paying sufficient rent, votes for the borough. The object of the noble Viscount's Amendment was said to be to place the leaseholder and the freeholder on an equality; but, in fact, if this Amendment was carried, leasehold property would be placed in a better position than freehold. The noble Viscount proposed to repeal the 24th and 25th sections of the Reform Act, which gave to the freeholder a vote for the county unless he possessed an occupation vote in the borough. The 25th clause provided that no leaseholder or copyholder should vote in respect of any leasehold or copyhold property in a county within the limits of a borough if the lessee of that tenement possessed an occupation vote for the borough. The Amendment of the noble Viscount repealed those clauses, and enacted that no person should be entitled to be placed on the register in respect of any property in the borough if the occupying tenant were already entitled to vote. By the noble Viscount's proposition three votes might be given in respect of the same property. The ground-landlord might let to the leaseholder property to the value of £10 per annum, which would entitle him to the possession of a vote for the county; the ground-landlord, himself, would remain in possession of a vote for the same property by virtue of being a 40*s.* freeholder; while the tenant of the leaseholder would vote for the borough in respect of his occupation of the premises. There would, in fact, be three persons qualified to vote for the same property—namely, the ground-landlord, the leaseholder, and the occupier, the two former voting for the county, and the latter for the borough. If, however, the property was freehold, there could be no more than two votes registered—one in virtue of the ownership, and the other in virtue of the occupation. He contended, therefore, that he was justified in asserting that leasehold property instead of being placed on a position of equality with freehold property, would in reality be placed in an improved position. The effect of the Amendment, if adopted, would be to increase the town element in the counties to an extent which would be injurious to the county constituencies. A similar provision was, he believed, originally inserted in the Bill introduced last year by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell). That provision, as he was informed, was subsequently withdrawn, but it was said that the effect of it at Birmingham alone would have been to have given county votes to 5,000 leaseholders in the neighbourhood of that town. Believing that it was not advisable, either for the counties or boroughs, to have so strong an infusion of that town element in the county constituencies, he trusted their Lordships would reject the Amendment.

VISCOUNT HALIFAX asked, whether the case was not precisely the same at this moment, where the owner in fee, the long leaseholder, and the occupier, could all vote for the same property?

EARL RUSSELL said, that he expected the noble Duke (the Duke of Richmond) would only have been too happy to consent to the Amendment, seeing the large number it would add to the county constituency. As the Bill stood it actually deprived many persons of a vote who now possessed it. The Bill gave to £10 occupiers a vote for the borough; but a large number of persons who, before the Act had the right of voting for the county would lose their right, because they did not possess a vote for the borough. The Bill would, therefore, deprive them of rights which they now possessed.

On Question? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 41; Not-Contents 135: Majority 94.

CONTENTS.

Ailesbury, M.
Normanby, M.

Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E.
Morley, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.

Halifax, V. [*Teller.*]
Sydney, V.

Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Cranworth, L.
De Mauley, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Houghton, L.
Leigh, L.
Lovat, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Methuen, L.
Mostyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)

NOT-CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Cleveland, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Rutland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.
Westmeath, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cardigan, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Cawdor, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Effingham, E.
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Erne, E.
Essex, E.
Fortescue, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Grey, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harrowby, E.
Home, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lovelace, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Manvers, E.
Minto, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Wicklow, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Lifford, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Peterborough, Bp.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Bagot, L.
Berners, L.
Bolton, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Clinton, L.
Cloncurry, E.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Denman, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Kingston, L. (*E. Kingston.*)
Londesborough, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Monson, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Northwick, L.
Overstone, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Saltoun, L.
Seaton, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Templemore, L.
Vernon, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wentworth, L.
Wharncliffe, L.
Wrottesley, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

LORD LYTTELTON rose to propose the clause of which he had given notice, enacting that no person should be entitled to vote at any election of a Member of Parliament who could not write a legible hand, and that the Privy Council should frame and issue regulations for giving effect to that provision. He would admit that he had not much hope that this clause would be accepted by the Committee; and he perceived that the clause, partly he feared from some personal reasons connected with the proposer of it, had been received in some quarters with a certain amount of ridicule. His belief was that it was too reasonable a clause to pass; and he conceived that it was greatly justified by the nature of the present Bill. It was not his habit to trouble the House often, and he had not thought himself entitled to take any part in the general discussion of that great subject. He had neither taken a part in the very easy task of showing the inconsistency of household suffrage with the previous character and proceedings of the Conservative party, nor in that other task—also not a difficult one —of making some sort of defence for that party on account of the change of circumstances. There was no doubt that there had been a great change of circumstances. The late Government had been turned out by members of their own party, and the present Government could not help coming in; and when they were invited and entreated by, he might say, the whole country to bring in a large measure of Reform, he could not conceive that it was possible for them to avoid doing so. He believed that if that Bill, even as it stood, had been brought in last year, it would have been jumped at by the whole Liberal party with united acclamation. At the same time, he must say, it seemed to him very marvellous that the Conservative party should have been found bringing in such a measure; for he believed that if a year ago the intelligence of the whole country had been asked what was the dividing line between the Conservatives and the Liberals, the answer would have been that it was in household suffrage, pure and simple; because when it was said that it was not household suffrage pure and simple which was now proposed, he supposed that no one imagined that every man who occupied a house, it might be only for a few days, was to receive the franchise. The Bill would establish what was commonly understood to be household suffrage. As to his Amendment, he thought that, in common sense, some respect ought to be had to the personal qualification of those who were to exercise the franchise; and it seemed to him monstrous that in so many large towns the well educated and intelligent population was to be overborne —as would be the case under the Bill as it stood—by what was called a set of "roughs" who could not even write their own names. On that ground he ventured to propose that there should be so far an educational test that the voters should be able to write. He did not mean to go into the details by which such a proposition might be made practicable. He was aware it was a question of some difficulty; but he had no doubt that for the Privy Council to frame proper regulations on the subject would be easy with the expenditure of a very little ingenuity. It had been suggested that he should leave out the word "legible;" but that would make the whole thing absurd. And when he was told, as he had been in the newspapers, that his clause would disqualify half the statesmen and public men of the day, he thought that was a preposterous argument. He did not require that everybody should like the late or the present Prime Minister, write a beautiful hand, but only that every voter should be able to write legibly; and he believed that anybody who had ever learnt to write could, if he took the trouble and wrote slowly, write legibly. He had received suggestions from persons of skill on that subject, who believed that his proposal was perfectly practicable. Among those persons were Mr. Edwin Chadwick and other authorities. For instance, it had been suggested to him that the test of being able to write should be applied, not at the time of election, but at the time of registration. He did not suppose that his proposal was likely to be accepted at that moment, but he wished strongly to express his agreement with those who thought that by this, or, if possible, by some more effective measure, some attempt should be made, now that that large extension of the suffrage was to take place, to stimulate the spread of elementary education among the people.

Moved, "That from and after the Expiration of Six Months after the passing of this Act no one shall be entitled to vote at any election of a Member of Parliament who cannot write a legible Hand.

"And be it enacted, That the Lords of Her Majesty's Privy Council are hereby authorized and required to frame and issue Regulations within Three Months after the passing of this Act to carry the last preceding Enactment into effect."—(*The Lord Lyttelton.*)

THE EARL OF DENBIGH said, that the Amendment had at first sight a certain reasonable appearance; but on consideration it could not be agreed to, because the fact that a man could read and write was no guarantee that he was a respectable member of society. Their Lordships must all have had experience that the most immoral classes in society—namely, tramps, begging-letter writers, and impostors—often wrote the best hand. There was one advantage, at least, in a man not being able to write a legible hand—he could not forge. One of the most valued friends he had ever had wrote so remarkable a hand, that having occasion to write a letter to a stranger, the only word that could be read was the name of a gentleman in the county. The person to whom the letter was written acccordingly took it to this gentleman to see if he could tell him what it was about and who it came from. He would urge their Lordships to remember that the possession of the faculty of reading and writing was not a sufficient qualification to prove a man to be a respectable member of society. It was the greatest mistake to suppose that instruction was the same thing as education. Some day he should probably come before their Lordships with this Bill in his hands to ask them to give the greatest possible freedom and facility for religious instruction. A clever man without religion was like a vessel without a pilot or a rudder. The Amendment was, in his view, utterly useless.

Earl GRANVILLE said, there was this peculiarity in the proceedings during the last two days—that certain speeches against certain propositions had decided persons to vote exactly the opposite way to that which the speakers had intended, and if anything could induce him to vote for the Amendment it would be the speech they had just heard. His principal objection to this clause was of a practical character, arising from the difficulty of laying down a standard and framing regulations for carrying out the Amendment. With regard to legibility of handwriting, he could not agree with his noble Friend (Lord Lyttelton) in the principles he had laid down. They all knew that the late and present Prime Ministers wrote a very good hand; but they also knew some statesmen who wrote remarkably bad hands. He was, for a very short time, at the Foreign Office, when it was his duty to correspond with many distinguished representatives of Her Majesty at Foreign Courts. One of them wrote so illegibly that he felt himself compelled to ask, with due humility, whether it would be convenient to them to send him copies of their private letters and to keep the originals themselves. One of them apologized, and promised to be particularly legible for the future—a promise which he certainly never kept. He might appeal to his successors in regard to one diplomatist who had just retired from his post with the regret of two countries, and ask them to say whether copies of his letters would not very often have been more acceptable than the originals. It was worthy of consideration whether, if this test were exacted from persons unused to writing, their very nervousness would not prevent them from complying with it.

Lord HOUGHTON said, he believed his noble Friend (Lord Lyttelton) merely desired to fix upon a minimum test of education, and he did not believe there would be any practical difficulty in the way of carrying out the Amendment. If an educational test were established at all he did not see what milder or simpler form it could take than was now proposed. A proposition for an educational franchise had been fairly discussed in the other House of Parliament. It was, however, a great novelty in this country, and he did not feel much hope that it would be established. He was afraid all they could do was to endeavour to bring about, by other means. the result the noble Lord desired. Let them try to teach every man who had a vote to write. It was by means of popular education alone that the enormous change now proposed could be made without danger.

Lord DENMAN: I had the honour to meet Dr. Jarvis of Massachusetts at a Social Science Association annual dinner, about four years ago, and he had assured the meeting that no one was admitted to the franchise in his county, who could not read and write. This, after a time, might be carried out in England, and when we considered how many criminals in the Calendar appeared to be persons who could neither read nor write, we might think it desirable that this condition should attach to the franchise, if dangers arose from the want of knowledge at future elections.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, that everything that fell from his noble Friend (Lord Lyttelton) was entitled to great respect, but he must remind him that the Bill was an enfranchising and not a disfranchising Bill. Unfortunately, the state of education in this country was such that an Amendment imposing such a condition would have a more disfranchising effect than the vote of last night on the lodger franchise. It would also impose a very invidious task upon the Committee of Council. He presumed it would be the duty of that Office not only to frame regulations for carrying out the Amendment, but to devise a certain system and standard up to which the candidate must come. It would also be the duty of that Office to impose the examination to which candidates for the suffrage must submit. Considerable complaint had already been made as to the mode in which the educational tests had been carried on by the Educational Department, and if they had in addition to assign the standard and impose the examination, the dissatisfaction would be largely increased.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE proposed the addition of a clause providing that no person who, after the passing of the Act, shall become a freeman of any city, town, or borough, shall be entitled as such to be placed on the register, saving the rights of existing freemen. The noble Marquess said, that the venality of this class of voters had come under notice in every inquiry respecting municipal and Parliamentary elections that had of late years been instituted, and Committees and Commissions had been all agreed in representing this class of voters as hopelessly corrupt. The only objection offered to the proposal in the other House, that this was a measure of enfranchisement and not of disfranchisement, was of no force; for the Bill before the Committee was in name, and, he hoped, was intended to be in fact, a Bill to amend the Representation of the People; and this proposal, he submitted, was one which would indisputably amend the representation. Moreover, as to disfranchisement, a number of existing electors would be disfranchised in the four boroughs which were to be punished for their corruption, and the argument employed with reference to lodgers, that the franchise should rest on the possession of some property, applied with equal force to freemen as to others, who ought not, merely as such, to possess votes. Neither was his proposition one that would disfranchise anybody who now had a right to vote—it would merely apply to such as might become freemen hereafter.

Moved, after Clause 8, to insert the following Clause:—

"No person who after the passing of this Act may be elected, made, or admitted a Freeman of any City, Town, or Borough shall be entitled to register a Vote, or to vote as such for the Election of any Member of Parliament for such City, Town, or Borough: Provided nevertheless, that such Person may be registered as an Elector and may vote for a Member or Members of Parliament for any Place for which he shall be entitled to vote by reason of any Franchise created by this Act or otherwise; and nothing herein contained shall prejudice or affect any Right or Privilege, Municipal or Corporate, to which he may be entitled, except the Right to vote as a Freeman for the Election of a Member of Parliament."—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he would not enter into a discussion on the merits of this class of voters; but would simply remark that the clause was negatived in the other House without a division, and that it was contrary to the principle of the Bill, which was that there should be no disfranchisement.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND reminded theis Lordships that the clause would disfranchise no existing voters. The freeman franchise had been preserved in the Reform Act on the ground that the occupation had been placed as high as £10; but, now that the occupation franchise had been placed on a wide basis, there was no necessity for retaining this exceptional qualification.

EARL FORTESCUE said, that at his instigation a Commission inquired into Corrupt Practices at Barnstaple, where the freeman qualification existed, at great expense to the country and with very little result. A Bill for disfranchising the corrupt voters by name was given up by the Government of the day, and the consequence was, that at municipal dinners and on other occasions, these men, so far from being penitent, gloried in their shame. Bribery continued to prevail in that borough, and was notoriously very rife at the last election. The freemen were conspicuous among the corrupt voters, and, having been brought up in habits of corruption, it was to be feared that they would contaminate the class about to be admitted into the constituency. On this ground he supported the clause. It should be remembered that the Bill disqualified the persons guilty of bribery at Totnes from voting for the county. He thought that disposed of the argument that this was an enfranchising and in no respect a disfranchising Bill.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, that when he had experience of Liverpool he could say that the freemen there were as free from corruption as the £10 householders. If the Committee looked at Lancaster they would see that respectable farmers were quite as guilty as the poorer class of voters.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that this testimony of the noble Earl was somewhat comforting after his observations the previous evening. If the noble Marquess went to a division he should support him. It was quite clear that a great many freemen would come in under the provisions of the Bill even if the clause were adopted.

THE EARL OF LEITRIM said, that they must extinguish bribery in high places before they could extinguish it among the freemen. The bribery of office was far worse than the bribery of which the poor man was guilty.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

LORD CAIRNS: As this may be a convenient opportunity, I wish to call your Lordships' attention to an Amendment placed upon the Paper in my name which I venture to think well worthy of your Lordships' consideration. I know that in the discussion of this Bill time is a considerable object, and therefore I will take the liberty of placing before you, in the briefest possible way, the proposition which I have to make, and the reasons which I have to advance in support of it. The proposition is one which concerns those constituencies, and those constituencies only, that return three Members to Parliament. Your Lordships may desire to be reminded of the number of those constituencies at present. I believe there are eight constituencies in all which return, according to the present system of representation, three Members each to Parliament. By the present Bill it is proposed that one of these constituencies—namely, South Lancashire—shall cease to return three Members, and that it shall be divided into two parts to return two Members each. There remain therefore seven constituencies returning each three Members to Parliament. I also put aside at present the City of London, which returns four Members, and about which I shall have a word to say by-and-by. Those who consult that useful publication the *Parliamentary Companion* will find that out of those seven constituencies there are only three at present where the Members are all of the same party and sit on the same side; in the case of the other four there is a division, two Members for each sitting on one side of the House and one on the other. The Bill now before the Committee proposes to add four new "three-cornered" constituencies—namely, Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds. We shall then, supposing the Bill passes in its present form, have eleven of those three-cornered constituencies. Now, what I have said with regard to those we have at present, and what we know of the political opinions of the four constituencies which are to be added, will, I think, satisfy your Lordships that the proposition which I am about to make is one which cannot be held or conceived to be in the interest of any particular party. Indeed, as far as party is concerned, it would, I believe, leave both parties very much in the same position as regards those eleven constituencies as they are now. There is, therefore, no reason why the proposal should not be considered on its own merits, without regard to any advantage to be gained by one party or the other. I should also wish to add that, as far as I am concerned, it is not intended to have any connection with any other Amendments which may be offered to your Lordships' consideration. I venture to think my proposition worthy to be considered upon its own merits, whether it be followed by any other Amendments or not. I own most frankly that I cannot but foresee that, if it should happen either in a short or a longer time that there should be a further alteration in the distribution of electoral power, the great probability is that such alteration will go in the direction of increasing the number of those three-cornered constituencies. I own also that this consideration does make me more anxious that some proposition of this kind should be adopted; because, although the existence of those anomalous constituencies, at present, is limited to a very small number, when they come to be increased by a larger number there will be a still greater need to counteract the accumulation of numbers in particular constituencies. Now, the proposal which I have to make is very simple in its operation, and very easily described. I ask you to consent to a clause which will, in each of those three-cornered constituencies, limit every voter to a vote for two Members only—which will put him, in point of fact, upon the same footing as a voter in any other constituency—I mean, of course, constituencies which return two Members. In other words, my proposal is that no advantage should be gained by a voter because he happens to reside within a three-cornered constituency over another who may reside in a constituency returning two Members only. This proposal does not lay the least claim to originality, if originality would be a merit; it has often been made before, and was made on one occasion by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) when, as the organ of the Government, he embodied it in the Bill presented to Parliament in 1854. I will not repeat now what I ventured to express to your Lordships a few nights ago, as to the fact that the creation of those three-cornered constituencies is really a complete departure from what is now familiarly termed "the old lines of the Constitution." So far as the history of our Constitution is concerned, these three-cornered constituencies are an entire novelty, and their creation imposes the necessity and gives the opportunity of dealing with a very serious question—the question of the want of representation of the large masses who may happen to be in the minority in particular districts. Let me ask you what is the amount of the minorities in constituencies of this kind. I will take the twelve constituencies which I have mentioned—that is to say, the eight three-cornered constituencies we now have and the four which are proposed to be created by this Bill. If your Lordships refer to some Returns on the table you will find that, speaking in rough numbers, the population of these twelve constituencies alone would amount to something like 2,300,000 persons. It is impossible to say what may be the number of the minority in each of these constituencies; but taking them to be one-third, you have in that way something like 700,000 or 800,000 of a population who, unless some provision is made for the expression of their opinions, are wholly unrepresented in our electoral system. I think you will agree with me that in most cases, if not in all, the minority in these constituencies are the possessors of a great, if not of the greatest, amount of property and intelligence. Certainly that would be so in the case of the constituencies of populous towns. I do not desire to enter into any question whether the majority or the minority are likely to be right; but it can hardly admit of controversy that in the case of large masses in our large towns the great bulk of the property and intelligence will be found of necessity in the minority and not in the majority. In addition to that, the fact is apparent that unless the representation of these large constituencies is divided by consent or by legislation, the minorities to which I have referred, representing so large an amount of intelligence and property, are never brought into actual and direct contact with the legislation of the country. I know it is the fashion to say that these minorities, though not represented in their own particular constituencies, are sure to be represented indirectly, if not directly, in some other constituencies. But that argument, if admitted, would go entirely to the root of our whole representative system. The same argument was adduced during the discussion on the Reform Act of 1832. When it used to be contended then that large towns like Manchester ought to be represented in Parliament, the answer was, "No doubt Manchester is not represented directly; but the opinions of the inhabitants are represented indirectly by those who are Members for some other place." If, then, the argument be worth anything, it would go to the principle of indirect representation, and would be an answer to all appeals made for the enfranchisement of large and growing constituencies to which we are now giving the franchise. Now, I think I cannot do better than state what seem to me to be the advantages of such a system as I have proposed. These must obviously be looked at from three points of view—the advantages to the general legislation of the country, the advantages to the Members who would be selected under an arrangement of this kind, and the advantages to the constituencies themselves. Now, with regard to the Legislature, the advantages which I think would be gained by this system would be these—you would obtain in the persons of those who would be the representatives of the minority in these large constituencies a body of men of great intelligence and of great independence; you would have those elements of advantage which exist in the representation of small boroughs, and, at the same time, you would be perfectly free from the disadvantages and defects of the small borough system. If these minorities could return Members to Parliament, it seems to me that you would be able to provide seats for persons whose claims upon a constituency would be the claims of intelligence, freedom from any popular excitement or prejudice, and independence. Now, these are just the advantages which we are in the habit of saying have been obtained through the medium of small boroughs; and when you come to curtail the representation of small boroughs, or even abolish them, it would be desirable if, avoiding what is injurious, you could get that which is beneficial in the small borough system — getting it, however, in another shape. I think further that the Legislature would have in such persons an extremely steadying element in times of popular excitement. So long as you had only eleven or twelve constituencies, the operation of the plan I propose would, of course, be very small, and it would not, perhaps, have any very strong countervailing influence. But I look forward to a great extension of these constituencies, and, in that case, if you should get some forty or fifty, and an equal number of Members representing the minorities in those constituencies—I do not care on which side of the House they may sit—you would obtain a steady, stable element in the representation of the country which would have a most beneficial and salutary effect, especially in a time of any great popular excitement. In addition, you would gain this very great advantage:—without in the least entering into the comparative merits of Members for populous towns and of county Members, I think your Lordships must have observed that in a Representative House there is of necessity a very considerable sameness and monotony, both in the Members for large towns and the Members for large agricultural counties respectively. It is not a fault to be laid to any one's charge; the nature of the case requires it. Take the Members for the large manufacturing towns throughout the kingdom. They have very much the same views; their constituents have very much the same interests; the Members express the interests of the majority of their constituents; the majority is generally a majority in one direction; and the result is that you get in the House of Commons a body of men representing large manufacturing and commercial constituencies who are distinguished, I agree, by great ability and, if you please, intelligence, but at the same time by great sameness and monotony of character as regards the expression of their political sentiments. Now, I think it would be of great advantage to break in upon that political sameness; it would be a great advantage for the Legislature to have among them not only men who, representing the majority in the manufacturing towns, express the views most prevalent there, but also others who, representing the minority, would thus produce diversity, change, variation, in the sentiments expressed in the other House of Parliament and in the political tone of that assembly. There is another point, too, which deserves consideration. We are in the habit of saying that questions of politics are Imperial questions. That is, no doubt, quite true. At the same time questions are constantly arising which, in one aspect, are questions of general political interest, but which are more or less connected with local interests and bear upon local claims; and thus a question which, in a general point of view, is of political interest to the whole country sometimes becomes coloured and affected in many ways by the aspect in which it is viewed in different localities. No doubt in discussing general questions of political interest it would be of the greatest possible advantage to hear how those questions were viewed, not merely by different localities, but by different bodies of men in the same locality. That result you would obtain by the plan which I propose. I will not dwell further upon its advantages to the Legislature, but will pass to the consideration of the advantages which would be gained by the representatives of those large constituencies themselves. No doubt at the present moment there are are such things as Members sitting for the same constituency and yet differing in their political opinions. Happily, that is often so at present. I think it impossible to deny that the contact and intercourse with each other of Members of different political views sitting for the same constituency are highly beneficial. But at present—one must speak frankly upon such matters—it is impossible not to see that the intercourse between two men of different politics sitting for the same constituency must occasionally be influenced by a sort of rivalry—an apprehension of the bearing which their different views and interests may have upon their fate at some subsequent Parliamentary contest. Now, that would be entirely avoided by the arrangement which I propose. You would then have from the same constituency two Members representing the majority and one representing the minority, communicating freely with each other, and without the slightest tinge of jealousy or apprehension that the interests of one would jar or conflict with the interests of the other in the constituency. Moreover, I have the strongest opinion that there could be nothing more beneficial for public men and for Statesmen than that a public man of one way of thinking in politics, differing in opinion from the majority of a large constituency, should be brought face to face with the majority of the constituency, even although in doing so he should become the representative of the minority. I venture to think, for example, that if some one unconnected with manufactures, yet selected by property and intelligence and representing the minority in a manufacturing constituency, were brought face to face with the majority there, he would derive great benefit from the free expression of their views; and in the same way, some person chosen by the minority in an agricultural constituency, and not perhaps in any way connected with agriculture, would derive considerable benefit from being brought face to face with the majority in that constituency. Again, with regard to the constituency itself—and this is one of the most important views of the case—observe the advantages which would be gained. First, I believe you would gain the greatest possible local satisfaction. There is nothing so irksome to those who form the minority of one of those large constituencies as finding that, from the mere force of numbers, they are virtually excluded from the exercise of any political power; that it is in vain for them to attempt to take any part in public affairs; that the elections must always go in one direction, and that they have no political power whatever. On the one hand, the result is great dissatisfaction; and on the other, it is disinclination on the part of those who form the minority to take any part in affairs in which it is important they should take a prominent and conspicuous part. Another advantage of this proposal is that there is in it nothing that is invidious in the way of dividing constituencies into classes according to rateability or their stake in regard to property—there is no giving of a Member to one class of society, and thus distinguishing it from the rest of the community. Propositions of this kind are necessarily invidious; but mine contains nothing which can be considered invidious by any member of a constituency. In addition to that, it would do much to soften the asperity of political feeling which sometimes, though not often, prevails in large constituencies. I mean that, as a general rule, Englishmen exhibit such a spirit of fairness that they would be well content with any arrangement which gives to the majority of any large constituency the right of choosing two Members, and at the same time leaves one Member who would be the representative of the minority. Of this I am perfectly sure — and, although some treat it as an objection, I think it a great advantage of the scheme — that contests would be very much diminished in large constituencies, where contests are most expensive — so expensive that the mind almost recoils at hearing the sums which they cost. Contests, practically, would come to an end, and, as they did, so would danger of bribery and corruption. You would have great constituencies divided into great component parts; you would have each portion well represented; you would have freedom from expense, freedom from the irritation of political feeling, and from the curse of all elections—bribery. These are the advantages that it appears to me would follow the adoption of the proposal I venture to make. I have heard only two objections urged against this measure. I do not think the proposal I make was made in the other House of Parliament; but it has, of course, been a subject of discussion; and the only two objections I have heard are these:—First, if you adopt any measure of this kind, tending to the representation of minorities, you must introduce it also into constituencies represented by two Members. The result of that will be you will have one Member for each side, the one balancing the other, and you will neutralize and perhaps paralyze the whole representative system of the country. Now I make no proposition for the representation of minorities in constituencies returning two Members. On the contrary, I venture to think that any proposition of that kind would be open to very great objection. I think the great merit of the proposal I make, as compared with what has been called cumulative voting, is that, if you adopt my proposal, from its very nature you cannot carry it beyond the three-cornered constituencies; it must begin there and rest there: whereas if you introduce cumulative voting, even into three-cornered constituences, I believe you would find it difficult to resist the argument, in point of principle, which would say it ought to be carried further, and introduced into constituencies returning two Members. The other and more practical objection which I have heard is this—that supposing a vacancy occurs in the middle of a Parliament in respect of the seat occupied by the representative of a minority it must fall into the hands of the majority. Of course, at a General Election the arrangement would work without difficulty; the three seats would have to be filled up, and electors would vote accordingly; but if a vacancy occurs by the death or resignation of the

Member representing the minority in the middle of a Parliament there is an election to supply his place, and the majority must be allowed to vote, and practically to choose the candidate. I quite admit that; but it does not appear to me to be a fatal or a serious objection to the proposal. This is one of those matters in which what happens in one constituency will be fairly counterbalanced by what happens in another, through the respective majorities and minorities being of different political opinions. I do not think we need trouble ourselves about a slight circumstance of this kind, which, if the principle be a good one, will not affect its working in any way. These are the only two objections which I have heard; and if there are others, they will, perhaps, be stated. Without sharing alarm, while sharing anxiety as to the result of this measure, which introduces into the constituencies great numbers that have not had votes hitherto, and alters the system under which a select and privileged class have hitherto had the choice of Members of Parliament, I venture to press upon your Lordships that it will be worth your consideration and care to provide an arrangement by which, at all events, while we give additional force and weight to numbers, we shall not lose sight of the advantages which may be derived from considering the interests of the property and intelligence of the country.

After Clause 8, *moved* to insert the following Clause:—

"At a contested Election for any County or Borough represented by Three Members no Person shall vote for more than Two Candidates."—(*The Lord Cairns.*)

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY: My Lords, whatever may be the merit of the clause which the noble and learned Lord recommends, the proposition gains from the ability of his advocacy, and it is always most difficult to follow him, and convince those who have heard him that he is wrong in his arguments. I do not believe that in this instance the noble and learned Lord's case is as strong as, by his eloquence and talent in advocating it, he has made it appear to be. My first objection to his proposal is that it is entirely a new-fangled one. The plan exists in none of our institutions that I know of. In our municipal institutions it does not exist; certainly it does not in our political institutions; and I am not aware that such a plan of voting has been introduced into any of the public or private companies, which are now so numerous. I think the reason of that is obvious. The mind of an Englishman is a very straightforward piece of machinery, and I may say he generally puts the question in black and white. Upon the subject of discussion he is accustomed, and has been accustomed, ever to obey majorities, to be ruled by majorities, and to be obedient to the decisions and verdicts of majorities. If you agree to this proposition you are going directly contrary to the customs and habits of the country. But is this principle of representing minorities a fair proposal when we are amending the Representation of the People? What has been our object in introducing three-cornered constituencies by this Bill? We are not, as I said before, governed entirely by the numbers of the population, but we do, as far as discretion allows, pick out among the constituencies those who contain the greatest populations, and we add to the number of their representatives. To each of the four towns the noble and learned Lord has mentioned — Liverpool, Leeds, Manchester, and Birmingham — we have given an additional Member: and why have we done so? We have done so to give them additional power of representation, not of minorities, but in the Lobbies of the House of Commons; and if the scheme of the noble and learned Lord is followed you will take away with the one hand what you have given with the other. I will take the case of Manchester. You have given Manchester three representatives. If you adopt the scheme of my noble and learned Friend, what happens? That, practically, the majority in Manchester is represented by only one Member in the House of Commons. The second Member is neutralized by this "outrigger" who represents the minority. Therefore, the original object you had in giving three Members to Manchester is defeated entirely by the scheme of the noble and learned Lord. Not only so, but if the scheme is adopted Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Leeds will actually stand in a worse position than smaller boroughs which return two Members, because those smaller boroughs, if their opinions are strong, one way or the other, will send two Members to the House of Commons representing those opinions, and they will therefore be practically represented by twice as many Members as the larger towns we wish by this Bill to render more powerful through their representation in Parliament. I do not know whether that may be the object of the noble and learned Lord; but his proposal appears to me, in the first place, to be one tending totally to defeat the object of the Bill. One of the advantages which the noble and learned Lord mentioned was that the tendering of the scheme would be to diminish, if not altogether to put an end to rivalry between candidates and to election contests. In some cases, no doubt, the frequency of contests would not only be diminished but they would actually cease. The candidates would meet together in order to ascertain what should be done. They might, perhaps, find out that one-third of the constituency, *plus* one, represented the minority, and in that case they would have nothing to do but to shake hands and to set down one name as representing the minority and two others as representing the majority; and in that case there would be no contest. Now, I think the principle of three-cornered constituencies is a very bad one, and I hope they will never be increased. It is said to have been first adopted in consequence of the Government, at the period of the passing of the Reform Act of 1832, having begun to disfranchise before they had ascertained what places they ought to enfranchise. They ultimately found that they had too much stuff on their hands, and not knowing what else to do with the surplus Members they gave a third Member to some of the counties. Whether that tradition is true or not I cannot say. My noble and learned Friend has stated that his proposal will, if adopted, tend to soften asperities. Now, though we certainly all wish that as little asperity as possible should be imported into political discussions both in Parliament and in the country, I very much doubt whether, to attempt by such means as this to put an end to contest and rivalry, you will not produce a tameness in regard to politics very much to be deprecated. In this country there is great freedom of speech, and I think the — what I will call fighting propensities of Englishmen at contested elections are rather beneficial than otherwise, if such elections do not recur too often, and the rivalry is not carred too far. Of course, if you had annual or even triennial Parliaments the country would not be the better for the frequent contests that would take place; but I think the contests and discussions which now occur in the different counties and boroughs of Great Britain periodically are most beneficial to the country. These contests extract the real opinions of the great mass of the people; but you will have in many cases an almost private compact and agreement for dividing counties and boroughs if the triangular system is introduced, and this I think much to be deprecated. I believe that the House of Commons did not discuss exactly the same proposition as that of my noble and learned Friend, but still that House discussed a scheme very similar to it, relating to the cumulative vote, and rejected it by a considerable majority. Under the circumstances I do not think it will be beneficial either to Parliament itself, or to the Members of Parliament, or to the country at large, that the system of a clear and straightforward representation by majorities should be abandoned and that the proposed arrangement should be adopted. For these reasons Her Majesty's Government cannot, I am sorry to say, agree to my noble and learned Friend's Amendment, and I hope your Lordships will vote against it.

Earl RUSSELL: I hope your Lordships will consider this proposition well before you decide against it. It was thought prudent to insert a like provision in the Reform Bill, introduced by the Government in 1854, and I may mention that the late Duke of Newcastle and Sir James Graham were Members of a Committee of the Cabinet which reported in favour of the plan. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Malmesbury) has objected that this is a novelty. I fully admit it; but are we to reject every novelty? Let me remind your Lordships that the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland has been a most effective one since the Revolution of 1688, but that it has been at the same time a Government of extreme complexity. It has only succeeded by reason of the blending of various powers—the blending of the prerogative and influence of the Crown, the rank and influence of the aristocracy, and the rights and liberties of the people into one compact force, which has acted powerfully and harmoniously. Now, let us consider what was decided upon soon after the Revolution as the principle of Government. It was stated very ably by the late Lord Macaulay, who showed that in 1693 it was decided, under the advice of a man who had given very bad advice before, and nearly ruined the country—I mean Lord Sunderland—to have a party Administration. Previously to that time the Administration had been variously composed.

Sometimes half of the Administration were of one party and half of another, no clear and decisive line of action being laid down for the Government to adopt. Well, in consequence of that advice of Lord Sunderland a party Administration was formed towards the end of the reign of William III. The same system was adopted by Queen Anne who formed first a Whig and afterwards a Tory Ministry. A Whig Ministry was installed in the early part of the reign of George I., and soon afterwards Sir Robert Walpole came into power. That was the commencement of the system which has prevailed ever since. Under that system it has been found necessary to have a great part of the Administration in the House of Commons, and of course Members of that House must be found who are qualified to fill great offices in the Administration. Now it commonly happens that the men who possess the confidence of great manufacturing towns and great commercial cities are persons very deeply and very extensively engaged in business and trade, their time being occupied by those pursuits by which they have amassed their fortunes and placed themselves at the head, as it were, of the towns in which they reside. Generally speaking, they are so completely taken up with their business that it would be a very great loss to them to accept an office with a salary which is trifling in comparison with the fortunes they are making. Then, again, take the leading men in the great agricultural counties. They are often men of large fortunes and devoted to agricultural pursuits. They may be very excellent magistrates at the Quarter Sessions, but still they are not men who have studied the course of political affairs, and they would be very unwilling to leave their country avocations and comforts and their delightful homes, in order to engage in political pursuits and devote themselves entirely to the duties and labours of office. But we had many nomination boroughs previously to the Reform Act of 1832, and since then there have been boroughs which, though not nomination boroughs, were still very small boroughs, which give an opportunity of entering Parliament to the very class of men—such, for instance, as the late Sir Robert Peel—who had from an early period of life given themselves up to politics. In 1832 we found ourselves on the road to the abolition of small boroughs. We are now on the road to abolishing them still further. The question then arises whether, if we maintain scarcely any constituencies but large communities, we can carry on our complicated system of government. Shall we find in great commercial cities and in large communities men who would be willing, and at the same time able, to fill our great offices with credit to the country? It will not do to say, as the noble Earl opposite has said, that this proposition is entirely new. That is not a sufficient answer to the proposal. You are making great changes, and if you change one part of our complicated system without changing the other parts you will put the whole machinery out of gear. I believe, perhaps, it is with me a kind of superstition, that our constitutional system is the best plan of government ever put in practice; but if you deal with it in the way to which I have just referred you will find that it will fail in some way or other. The monarchy, the aristocracy, and the people will be pursuing different paths, and the Constitution will be brought to such a pass as to make us despair of its future. Now let us consider what the effects of the proposition of the noble and learned Lord will be—first, with regard to Parliament, and next with regard to the constituencies who send representatives to Parliament from the counties and towns. With regard to Parliament, I think that whether in such a place as Manchester, where the great current of opinion is in favour of what are called Liberal politics, or whether in the county of Buckingham, where the great current of opinion is in favour of Conservative politics, it would be a great advantage to have one man of moderate views returned to Parliament. You are more likely to bring about such a result by the plan of the noble and learned Lord. I believe that by means of such a plan you would introduce into the House of Commons men of moderate views whose influence would tend to reconcile parties on those occasions, which now and then arise, when neither extreme is completely right, and when the influence of moderate men is of much use in allaying the heat of party passion. Then let us consider what would be the case as regards the constituent bodies. The noble Earl says that if the Amendment were adopted the views of the majority of a constituency returning three Members would not prevail in the way those views prevail now—that if one of the Members were returned by the minority of, perhaps, more than one-third of the entire constituency, the majority would not feel that they were fully represented, inasmuch as the vote of one of their representatives would be neutralized. Well, I must say that I think a party would be rather unreasonable if they were not satisfied with having two to one of the representatives. If there were fifty constituencies so divided, the majority would have 100 votes in a division, and their opponents only fifty. I think the majority might be tolerably well satisfied under such circumstances. But is there no other advantage? Suppose a town has 20,000 voters, and that 12,000 are of one side in politics and 8,000 of the other, would not that town be better represented if both the 12,000 and the 8,000 were represented than if only the 12,000 were represented? The gentleman who first impressed me with those opinions as to three-cornered constituencies mentioned to me that in a great manufacturing town where there was a very considerable Conservative minority, men of the greatest respectability, men of wealth, and men of education, were in such a state of political irritation from the fact of feeling themselves reduced to the position of mere ciphers at elections that they were sometimes ready to support candidates of even extreme democratic opinions. The advantages of the plan now proposed would be felt in important counties as well as in large towns. Is it not a fact that persons who have lived together in the greatest harmony, both as regards business transactions and social relations, sometimes have their friendly communications entirely broken by party contests in counties? Ten or fifteen years have sometimes elapsed before friendship, thus interrupted, has been renewed again. I own I think it extremely likely that one of the effects of the system proposed by this Amendment would be that, if two Members were to be elected by the majority and one by the minority, the respective parties would come to such an arrangement as would render a contest unnecessary. There is, however, no ground for the apprehension that all political activity would cease, because at present the plan would only apply to twelve constituencies, and at no time would it be likely to extend to one-half of the entire constituencies. I can well understand men who are extremely intolerant and exclusive in politics objecting to give any voice to those whose political views are distasteful to them; but I cannot understand such an objection being urged by those who are in favour of having public opinion fairly represented. I think that when you are making a great change in our old, and, I may add, mysterious Constitution, of which Mr. Canning said, "It was fearfully and wonderfully made," it will be wise to consider every proposition by which the change can be made to harmonize with that which we all admire, which we all love, as a form of government. For these reasons, my Lords, I think you ought not lightly and inconsiderately to reject the Amendment which the noble and learned Lord has proposed.

LORD DENMAN: It is quite problematical whether the introduction of this scheme into the Bill will not impede its success, and I look at it more as a promise than a certainty. I beg to remind your Lordships that, in 1853, Mr. Locke King had said on introducing his County Franchise Bill—

> "He hoped still more that he should not be told that he ought not to press it now because they had a promise of Reform. He was heartily sick of these promises of Reform. It was the discussion on a similar occasion which induced the noble Lord (Lord John Russell) to make a promise of Reform, but the fulfilment of that promise caused nothing but dissatisfaction and disappointment."—[3 *Hansard*, cxxvi. 1046.]

In 1858, the noble Earl, now on the front Opposition Bench (Earl Russell), said, on leave being given for the introduction of another Bill on the same subject—

> "For my part, I think the right course will be at once to accept the Bill of my hon. Friend and not listen to the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman that we should vote for the previous Question. We should remember that a 'Bird in the hand is worth two in the Bush,' and in that spirit support the Motion of the hon. Member for Surrey."—[3 *Hansard*, cxlix. 1828.]

The noble Lord proceeded to remind the House how, in 1854, Lord Jocelyn, in the House of Commons, had dissuaded the noble Lord from bringing in a measure of Reform, and how, in their Lordships' House, the noble Earl, now the First Lord of the Treasury, whose absence every one in this House deplored, earnestly entreated the Earl of Aberdeen not to bring in a Reform Bill, when, in the opinion of every one except that noble Earl war was imminent; and how, in 1854, the noble Earl on the front Opposition Bench was unable to carry on that Reform Bill containing a provision like that proposed by the noble and learned Lord; but now that a Reform Bill has gone through nearly all its stages, it was most unadvisable to adopt a proposition, however ingenious, which would jeopardize the passing of this Reform Bill, and deprive the concession to four great boroughs of all its weight.

EARL SPENCER said, he felt he could add little or nothing to the able and searching argument which had been addressed to their Lordships by the noble and learned Lord who proposed this Motion; but the subject was one of such vast importance to the country that he thought it the duty of any one who had considered the subject with earnestness to come forward and state his views with regard to it. We were entering on a new and unknown region of our representative history: very few of their Lordships were able to look forward with any certainty to what might take place after the passing of this Reform Bill. In view, therefore, of the difficulties of the future ought they not to look back upon the past to see whether experience had pointed out any evils which timely precautions might be able to palliate, and being fore-warned by the past, we ought to be fore-armed for the future? One of the strongest arguments urged last year against the Bill of the late Government was that it admitted so large a body to the franchise that it, together with the kindred elements in the existing constituencies, would overpower all other classes of the community. He agreed with the noble Duke who spoke on the second night of the debate on the second reading (the Duke of Argyll), and who so ably pointed out that, until the statistics procured by the late Government were made known, no one could have conceived how large a body of working men were already in possession of the franchise. As they had not hitherto combined, he did not think it unreasonable to hope they would not do so under the increased constituencies. He did not therefore apprehend that danger would result from this extension of the franchise; but it might give rise to difficulties against which we ought to provide some protection. This was, perhaps, a speculative difficulty; and though he did not himself attribute great importance to it, he was aware that it had great weight with many persons when considering the present measure, and ought, therefore, to receive careful consideration; but there were evils of a more practical character which experience had very clearly pointed out. In America, for instance, for many years past, great complaints had been made that large numbers of persons, men of influence, of intellect, of wealth and position, refrained from taking any part in political life. Why was that? Because they felt that they were a hopeless minority, whose opinions were crushed by the overwhelming mass of the majority; they were, as the noble Earl (Earl Russell) had said, cyphers in the political world. If we looked at home we should find in all the great constituencies large bodies of men who did not care to go to the poll, and large bodies who refused to be put upon the register. Did not this arise from a similar cause—from feeling themselves cyphers in the constituency? They learned from a statement made a few nights ago by an hon. Member (Mr. Hughes) in "another place," that in his constituency, out of 26,000 voters, 10,000 abstained from voting. Surely that was an evil for which some palliative was required. And was it to be wondered at that interest should cease to be felt in many cases by the electors? All the sixteen Members for the Metropolis were of one shade of political opinion; yet those who sat on the Opposition side of the House were not so prejudiced as to suppose that Her Majesty's Government had not the support and sympathy of large numbers of residents in the metropolis. It was said that if not directly represented, those Conservative electors who in London were in a minority were represented through the majority somewhere else. As far as the House of Commons in that aggregate was concerned, he believed the answer was a sound one: but he did not look upon it as a complete and sufficient answer, and it certainly gave but very poor comfort to the individual constituency in which the minority were thus extinguished. Their opinion was entirely crushed, and that he took to be a very great evil, remembering that one of the great objects of representative government was to interest the greatest possible number in the public affairs of the country. Several remedies for this condition of things had been proposed, but he would not discuss them in any detail; it was enough to say that one of them had now been brought forward in a practical shape, and he believed it would have the desired effect of protecting the minorities. It was not the wish of those who, like himself, supported the Motion of the noble and learned Lord, to give the minorities an equal voice with the majority; their only desire was that the constituencies should be fairly represented, and that if a minority attained a certain proportion of the whole constituency, they should to some extent receive representation. The plan, he believed, was an exceedingly impartial one; in one place a Conservative would be returned by the minority, in another a Whig, and in another an extreme Liberal. It was the duty of their Lordships to look forward in legislating, and the day will probably come when the electoral districts of this country will be changed to a far greater extent than at present. They might anticipate a day, possibly not far distant, when equal electoral districts might be introduced into this country. If such a system should ever be established, of what enormous value would it then be to have tried beforehand the experiment—for to some extent it was an experiment—embodied in the present Motion! The proposal, if it proved successful, would enable them to mitigate to some extent the evils apprehended from equal electoral districts. For his own part, he heartily supported the Motion of the noble and learned Lord. He believed that it would tend not only to prevent great numbers from overpowering small ones, but would foster political feeling in the local constituencies, and would supplement to some extent the small boroughs, which undoubtedly had introduced many eminent and distinguished men to Parliament.

Earl STANHOPE said, he was sorry to find that it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to resist the present Motion. For his own part he approved it, and should give it his cordial support. Among the arguments used by his noble Friend the Lord Privy Seal there were some that he had heard with great surprise. His noble Friend had stated that, in his opinion, this system of three-cornered constituencies was an erroneous system, which ought on no account to be encouraged. Well, but who had encouraged the system; who had increased the number of these three-cornered constituencies? Why, Her Majesty's Government. To the existing constituencies of that class they added by this Bill third Members for the boroughs of Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Leeds. Whom then were their Lordships to trust as the representatives of Her Majesty's Goverment—the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had introduced this proposition to the other House of Parliament, or his noble Friend who had denounced it that evening? His noble Friend seemed to think that the third Member elected by the minority would occupy a disadvantageous position as contrasted with his colleagues. His noble Friend said he would be an "outrigger"—a term he (Earl Stanhope) did not clearly understand. He must even confess that he had never heard it before. But be its meaning what it might, he altogether denied that the third Member so elected would stand in any inferior position. The largest and most valuable constituencies in this country nearly all comprised a most respectable and influential minority. His former knowledge of Manchester enabled him to state that, although the Liberal majority in that town was very decided, there was a most respectable, and, for a minority, a most numerous body of Conservatives. The same thing might be said in an opposite sense of the counties where Conservative feeling prevailed. One of the noble Dukes on the Conservative Benches no doubt would stand aghast at what he was going to say; but as a landed proprietor in Buckingham he felt bound to declare that the Liberal minority, as far as numbers went, were very well entitled to a seat. He did not mean for a moment that there would be any danger to the seat of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose undoubted genius, great ability, and long experience in public affairs, would always place him at the head of the poll in that county, whoever else might be a candidate — he merely asserted, from his knowledge of the county, that supposing the circumstances to be such as to favour the election of a Liberal candidate, as far as numbers went that candidate had a fair claim to be returned. It would be of enormous advantage to temper in some such manner the extreme rigour of the principle which would elect all three Members upon one side; and, for his own part, he should never consider any plan of representation complete which did not give one Conservative Member to such a city as Manchester, and one Liberal Member to such a county as Buckingham. It was only by this system of blending different interests and mitigating the asperities of party feeling that a House of Commons could be brought together that would work, as we all desired it should do, in harmony, and in accordance with the best interests of the country. For his own part, he had always regretted that this system was not introduced by Her Majesty's Government at the very commencement of the discussion. Let their Lordships not deceive themselves as to the magnitude of the change now before them. He believed that so great a change had never been proposed by peaceful legislation; greater changes undoubtedly had been made as a consequence of civil war or foreign invasion, but speaking solely of peaceful legislation, he did not think that they would find that so great a change had ever been effected. What was it they were about to do? They were about to transfer the government of this country from the middle classes, who, speaking as a whole, had exercised it during the last thirty years, to those whom he might describe as the wages class—the class subsisting on weekly wages. This was an immense change. He did not say that the Constitution would sink under such a change; nor did he altogether share in the gloomy anticipations that had been expressed with so much ability, with so much force, and with so much knowledge of the subject by the noble Earl he saw opposite (the Earl of Shaftesbury). Still, however, no one could say where they were going. They were taking a leap in the dark. Like the Prince in the Persian tale, they might possibly alight on a bed of roses, but it was equally possible that at the close of the descent they might find themselves on a mass of flints. Under any circumstances, he trusted that their Lordships would not shut their eyes to the magnitude of the change they were effecting. With all frankness he acknowledged that he had been deceived in the anticipations he had formed with regard to the first Reform Bill. In 1831 and 1832 he had, speaking honestly to the best of his lights, predicted all kind of evil and danger from the Reform Bill which was at that period anxiously discussed and finally passed. In those predictions he had been, as he desired frankly to acknowledge, entirely mistaken; and that fact led him to hope that he might also be mistaken now. That chance—or, if their Lordships would rather say, probability—did not, however, deter him from saying that, considering the uncertainty which beset their path, it behoved them to take every possible precaution to avert danger. He regretted exceedingly that the plan of a third vote had not been proposed at the commencement. Their Lordships would remember that when the Bill was introduced, in contemplation of the great changes it was calculated to bring about, it was accompanied by a great number of safeguards and securities. One by one those safeguards and securities had fallen—one by one they had been swept away. He confessed his regret that the Government, in framing their Bill, had not instituted a larger number of three-cornered constituencies. Had they done so, and accompanied it by a proposal similar to the present, they would have secured to the minority a share in the representation; they would have guarded against the excess of popular violence in places where, in the torrent of opinions, no barrier was regarded and no private opinion cared for, and where the only object was to secure every seat that could be gained. He believed that to give an effectual though limited share in the representation in large and populous places to those who by inheritance, by education, and by property, were qualified to exercise the franchise to the advantage of the public would be displaying consistent and statesmanlike discretion. He must say, therefore, that he gave his entire assent to the proposal of his noble and learned Friend. That proposal came before their Lordships under peculiarly favourable circumstances, considering the ability with which it had been urged and the high character which the noble and learned Lord had already acquired with all sides during the short time that he had been a Member of their Lordships' House. It was quite true, as had been urged by one of the noble Lords opposite, that the proposal would, in the first instance, affect only twelve constituencies; but he would be a very short-sighted observer of the signs of the times who did not entertain an apprehension that the change in Parliamentary representation now carried so far, would be carried by other hands still further. If then it should be found necessary to new-model in another manner the distribution of political power, this principle of a vote limited to two Members wherever three existed, would, he was convinced, if admitted, open a path by which much complication and danger might be averted. He had, until this moment, refrained from urging objections to the Bill, however strong his opinions might have been with regard to particular provisions, because he did not see how they could, under the circumstances, do other than accept the measure sent up to them. In spite of its many defects and shortcomings he, therefore, advised their Lordships to accept the Bill, and to throw no substantial obstacle in the way of its passing. He did not, however, regard this Amendment as any substantial obstacle, while it would go far towards conferring on the measure the moderate character which they desired it should possess. On a question of this nature party considerations sank into comparative insignificance, and when he saw it possible to amend the Bill, and to render it more perfect, such considerations would not for a moment affect the course which he should take. His remarks did not apply to such Amendments as the one which had emanated from his noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey), because the success of such Amendments would endanger the passing of the Bill; but as to the Amendment moved by his noble and learned Friend, and in favour of which he should record his vote, that Amendment, in his opinion, while it would tend to the most surpassing benefit, would by no means be open to the same disadvantage, nor liable to the same result.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH: My Lords, It is always a matter of difficulty and invidiousness for Her Majesty's Government to adopt any course opposed to that which is marked out and suggested by the noble and learned Lord who has acted and still acts with so friendly a disposition towards them, and has rendered them such important service during the progress of this Bill. And, my Lords, it is a matter of no slight difficulty to oppose a proposition of this nature, which has on its surface so much of speciousness and so much of apparent plausibility to recommend it. Nevertheless, it is the duty of Her Majesty's Government to warn your Lordships that it is their strong belief and conviction that the acceptance of this proposition will be attended with very serious dangers and very serious complications to our constitutional system. The subject is one which has been very much under the consideration of the Government: it is not now brought forward for the first time; it was raised in the other House of Parliament; and Her Majesty's Government have had frequent opportunities of considering whether it would conduce to the sound and good government of the country. They believe, however, after mature consideration, that it is not one that ought to be introduced into the Bill; and that though on the one hand, much may be said in its favour, its disadvantages are on the other hand so great that they ought not to accept it. This proposal appears to be advocated from two or three points of view. The noble Earl who hast just spoken (Earl Stanhope), looks upon it as one of those safeguards which he regards as necessary to counteract the effects of a measure which he believes to be too democratic in its character and to be likely to lead to injurious results. On the other hand, this proposal is also supported by noble Lords opposite, and from them we have but one opinion—that they are not afraid of their countrymen nor of the democratic tendencies of the Bill. If the ground, therefore, taken by the noble Earl behind me is correct, I claim on that account the support of the noble Lords opposite. But, my Lords, the noble Earl behind me has taken my noble Friend (the Lord Privy Seal) very seriously to task, and in very warm and fervid language, for having stated that he could not approve three cornered constituencies. Now the scheme of re-distribution under this Bill as first introduced by Her Majesty's Government did not contain three-cornered constituencies. Those three-cornered constituencies were part of a subsequent plan which was recommended to the Government, and strongly supported in the other House of Parliament, and which, although they had not originally proposed it, they ultimately adopted. I do not mean to say that Her Majesty's Government are not responsible at the present time for those three-cornered constituencies which are now included in the Bill; but what I say is that although they accept the responsibility at the present time they were not the advocates of them at the outset. My Lords, we have had a strange doctrine laid down by the noble Earl who spoke last. The noble and learned Lord who has brought forward this proposal stated that he asked your concurrence in it, because it could only apply to twelve constituencies at the present time and that, therefore, it was a matter of no great importance. He admitted he proposed it as an experiment; that it was an experiment which might or might not succeed; in the noble and learned Lord's opinion it was a valuable experiment to try; but he recommended it to your Lordships' adoption because of being of so limited a character, it was a safe experiment to make. But what we have heard from the noble Earl who has just sat down and if I mistake not also from the noble Earl opposite, is that they look upon this as the commencement of a new system which is ultimately to change and revolutionize the constitutional representation of England and that this is to be extended not to twelve but to fifty constituencies, and thus may form a very important feature hereafter in the whole distribution of our representation. If this is the view which is to be taken, I think Her Majesty's Government are fully justified in hesitating before they give their assent to this proposal. If this principle is to grow by degrees until it has largely interwoven itself with the Constitution of this country, surely we ought to pause before we take a step from which there may be no receding, on a matter so vital to the interests of the nation. I confess I cannot understand the argument of the noble Earl, whom I do not now see in his place (Earl Russell), and who, in very glowing language, gave a powerful sketch, as he is so well able to do, of the Constitution of this country. The noble Earl went back to the days of Charles II., and described the origin of party government. He stated that it was this that had brought England up to her present pitch of greatness; that it was by the blending of all parties and interests together that the country had arrived at its present condition of harmony, and at that state of agreement and general vigour which is the characteristic of her institutions and her people. But I could not understand the logical position of the noble Earl; because, if that be the case—if it is under our existing Constitution and our existing mode of voting that England has attained her present position, and has maintained her vigour up to this time—on what plea and on what ground can he come forward and ask us to introduce this important change which, it is admitted, will have a most material effect on our future system of representation? Allusion has been made to the operation of this proposal in preventing contests in boroughs; and I cannot help thinking that a proposal of this sort would tend very materially to do away with that important element in the freedom of constitutional election—namely, contests both in boroughs and in counties. The inevitable result of this mode of voting would be to greatly reduce the number of candidates who would offer themselves to constituencies. Matters would be arranged in boroughs by electioneering committees. Candidates would be nominated by them, and it would be agreed by them who should become the representative of boroughs. Those candidates would simply be put forward on electioneering tickets, very much as is the case in America, and the elections would take place without an opportunity being given to the constituents generally to express their opinions as to whom they would think it most desirable to have returned. Certain candidates would be selected by the most active, most pushing, and most ardent partizans of the place, who would form themselves into committees, and the electors would merely be asked to record their votes for A and B, without being allowed to chose from a number of rival candidates. My Lords, I can conceive nothing more prejudicial or more fatal to the vigour of our English system of election than that this mode of voting should prevail. The plan is a specious one, but it has this essential defect in it—that it would deprive of all its vigour, the House of Commons, whose decisions have always, in a remarkable degree, commanded the confidence and respect of the country. Whatever verdict the House of Commons may pronounce, the country abides by it, because it feels that the verdict of that great assembly is the verdict of the majority of the country. That is the simple theory which has pervaded all our institutions; that is the theory which Englishmen understand; that is the theory which has contributed to give Parliament all the authority which it has always exercised; and I fear that if this new system were established the House of Commons could no longer be looked upon as representing the opinions of the majority, but as being a kind of divided, nondescript, non-homogeneous body, whose decisions would, to a great extent, lose their weight and authority. My Lords, this question has been fairly considered by the other House of Parliament, and the decision pronounced upon it with that instinctive perception which the House of Commons always has of its own rights, its own privileges, and its own safety, does, I believe, fully express the true character of this measure; and in the very large majority of 134 who voted against this proposal in the other House, I believe the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) actually recorded his opinion against it, as being one which was neither consistent with the safety nor the authority of that great assembly. My Lords, I will not trespass further on your attention, but Her Majesty's Government feel that, however much they regret to have to differ from my noble and learned Friend, this is an Amendment which they cannot approve.

EARL COWPER said, that although Her Majesty's Government had been enabled to defeat the proposal for creating additional three-cornered constituencies when that proposal was supported by the great body of the Liberal party in the other House of Parliament, yet on thinking the matter over again afterwards the Government, on their own responsibility, had thought fit to adopt some of those very same three-cornered constituencies. The noble Duke who had just spoken (the Duke of Marlborough) did not seem to object so much to that system being applied to twelve three-cornered constituencies as to its being afterwards gradually extended further; and, indeed, it would appear that Her Majesty's Government preferred sudden changes to gradual ones. As to the present proposal preventing election contests, he could not conceive how anybody who was acquainted with the evils frequent at such contests could object to their being avoided as much as possible. He thought that the arguments addressed in favour of adopting the Amendment were overwhelming. The general tone of those arguments had been from a Conservative point of view, and he was afraid that the great majority of their Lordships having declared themselves against any Amendment of a Liberal character would have a detrimental influence in the country. But every measure of progress had begun with a minority. That was the case with all the great measures, from Catholic Emancipation down to the Reform Bill of last year. He believed that the great majority of the other House were opposed to Reform last year; but this year there was hardly a Member of that House who was not in favour of it. He thought that the representation of minorities was above all to be desired by those who wished to avoid sudden and violent changes, because by the weight and influence of an intelligent minority great measures might be carried gradually, and in a safe and deliberate manner, and not suddenly and by jerks, like the repeal of the Corn Laws. He believed that this proposal might be advocated quite as much from a Liberal as from a Conservative point of view, and it was as a Liberal that he should support it.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, I am glad to have this opportunity of drawing your Lordships' attention to some of the real points in this question, instead of following my noble Friend who has just addressed your Lordships in those somewhat party considerations which have tinged his speech. I believe that of all the questions connected with Reform that come before us this especially ought not to be regarded from a party point of view. The difficulty I experience is this — that the whole subject has been so fully discussed, and the arguments in favour of this proposal have been so unanswerably urged by my noble and learned Friend, that it is almost impossible to adduce any fresh considerations on its behalf. I may, however, be allowed to take my departure from a somewhat earlier point of view than that of my noble and learned Friend. I am not prepared to say that the present electoral system is not, in the absolute preponderance which it gives to a bare majority of electors, accompanied by a certain amount of evil and injustice. That evil and injustice, qualified, as it is, by various considerations, may be endured; but when once your new constituencies come into existence the evil and injustice will become almost insupportable. Look to the position in which we are placed. It is competent in any constituency for a majority, however small, if they are organized and held together, to disfranchise the minority, however large. Take an extreme case, which, for illustration, is as good as any other. In any constituency composed of 100 members a majority of 51 can disfranchise the remaining minority of 49. Is this fair? Is this reasonable? Is this just? In the United States, where all questions are pushed to an extreme, we have seen how a not excessive majority is able not only to disfranchise but absolutely to silence the minority. But in the present case, while you are placing the small boroughs of this country under sentence, there is, on the other hand, a tendency for the large boroughs to grow larger under this Bill; and my noble and learned Friend has conclusively pointed out that, as a matter of fact, candidates and Members for large constituencies, with a few exceptions, such as that of the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill), are assuming a type of character which is gradually becoming lower. In the nature of things it must be so. As we know, all large towns are democratic, and men of independent views will not agree to that compromise of opinions to which allusion has frequently in these discussions been made, and prefer to retire into private life rather than consent to fill the character of mere delegates. That is the difficulty with which we have to deal; and what is the remedy which my noble and learned Friend proposes? He proposes, as I understand, that you should give to a minority which is more than one-third of the whole constituency a share in the representation. And if the present system is accompanied with mischief to both parties, making the majority arrogant and overbearing, and the minority discontented and dissatisfied with their position, a great advantage would be gained by adopting the proposal of my noble and learned Friend. I rest my concurrence in this Motion upon the argument that the representation of the minority is advantageous alike to the majority and the minority, to the electors and the elected; that it is neither a Whig scheme nor a Tory scheme—neither a Conservative nor a Liberal scheme, but that it is conceived in the interest of all parties and all classes in this country. I listened with very great attention to the objections urged by Her Majesty's Government to this proposal, but the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) will forgive me if I say that I did not hear from him one solid argument in opposition to this clause. He started, indeed, by stating that there were advantages and disadvantages on both sides of the case; but the noble Duke, after doing but poor justice to the advantages, forgot to state what were the disadvantages of the present proposal. The only argument I heard from my noble Friend (the Lord Privy Seal) who spoke on the part of the Government, was that this is a "new-fangled" scheme. But I say that it does not lie in the mouth of a Government which is introducing a measure that is revolutionary to take an objection like that; and I am confident that there is no illusion so fatal as to suppose that you can adopt a new system in part and with it retain the fragments and meaningless remnants of an old one. If you are prepared to enter upon this new path, then you must go into it with new conditions and new securities for the future. The noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) said it was the habit of the English people to be governed by a majority. Now, I accept this statement as a matter of fact within certain limits; but I know no doctrine so wretched as the theory that the majority must be all in all. It has been a minority over and over again in history, in politics, in religion, in literature, in science, in philosophy, and in every department of human thought and action that has first stirred the great questions by which the welfare of mankind has been assured, and their moral happiness raised. But then my noble Friend has said that this clause will have only a very limited application. That is a matter which rather concerns us who support this proposal, and who are content to accept it as a principle, which we believe may work out beneficial effects, than those who object to it on the ground alternatively of it being too small or too large. If, as has been said, the tendency of this proposal would be to put an end to contests I should hail it as an advantage. What are twelve contests? How will the absence of twelve contests throughout the whole country produce that stagnation of public feeling on which my noble Friend dwelt as an argument against the proposal? Nay, even in a party point of view, I deny that it can produce any possible inconvenience. Of the seven existing three-cornered constituencies there are three which are at this moment held exclusively by one party; and as the principle would be applied to the four great towns which are to have an additional Member, those towns will balance the three seats held by gentlemen of one way of thinking. But let the House consider what the alternative is if they reject the proposal of my noble and learned Friend. That alternative is obvious. You have, you say, added a third Member to large towns, not only in virtue of population, but also in virtue of wealth; but if you refuse this proposal you defeat your own intentions, and reject, in fact, the representation of property, placing the representation of those great towns simply and solely upon numbers. Need I ask your Lordships to consider what, before many years, that principle would bring us to? It has been admitted on all hands that we are entering on a very democratic system of government. Now, there are two forms of democracy; there is the mere democracy of the mob, which avenges itself and comes to an end very soon; but there is a higher form of democracy, ideal and visionary as it may be, with which some cultivated minds may hold sympathy — namely, the organized representation of the nation as a whole. Give that and you give some chance to your new system. Deny it, and that new system must inevitably crumble to pieces. Your Lordships will recollect that during the Crimean War Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden, having expressed opinions which were somewhat unpopular among their constituents, lost their seats, and for a short time were excluded from the House of Commons. Now, I have certainly no sympathy with the views which are generally propounded by Mr. Bright; but I say frankly that the absence of a man so eminent as Mr. Bright in many ways is, would be a very serious loss to the House of Commons. But, under such an electoral constitution as that which you are now creating, this might very easily happen; and a Member quite as popular as Mr. Bright might find it very difficult to obtain a seat even in one of the three-cornered constituencies to be created under this Bill. In every point of view, therefore, Conservative or Liberal, this proposal offers a shelter for the expression of those thoughts and opinions which lie off the highway of public life in this country, and for those whose independence of character, in a time of public agitation, forbids them to acquiesce in the popular cry of the day, whatever it may be. For these reasons I heartily concur in the proposal of my noble and learned Friend. We have now arrived at a point of vital importance; and I earnestly entreat your Lordships to dismiss from your minds all party considerations, and to look at this proposal neither with reference to party nor to previously formed opinions, but simply as Members of the House of Lords, conscious that we have a great trust to discharge, and conscious of the responsibility which attends the manner in which we discharge it on this occasion.

. Lord HOUGHTON believed that, so far from the Liberal character of the Bill being restricted by this proposal, it would really be enlarged. The representation of minorities really rested on the great principle that every Englishman should, in one way or another, be represented; and that, as far as practicable, individual opinions should find expression. It had been assumed, somewhat too gratuitously, that in all these cases the minority would return a Member; but the real advantage of the proposal was that it would induce the minority in large constituencies to come forward and express their opinions. The entire abstention from politics of men of a philosophical turn of mind, and of men of extreme and peculiar views, was a great evil, and it was very desirable to encourage the expression and development of individual opinion. It had been said that this plan would be a check on democracy. What, however, made the word democracy distasteful was the fear of its power being abused; and, just as an absolute and tyrannous monarchy or an insolent aristocracy should be held in check by every legitimate means, so should the abuse of democratic power be guarded against. The present proposal was not only calculated to serve that purpose, but to encourage and develop individual liberty; and it was perfectly consonant with the best provisions of the Bill, and with the principles and traditions of our Constitution. He was thankful to find that the proposal had received such a fair consideration from both sides of the House. No opposition had been offered to it except by the Government, who seemed to regard it from an extremely democratic point of view. Their Lordships had now an opportunity of exercising a very beneficent influence, and, while not impeding the progress of this great measure, of materially allaying any apprehensions which were now entertained as to its operation.

The Earl of SHREWSBURY regretted that so much party feeling had been displayed in this debate, for he had hoped that on this question such feeling would, as in the other House, have been put aside. He had always been a thorough party man, and regarded government by party as very beneficial to the country; but he felt bound to support the clause as a safeguard against the dangers of the enormous change about to be made. He would not do so, however, if he thought it hostile to the Bill as a whole. The Bill had been most laboriously discussed in the House of Commons, and deserved the most careful consideration at their Lordships' hands. They were not there, however, merely to register the decisions of the House of Commons, but to express their own opinions as the hereditary branch of the Legislature, and in doing so they had a right to have a liberal construction put upon their motives. He would prefer, as more consonant with his own feelings, if the proposal were to give only a single vote to every elector. That was a thing which everybody, even the commonest voter, could understand. He did not see why a voter in the City of London should have three votes more than an elector in another constituency. The single vote would secure the great constitutional principle that representation and taxation should go together; and it had this further merit—it would confine every constituency, whether represented by three, two, or one Member, to the simplest mode of attaining its object. He owed strong allegiance to the present Government; but then he felt that he was only taking an honest and straightforward course in doing what, in his opinion, was best for the country. He accepted the proposal of his noble and learned Friend as an instalment, his main objection to it being that it was so limited in its character. It only applied to twelve constituencies—he should like to have the principle applied to all the constituencies in the country.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE: I hope the House will bear with me, even at this late stage of a discussion so amply and ably maintained, if I rise to say a few words in support of the vote I mean to give. The alteration proposed in the Bill by the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) is principally recommended on the ground of its being desirable to give a representation to minorities. That I conceive to involve a principle of undoubted usefulness, and one which is the special boast of this country. The rules of Parliamentary proceeding have always been eminently favourable to its application, and that sense of fairness and justice which marks the character of British freemen has never failed to give it a warm reception in meetings called for the discussion of interesting and important questions. My Lords, it has been my lot to witness in foreign countries, and most especially in a country no less celebrated for the love and establishment of free institutions than any in the ancient world, an exercise of the contrary doctrine; which served to convince me that the triumph of a party, when fiercely zealous for its opinions, is but too often carried to the extreme of violence and cruelty unless restrained by an habitual respect for the rights of a defeated party. I remember that, when I was in Switzerland, at a time of civil contention, terminating in the complete ascendancy of the Radical party, I found that the chief leader of that party maintained the right and duty of himself and his adherents to crush their opponents, and to deprive them of all independence in matters both of Church and State. This, my Lords, was not an idle expression of opinion; it was carried into effect to such a degree that persons who abstained from attending Divine Service in the Protestant Cathedral of Lausanne—the head-quarters of liberty—not on any grounds of doctrine or discipline, but on some slight reason of religious taste, were prevented from exercising the rites of worship in their own houses. The police were sent into the privacy of the domestic circle, and by order of the Government substituted, as I have been informed, a lawless violence for the family performance of a sacred duty. More than this—the language of another partizan was that the level of equality should even be driven over genius; and, unhappily, we are beginning to perceive unmistakable symptoms of the application of this monstrous notion even in this land of free discussion and respected minorities. I mention these facts as so many testimonials of the truth which has shone forth so strongly in the speeches delivered in favour of the clause which is now passing to a division. I sincerely hope, for the reasons already stated, that the clause in question will be carried, and, for myself, I shall not hesitate to give it my willing and cordial support.

On Question? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 142; Not-Contents 51: Majority 91.

CONTENTS.

Cleveland, D.
Grafton, D.
Manchester, D.
Rutland, D.
Somerset, D.
Wellington, D.

Bristol, M.
Camden, M.
Normanby, M.
Salisbury, M.
Westminster, M.

Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Amherst, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Dartrey, E.
De Grey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Ducie, E.
Effingham, E.
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Grey, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harrowby, E.
Huntingdon, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lovelace, E.
Lucan, E.
Mansfield, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Morton, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Russell, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Spencer, E.
Stanhope, E. [*Teller.*]
Stradbroke, E.
Verulam, E.
Wicklow, E.
Zetland, E.

De Vesci, V.
Eversley, V.
Exmouth, V.
Hardinge, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Lifford, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Sydney, V.
Templetown, V.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Aveland, L.
Belper, L.
Berners, L.
Blantyre, L.
Bolton, L.

Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Cairns, L. [*Teller.*]
Camoys, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Chesham, L.
Churchill, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clermont, L.
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Clonbrock, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Cranworth, L.
Dacre, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
De Mauley, L.
Digby, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Grantley, L.
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Heytesbury, L.
Houghton, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Kingston, E. (*E. Kingston.*)
Leigh, L.
Londesborough, L.
Lovat, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Meredyth, L. (*L. Athlumney.*)
Methuen, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Mostyn, L.
Northwick, L.
Overstone, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Ravensworth, L.
Rollo, L.
Saltoun, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Sherborne, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Southampton, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Taunton, L.
Templemore, L.
Truro, L.
Vernon, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.
Wharncliffe, L.
Wrottesley, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Abercorn, M.
Ailesbury, M.
Exeter, M.

Abingdon, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cawdor, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Granville, E.
Home, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Manvers, E.
Sandwich, E.
Tankerville, E.

Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Strathallan, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.

Bagot, L.
Boston, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Churston, L.
Clinton, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Denman, L.
Feversham, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Monson, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Romilly, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Tenterden, L.
Wynford, L.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

Clause added to the Bill.

Then, on the Motion of Lord CAIRNS, the following Clause was *agreed to,* and added to the Bill :—

"At a contested election for the City of London, no person shall vote for more than three Candidates."

Clause 9 (No Elector who has been employed for Reward at an Election to be entitled to vote).

THE MARQUESS OF BRISTOL moved the omission of the clause. Any of their Lordships who had been a Member of the other House of Parliament, or had taken part in elections, knew very well that the first thing which a candidate did, was to go to an agent and employ him for the purpose of promoting his election. That agent was very often a solicitor and a man occupying a highly respectable position in the borough or the county, well-known to most of the constituents. There was no reason whatever why such a person should lose his rights as a citizen ; but by this clause he would be totally disfranchised. He might be, and almost invariably was, quite respected, in large practice, and every way qualified to exercise the franchise. To pass such a clause would be to cast a slur upon his character ; and, for his part, he should be quite ashamed, if he were a candidate, to go to such a man and ask him to act as his agent, knowing that the penalty for so doing would be that he would be deprived of the right of citizenship. He was in favour of abolishing all possible restrictions upon the right of voting, and he did not think that policemen or Government clerks employed in the Post Office ought to be disfranchised. They were a useful class of citizens, and there was no reason to suppose they would be more liable to be affected by improper influences than any other class of the community. At that late hour he would not trouble their Lordships with any further remarks, but simply move the omission of the clause.

THE EARL OF HARDWICKE contended that if the clause were defensible, and if what were equivalent to criminal consequences were to follow the employment of an elector by a candidate, the employment of persons in the capacities of agent, clerk, messenger, &c., ought to be made illegal; otherwise a candidate would have to meet a difficulty with which he would not know how to deal. Hitherto these agents had been employed; was their employment now to be put an end to? If this were not made clear, candidates would find electors hesitating between employment and the sacrifice of their votes, and very great inconvenience would result.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR urged the retention of the clause, which had been adopted by the House of Commons in their desire to put an end to every pretext for corruption in contested elections.

After some discussion, which was inaudible,

Clause *amended* and *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Disfranchisement of certain Boroughs).

LORD SONDES moved the omission of Great Yarmouth from the clause.

LORD ROMILLY, in moving, as a further Amendment, to add at the end of the clause the words "before the 1st day of January, 1880," the effect of which would be to substitute a suspension of the franchise until that date for total disfranchisement in the case of four boroughs, including Great Yarmouth, specified in the clause, said, he had felt considerable reluctance in placing on the Paper the Notice which stood in his name, but he was induced to do so by the reflection that it was the duty of that House not to allow a great measure like this to pass with any trace upon it of gross injustice. With regard to this question of disfranchisement, their Lordships were placed in a different position from that of the Members of the other House, inasmuch as they did not hold their seats by the favour of any constituency, but they partook rather of the character of a judicial assembly, and consequently they were not likely to be influenced and carried away by popular feeling as the other House. The matter ought not to be considered from any party point of view; and, for himself, he had no personal feeling in this matter, having no connection or personal knowledge of any one of the boroughs it was proposed to disfranchise. He was not aware that he had any knowledge of a single person residing in either of them. It was solely in the interest of justice that he brought this Amendment forward. He put these boroughs all together, though they stood in different positions, but all were proposed to be disfranchised, on the ground of bribery. He did not mean to say that the case of Totnes might not at a future period be proved different from that of Great Yarmouth. The case of the latter borough was the strongest of the four. In 1861 the population of that place was 38,810, and the number of registered voters 1,645. At the last election 1,432 voted. Of those 438 were guilty of receiving bribes, and 98 were bribers, and 29 were guilty both of giving and receiving bribes. There were 1,200 voters against whom no case of bribery had been proved. Now, there were three classes of persons affected by the proposed disfranchisement. First, the existing electors—those who were guilty of receiving bribes, and those who were not; and the very large number of expectant voters who would be placed on the register should this Bill be passed without this disfranchising clause. He had nothing to say in favour of those who had been guilty of bribery. He should be glad to see them punished, and he would support any measure that would put down bribery. But what he wished to know was why those who had not been guilty of bribery were to be involved in the same punishment with those who had; and, above all, why other persons who could not be guilty because they had at the time no votes, but who would have had them under the general provisions of this Bill, should be denied their franchise for the sins of their neighbours? In the following clauses it was provided that no elector of Great Yarmouth or the other boroughs should vote for the county in which they were situated in respect of any qualification situate within the boroughs, but if the object had been to punish those who were guilty of bribery, why were they not prevented from voting in any constituency? When they came to the succeeding clauses he would move the insertion of words to the effect that the guilty parties should be incapable of voting at any election of Members of Parliament. He should also propose that the boroughs should only be disfranchised till the year 1880. The probable result of his Motion, if carried, would be that these electors would be excluded from using the franchise in these boroughs for a period of about three Parliaments—which would be, in fact, adopting the principle now acted upon by the other House of suspending the issue of the writs for a period of about fifteen years. In one instance the House of Commons had suspended the issue of a writ for three years. And further, it appeared to him that if they excluded the 438 persons who had been proved guilty at Great Yarmouth the remainder might be considered too small a number to return Members to Parliament; but in the course of fifteen years a great change would take place, and nearly one-half of the present constituency would disappear. The privilege of returning Members was one that belonged to these boroughs, and on what ground of justice could they declare that this privilege should be taken away from the children and the children's children of the present electors? A very obvious objection would, no doubt, be raised by Her Majesty's Ministers—namely, that the seats taken from Great Yarmouth and the other disfranchised boroughs had been disposed of, and that if the representation were restored to them in 1880 there must then be a new re-distribution, or the number of the Members of the House of Commons must be increased. He admitted that he was not disposed to increase the number of Members of the House of Commons. But nobody believed that the Bill would be a permanent settlement, and the portion of it that was least likely to be permanent was that which related to the re-distribution of seats. This was not the fault of the Government. He did not believe there could be brought forward at the present moment a re-distribution scheme which would be free from objection; but, also, from the nature of things, no plan of re-distribution could be permanent in this country. He was prepared to hear it stated that if it was a gross injustice to disfranchise those condemned boroughs permanently, it was at least a small injustice to disfranchise them for fifteen years. He admitted the difficulty, but he thought that the suspension of the writ for fifteen years would be a sufficient warning to the electors. But it was not consonant to the practice hitherto observed that total disfranchisement should be inflicted on such large constituencies, and where the guilt of bribery had not been brought home to half of the voters; nor was it consonant to the principles of justice that these places should be selected, because they had chanced to be found out, while a score of other boroughs, equally guilty, escaped. He did not believe that any borough of the size of Great Yarmouth or Lancaster had before been disfranchised, or that there had been disfranchisement in any case in which one-half the electors had not been concerned in corruption. The original proposal was a blot upon the Bill and he appealed to their Lordships to remove it.

Moved, at the end of Clause 10, to add ("before the First Day of January One thousand eight hundred and eighty.")—(*The Lord Romilly.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that his noble and learned Friend (Lord Romilly) admitted that those boroughs ought to be punished. The only way of punishing them was by depriving them, as boroughs, of the power of returning Members to Parliament. His noble and learned Friend had himself admitted this, because he proposed to deprive them of the right of sending Members to Parliament for a certain number of years. Only those voters who were rated at amounts between £10 and £12 would be totally deprived of votes; for those who were rated at £12 would have votes for the county. Small boroughs, as in the cases of Sudbury and St. Albans, had been heretofore punished on account of the prevalence of corrupt practices, not by a suspension of the writs, but by total disfranchisements; and in a question of corruption he could not draw a distinction between small boroughs and large boroughs. The seats lost by these boroughs were disposed of by the present Bill, and the boroughs could not be again put in possession of them without increasing the total number of Members. His noble and learned Friend had, indeed, suggested that between this and 1880 other seats might become disposable, and that these boroughs could then drop into the vacant places. But, surely it would be better to trust the case altogether to the discretion of the House of the House of Commons, which, if it thought proper, could restore their forfeited privileges to these boroughs after a certain period.

Lord CRANWORTH said, it was not entirely accurate to speak of the punishment of particular boroughs for acts of bribery. The right to return Members of Parliament was a trust to be exercised for the public benefit, and if bribery became habitual in any borough, and the trust could no longer be exercised for the benefit of the public, it ought at once to cease. For that reason he could not support the Motion of his noble and learned Friend (Lord Romilly). But, of course, if a time came when the trust could again be exercised for the public advantage, it would be open to the House of Commons to confer the right anew upon the boroughs now deprived of it.

Lord **SKELMERSDALE** thought it would be an act of gross injustice in the case of Lancaster not to give to the persons who had petitioned the other House of Parliament, declaring that their names had been erroneously returned by the Commission as parties guilty of taking bribes, an opportunity of proving their innocence and of establishing, as some of them stated that they could do, a satisfactory *alibi*.

The Earl of **STRADBROKE** said, there were a great many other important constituencies, which, if the circumstances had been inquired into after the last election, would have made just as bad a figure as Great Yarmouth. Great Yarmouth was neither better nor worse than any other borough.

The Earl of **KIMBERLEY** thought that no such case had been made out on the part of the condemned boroughs as would justify their Lordships in interfering to so great an extent as was proposed with the re-distribution of seats. At the same time, in the case of Great Yarmouth, there were some exceptional circumstances, and he had been glad to hear from the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor) an indication of opinion that at some future period it might be possible to restore to that borough the privileges which were now withdrawn.

The Earl of **MALMESBURY** said, that no Petition from the parties referred to by his noble Friend (Lord Skelmersdale) had reached their Lordships' House; but the House of Commons would, no doubt, take care that all proper opportunities of explanation were afforded.

On Question, That those words be there inserted? *Resolved* in the *Negative*.

Clause *agreed to*.

Clauses 12 to 14, which disqualify persons reported guilty of bribery in the disfranchised boroughs as voters for the several counties in respect of qualifications arising in the said boroughs, *agreed to*, with Amendments.

House resumed; and to be again in Committee on *Thursday* next.

House adjourned at half past Twelve o'clock A.M., till Thursday next, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, July 30, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee*—*Resolutions* [July 29] *reported*.

Public Bills—*Committee*—Factory Acts Extension (*re-comm.*) [236]; Hours of Labour Regulation (*re-comm.*) [258] [R.P.]; Sewage* [260].

Report—Factory Acts Extension (*re-comm.*) [236]; Sewage* [260].

The House met at Two of the Clock.

MILITARY KNIGHTS AT WINDSOR.

QUESTION.

Mr. **EYKYN** said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether old and distinguished Officers of Her Majesty's Service who may be Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, or Dissenters, are eligible to be chosen and appointed Military Knights of Windsor; and, if so, whether they will be compelled to attend the service in St. George's Chapel according to the rites of the Church of England?

Mr. **GATHORNE HARDY** said, that the question had arisen in 1865, whether a Roman Catholic knight could be appointed, and the Opinion of the Law Officers was taken. It was clear, upon this Opinion, that a Roman Catholic could be appointed a Knight of Windsor, and, he presumed, that Dissenters also might be appointed. Really, the only thing required of them was the regular attendance upon the ordinances of the Church, and, so far as the statutes went, that was imperative. He believed, however, that the Queen could dispense with this attendance.

COURTS OF LAW AND EQUITY.

QUESTION.

Sir **ROUNDELL PALMER** said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government is prepared to advise Her Majesty to issue a Commission of Inquiry into the operation and effect of the present constitution of the Superior Courts of Law and Equity in England (including the Courts of Exchequer Chamber and of Appeal in Chancery), and the Courts of Admiralty and of Probate and Divorce respectively, and into the operation and effect of the present separation and division of jurisdictions between the said several Courts, and also into the operation and effect of the present arrangements for holding and transacting the business of the Assizes throughout England and Wales, and of the present divisions of the Legal Year into terms and othewise; and generally into the operation and effect of the existing Laws and arrangements for distributing and transacting the judicial business of the said Courts respectively, as well in open Court as at Chambers; with a view to ascertain whether any and what changes and improvements either by uniting and consolidating the said Courts, or any of them, or by eztending or altering their several jurisdictions, or assigning any matters or causes now within their respective cognizance to any other jurisdiction, or by increasing or reducing the number of Judges in the said Courts, or any of them, or empowering one or more Judges in any of the said Courts to transact any kind of business now transacted by a greater number, or by any new arrangement of the divisions of the Legal Year, or by altering the mode in which the business of the said Courts, or any of them, or of the Assizes, or any part thereof, is now distributed or conducted; or, otherwise, might be advantagiously made, so as to provide for the more speedy, economical, and satisfactory despatch of the judicial business now transacted by the same Courts, and at the Assizes respectively?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that the Government had considered the subject to which the Question referred, and it was their opinion that it would be expedient to issue a Commission for the purpose indicated.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL —THE PROPOSED SATURDAY SITTING.

QUESTION.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he understood it would be very inconvenient to several hon. Members to proceed with the Contagious Diseases (Cattle) Bill on Saturday morning. He would, therefore, ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he could appoint some other time to take that Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he was sorry it was not in his power at the present moment to appoint any other time; but he should not think of pressing the House to go into Committee on that Bill on Saturday morning if hon. Gentlemen objected. He therefore should not make that proposition.

FACTORY ACTS EXTENSION (*re-committed*) BILL—[BILL 63.]

(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Sir John Pakington.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. MOFFATT rose to move—

> "That this House is not prepared, without further evidence, to interfere with the free exercise of labour to so great an extent as is contemplated by the present measure."

At the present moment the whole question of labour was in a most embarrassed and unsound condition, and it was admitted on all hands that the less they interfered with the rights of labour the better for that labour. The present Bill was of very extensive operation, and there had been no discussion at all upon it in that House. It had been sent to a Select Committee, but the Committee heard no evidence upon it, and nearly the whole of the information gained was of the most cursory and superficial character. He was sure that those Members who read the Reports of the Inspectors would be of opinion that more evidence was necessary before legislating upon the matter. It was true the Committee had before them gentlemen representing different trades, who were there to arrange the terms upon which legislation should be proceeded with; but those gentlemen, in answer to him, said that they did not think that legislation would be advantageous either to the employer or workman. If that were so, he thought, on that one point alone, he had made out a sufficient case for further inquiry. Besides, the provisions of the Bill did very much more than the promoters had intended. He believed they might legislate very beneficially in many cases in reference to the labour of children, but this Bill interfered with and touched the labour of children, young persons, women and males, in every large factory throughout the country where they employed more than 100 men. In the case of printers a great pressure of work came at particular times, and then it was required that the workmen should continue their labour sometimes for eighteen hours at a stretch, they receiving extra pay; but this Bill would limit the time to ten or twelve hours, as the case might be; and what was, perhaps, worse, it would put every printing establishment and manufactory in the kingdom under the supervision of inspectors. There was one point more to which he wished to advert. The Bill applied only to such factories as employed 100 hands and upwards, so that in the case of factories employing eighty or ninety hands, the evils of the system, whatever they were, would be allowed to continue. That was so unjust in principle that he could not understand how it could be embodied in the Bill.

MR. LEEMAN seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House is not prepared, without further evidence, to interfere with the free exercise of labour to so great an extent as is contemplated by the present measure,"—(*Mr. Moffatt,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. WALPOLE said, that when he introduced the Bill he explained its principles and details very fully. He agreed that the subject ought to be carefully investigated, but there was scarcely any question upon which the House had more information than this one, and that information had been long in their possession. The hon. Member seemed to think that this information was cursory and superficial; but it extended over no less than five folio volumes, and every one of the trades supposed to be affected by the Bill had been invited to give its opinion upon the subject. In consequence of the general desire expressed that the Bill should be sent before a Select Committee, no discussion was entered into on its second reading. No inquiry could have been more ample, nor more painstaken to arrive at the truth than in reference to the proceedings of the Committee on this Bill. That being so, the hon. Member had not adopted a course calculated to settle the question in trying to throw away the results of the labours of the Committee, and put a stop to all legislation in the present Session. The measure was one of the most important character as affecting the working classes of the country, especially young women and children, and unless the House undertook to deal with it now, he said advisedly that every week's delay would be pregnant with consequences of the greatest mischief as regarded the best interests of the people.

MR. LIDDELL, in supporting the Amendment, said, the Bill extended to almost every branch of industry in the country, and involved, to an unparalleled extent, the principle of compulsory education. That principle might be right or it might be wrong, but he objected to its being admitted into our legislation by a kind of side-door. They were going to extend enormously the principle of the Factory Acts, without knowing anything as to the effect it would have upon the classes who would come under its operation, and without waiting until the voices of those classes could, under the new franchise, be heard within those walls upon the proposed legislation. They were introducing this great and important principle by a sort of tentative and timid process, and by their hesitation they seemed to imply that the course they had ventured upon might be wrong. He wished the principle to be discussed broadly, and if right affirmed by something like the solemn vote of the representatives of the people. If this measure passed in its present shape, there would be no provision for the education of the hundreds of thousands of children coming within its provisions who were now, either imperfectly educated, or not educated at all. Many more schools must be built, and the means found for doing so; but no such machinery was provided. So far as the Bill operated for the protection of women and children, he had nothing to say against it; but it went much further by being extended to young male persons between thirteen and eighteen years of age—a provision which he thought would mischievously affect the training and supply of skilled labour. If boys did not learn their trade between those ages, when could they be expected to do so? and in his opinion the knowledge of the business of a life-time was the most valuable of all knowledge to the labouring class. It appeared to him that at the close of a Session, and on the eve of a new Parliament, they ought to pause, and not undertake a task of this importance.

Mr. BRUCE said, that the argument of the last speaker would go to postpone the passing of this measure, not until next, but until the Session after next, as it was impossible that, until that time, the Reformed Parliament could assemble. The subject of the Bill had been inquired into several years ago, and on the Report of 1863 a measure was introduced and was discussed very fully. It then became the duty of the Government to consider whether they should introduce a Bill upon the publication of each Report, or whether they should wait until the whole of the Reports were published, and then introduce a complete measure dealing with the whole subject. The Government decided to wait, and it then became the duty of the present Government to deal with the question. The present Government felt that it was necessary to divide the subject, and to introduce two Bills dealing with it. It would be found that the Committee had taken the greatest possible care to consider the whole of the circumstances connected with the subject; and, more especially, they directed their attention to the two great objects of the Bills before the House—namely, the limitation of the hours of labour and the education of the children. It was objected that the latter question involved the larger question of compulsory education generally; but, in reality, the measure before the House did not go further than the General Factory Acts, although it applied to a greater number of children. If the House were to wait, before dealing with this subject, until an agreement had been come to as to a national system of education, he was afraid that many years would elapse before the question was settled. He hoped that the House would go at once into Committee upon the Bill.

Mr. POWELL said, he could not concur with the abstract proposition of the hon. Member opposite, which would prevent the House from accepting the invitation of the Government to discuss the question of how far it was possible to ameliorate the condition of a large class of their fellow-countrymen. He, however, thought that the Report of the Commissioners was of an *ex parte* character, inasmuch as they were apparently sent to the country to make an investigation with a view to legislation, rather than to institute impartial inquiries for the purpose of ascertaining whether legislation was really necessary in the case. He regretted that the Committee upstairs had not taken further evidence on this subject, in order to ascertain more clearly the views of the different trades. He thought that the House had a just ground of complaint at the crude state in which the Bill had been laid before them.

Mr. AYRTON said, he should like to know whether the next Bill on the Paper —Hours of Labour Regulation Bill—was to be the complement of the present measure; whether the two were to be passed in one; and, whether the Government could give an assurance that they would be both proceeded with *pari passû*, and be passed together? He thought that the two ought to be fused into one Bill, and sent up to the House of Lords in that shape. The Bill proposed to give to the Secretary of State power to exempt, not particular trades, but individuals carrying on certain trades from the operation of the Bill. That, he thought, was a strange principle of legislation, which the House would do well to consider before sanctioning.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, it was his intention to refer this and the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill to the same Committee. He would answer the other questions that had been put to him when the House was in Committee.

Mr. HENLEY said, that although this kind of legislation was properly described as exceptional, yet it would be remembered that the country had experience of such legislation, and had found it eminently successful; they had heard of no complaint from either employer or employed in the trades hitherto dealt with, of unwelcome consequences from the Factory Act. Still the Bill was rather a curious one; it had twelve clauses and no less than twenty-seven exceptions or modifications, of which nineteen were permanent and the rest temporary. Those interested in the trades could tell how this would work. Then a clause states that any place where 100 persons were employed "making any article" should come under the provisions of the Bill. It was not easy to say why a brickfield where 105 people worked required looking after when a brickfield where ninety-five persons were employed did not. Besides this the definition was not clear, and it was most important that the language in this part of the Bill should be plain, and that it should properly describe the intention of the House. The 12th clause would cause a great deal of work to some people; it declared that certain places should be deemed factories until the contrary was proved; it would be an exceedingly difficult task to decide such questions in the future. He had asked whether a ship was an article, or whether a building yard came under the description, but had not received a satisfactory answer; but he asserted that it was necessary that these things should be decided by the House and properly expressed in the Bill. He was unable to support the abstract Amendment of the hon. Member for Southampton, and would prefer to get on with the Bill; if it did not turn out to be a satisfactory measure when it had passed through Committee, it could be set aside on the third reading. The other Acts had worked well, however, and he could not see why they should not be extended.

Mr. FAWCETT said, it had been argued that this large measure was an undue interference with the rights of capital and labour; but, as a question of political economy, it was easy to prove that there was no contravention of the principle of economy in legislation such as was proposed in this Bill. Those who in the first instance had opposed the Factory Acts were now the first to come forward and say that the legislation which had taken place had produced the most satisfactory results. With respect to the working classes his own experience among them had been that the working men were glad to welcome this kind of legislation. Certain it was that no public protest of the slightest consequence against it had ever come from them, and there was no subject upon which he had ever addressed a meeting of working men that excited more enthusiasm than that of the intended extension to other trades of the same legislation which, when applied to the manufacture of textile fabrics, had produced such remarkably satisfactory results. The observation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire that this was a Bill of only twelve clauses, but containing twenty-seven modifications, was a proof that the Committee had thoroughly investigated the subject. He bore testimony to the able manner in which the noble Lord the Chief Commissioner of Works and Chairman of the Committee discharged his duties as such, and also to the great attention paid to the subject by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Merthyr. Every opportunity was given for any person to attend before the Committee and give evidence.

Mr. MOFFATT said, he had not heard anything in the course of the debate to cause him to change his views, but he would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Motion *agreed to*.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee).

Preamble *postponed*.

Clauses 1 and 2 *agreed to*.

Clause 3 (General Definitions).

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY moved in line 8, after the word "on," to insert the words "and in which ten or more persons are employed." He made this proposition simply to exclude from the action of the Bill small tradesmen, such as plumbers who occasionally cast lead, and who certainly ought not to be affected under a Factories Act.

Mr. SAMUELSON said, that would be a dangerous provision to introduce into the Bill, as small factories required more stringent regulations than large ones.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the right hon. Gentleman evidently sought to remove from the action of the Bill not the owners of factories, but small tradesmen, whom the right hon. Gentleman ought to describe by apt words.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that he would propose an Amendment on the subject when the Report was brought up.

Amendment *withdrawn*.

Mr. COWEN moved in line 25 of the same clause to insert "or" after "city," and in the same clause after "town," to leave out "parish or place."

Amendment *negatived*.

Mr. POWELL moved in line 33 to insert the words "for sale" after the word "making." That would completely and entirely exclude from the action of the clause domestic labour.

Mr. BRUCE said, the words were wholly unnecessary in this Bill, though they were needed in the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill.

Motion *withdrawn*.

Mr. E. POTTER suggested that the number of 100 *employés* was too large. The average even in the cotton trade was only 150, and in the trades already under the Factories Act, 120. He was satisfied that the average in those intended to be dealt with was not more than fifty. He begged to move to substitute twenty.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, the number had been carefully considered both by the Government and the Committee.

Mr. REMINGTON MILLS thought there was more need for the Bill in the case of small manufactories than large ones.

Mr. BRUCE had given notice of a Motion to restrict the number to fifty; but on the whole he thought it better to adhere to the original figure.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER thought the number a very high one, and he should vote for the Amendment, provided that it was limited to cases where the twenty persons were employed in the same building.

Mr. FAWCETT hoped his hon. Friend would carry his Amendment to a division, in which case he should give it his cordial support.

Colonel AKROYD also supported the Amendment.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY suggested that the number should be fifty.

Mr. E. POTTER said, he could not accept the modification.

Mr. SAMUELSON thought the line ought to be drawn as low as forty.

Mr. BRUCE recommended the Committee to proceed cautiously, and not go below thirty or thirty-five.

Mr. POWELL thought it would be a daring step to lower the figure below 100.

Mr. COWEN supported the views of the Committee which had reported on the subject, and advised the House not to go lower than the number of 100.

Mr. LIDDELL said, that the greatest objection to this kind of legislation was the unequal manner in which it operated, and he objected to any lowering of the number.

Mr. WALPOLE said, that it was thought by the Committee that it was better not to begin with too low a number, but they thought that perhaps fifty would be the proper number eventually. He objected to the number being at once lowered to twenty-five.

Mr. E. POTTER then withdrew the Amendment, and the clause was agreed to, the number being limited to fifty instead of 100, as proposed by the clause.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Mr. E. Potter

On Motion of Mr. Bruce additional new clauses *added* to the Bill.

On the consideration of the Schedules,

Mr. FAWCETT proposed the insertion of words restricting the employment of young persons during the night to those above the age of fourteen. No person could read the Report of the Children's Employment Commission without seeing that it was most injurious to allow young persons to be employed during the whole of the night. The proposed legislation had two great objects in view—first, to prevent young persons being overworked; and second, to secure some education for the children employed. He thought that great mischief would arise from allowing young persons at the age of thirteen to work all night, since their education must cease at that age.

Mr. MOFFATT opposed the Amendment.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, that the difference between thirteen and fourteen was not of such importance as to warrant the Committee in upsetting the arrangement which had been come to in the Select Committee upstairs.

Amendment *negatived.*

Schedules *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

HOURS OF LABOUR REGULATION (*re-committed*) BILL—[Bill 63.]

(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Sir John Pakington.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (General Definitions).

Mr. POWELL proposed in line 20, after the word "making," to insert "for sale." The hon. Member explained that the object of the Amendment was to shut out the possibility of interference with domestic life on the part of inspectors under this Bill.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he did not think the insertion of the proposed words was necessary, as, in his opinion, the present wording of the clause was sufficient to secure the object of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

MR. HENLEY supported the Amendment. He wished to know from the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary whether a woman taking work to her own home, might, under the Bill, be restrained from working more than twelve hours?

MR. AYRTON asked, if it were intended that every person working in his own house without a master was to be inspected?

MR. BRUCE remarked, that the greatest cases of hardship arose from the exertion of parental authority upon children and women where few persons were employed, and it was difficult to guard against such cases.

MR. HENLEY submitted that they should know the class of persons that would be affected by the Act before they passed it. His question had no reference to the employment of children by their parents or anyone else. To the question he had asked he had not received an answer.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY had no doubt that workshops to which persons took home work from masters for the purpose of gain would come under the meaning of the Act, and inconvenience might arise from the circumstance. He saw the difficulty to which his right hon. Friend referred, but he did not perceive at that moment the way to guard against it.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 5 *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Regulations as to Time of Labour).

MR. POTTER referred to the importance of providing effectively for the education of the children, and moved an Amendment with that object.

MR. HENLEY called attention to the case of children taught needlework at schools, and asked how they would be affected by the Act?

MR. BRUCE: In such a case the child would not work for gain, but for improvement.

LORD JOHN MANNERS: If my right hon. Friend will look to the definition he will see that the words used are "master or parent," and schoolmaster is not included in that definition.

MR. HENLEY: The words are "for wages or not." The schoolmaster may get a profit out of the children's work.

LORD JOHN MANNERS thought the proposal of the hon. Member for Carlisle might be very fairly accepted by the Committee.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at ten minutes afterNine o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, July 31, 1867.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Mines. [No. 496.]

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee*—Navy and Army Expenditure (1865-6).

Ordered — Metropolitan Buildings and Management*; Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage.*

First Reading—Metropolitan Buildings and Management* [293]; Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* [294].

Second Reading—Commons Inclosure Act Amendment [151], *negatived ;* Dominica Loan* [291]; Militia Pay.*

Report of Select Committee—Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education. [No. 498.]

Committee—Masters and Workmen [77]; Naval Stores (No. 2)* [289].

Report—Masters and Workmen [77]; Naval Stores (No. 2)* [289]; Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education* [71].

Considered as amended— Customs Revenue* [238].

Third Reading— Metropolis Subways* [249], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Agricultural Children's Education [152]; Sale of Liquors on Sunday [96].

PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT MONUMENTS.—QUESTION.

SIR HARRY VERNEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will endeavour to devise means for the preservation of ancient monuments, many of them belonging to pre-historic periods, and some to the Roman occupation of Great Britain, which exist in different parts of the country, and many of which have been injured and partially destroyed, owing to the ignorance of their value and want of care of their owners?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY replied that he had not seen the Notice of the hon. Member's Question before he came down to the House, but he thought that there would be great difficulty in the way of the Home Department becoming also an archæological department. In the first place, they had no means to devote to the preservation of antiquities of that kind; and in the second, they were private property, and there would be no justification for the Home Department taking them under its charge. It was no doubt extremely desirable that they should be preserved, but the growth of intelligence in the country afforded, he thought, the best safeguard for their preservation.

AGRICULTURAL CHILDREN'S EDUCATION BILL.—[Bill 152.]

(*Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Arthur Peel, Mr. Trevelyan.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he should not have asked the House to proceed further with it at so late a period of the Session had it not been that Lord Shaftesbury had introduced into the House of Lords a measure on the same subject, which had passed a second reading about a fortnight ago without any objection to it being offered on the part of the Government. He felt bound to assume, therefore, that the principles of that measure were sanctioned by them, and, as there were between it and his Bill some points of fundamental difference, he wished to invite the House to pronounce an opinion as to which of them it was desirable should be made the basis of legislation. The Bill of Lord Shaftesbury provided that children employed in agriculture should attend school a certain number of hours during the year —400 hours in winter and 200 in summer; while he proposed that their attention should be regulated on the half-time or alternate day system. Experience proved that the latter system had been eminently successful, and the House had but the day before agreed to extend it to almost every branch of industry in the country. It was, on the contrary, shown by experience that the system of attendance for a certain number of hours had worked badly, and the Committee which sat on the subject had stated in their Report that it was, in their opinion, desirable that the Print Works Act should be amended in that respect, inasmuch as it did not work as well as the Factory Acts. Again, there was the experience connected with agricultural pursuits which was entirely in favour of his views. A very eminent agriculturist, Mr. Paget, had tried the alternate day system, and his testimony was to the effect that he had found it eminently successful. The going from work to school and from school to work on alternate days formed an agreeable change. But the consequence of the adoption of the certain number of hours' system was that the children were at one time overworked and at another overschooled, and that being at school for two or three months and absent for two or three months more, they gradually forgot what they had previously learnt. He had, he might add, fully considered all the practical difficulties which stood in the way of applying the half-time system as he proposed, and they were not, he believed, greater than existed in the case of other branches of industry to which the House had determined to extend it. As a matter of detail he might mention that of course provision was made for harvest time, so that the Bill would not interfere merely with the hours of labour on such special occasions. He next came to the most difficult part of the subject—the necessity of providing suitable schools for the children—a subject with which Lord Shaftesbury had not dealt in the slightest degree. It might be said that education in the rural districts was spreading, and why, under those circumstances, it might be asked, did he invite the House to interfere in the matter instead of leaving time to do its work, as it was doing? In 1860 an exhaustive Report had been published on the educational condition of the poor, and no one who had read that Report could fail to see that the state of education in those districts was anything but satisfactory. It was, in fact, most disgraceful. They voted large sums of money year by year for the purposes of education, and there was an increasing zeal displayed on the part of private individuals in the promotion of education. The members of all religious denominations were exhibiting the most admirable and praiseworthy zeal in the matter. But though there were in many districts admirable schools, with excellent teachers at the head of them, they failed to remedy the evil of children being taken away from schools at too early an age, for the purpose of earning wages by their employment on farms and other occupations. According to recent returns it appeared that in latter years the proportion of children taken away for such purposes was gradually increasing. In rural districts the curious fact was to be noticed that a greater proportion of the men at or above fifty years of age could read or write than of those between the ages of twenty and thirty. That might be accounted for from the circumstance that about forty years ago there was a great surplus of agricultural labour, and in consequence of the demand being so low, there were more children at that time sent to school. There was, however, now an active demand for such labour, Consequently it was no uncommon thing to find children as young as seven or eight years of age taken from school and placed in a position whereby they might be able to earn by their labour some weekly wages for their parents. They, therefore, soon forgot what they had previously learnt. There were three motives for the removal of children at an early age from school, avarice, ignorance, and the poverty of parents. If avarice were the motive which actuated parents in taking away their children from school, the State had an undoubted right to step in for the purpose of protecting the child from the avarice of its parents, by sending it to school. If in consequence of the ignorance of the parents the child was taken away at an early age from school, then there was an additional motive for educating the rising generation. When a man was educated himself, as a general rule he was better able to appreciate the advantages of education in others, and such men in their turn would not require any force or persuasion to send their children to school. So that legislation on this subject might be viewed as a temporary proceeding necessary in order to meet a temporary difficulty, and in a few years little legislation would be required on the subject. The third circumstance which caused the removal of young children from school was the most difficult to deal with —namely, the poverty of the parents. To a poor labourer earning only the scanty wages of 10*s*. a week, it would seem a hard thing to say that he should be deprived of the earnings of his child of eight or nine years old, whose earnings though perhaps only 1*s*. or 1*s*. 6*d*. a week, were, after all, of considerable use to the parents, enabling them to obtain some of the necessaries of life. But when it was considered that the effect of the withdrawal of those children from the labour market would be the reduction of the supply, and consequently, according to the axiom of economic science, the augmentation of the value of labour, the loss on behalf of the parents would not ultimately be so great as appeared at first sight. The case of the miserably paid labourers of Wiltshire and Dorsetshire might be considered an exceptional one, because those counties, as far as agricultural labour was concerned, might be looked upon as quite separate localities, and not to be affected by the labour markets of Yorkshire, or any other parts of England. The farmers of Wiltshire and Dorsetshire had some such system as this. They met together, and, having considered the price of wheat—the price of meat never once entered into their calculation —they asked themselves what it was possible for a labouring man with a family to live upon? They did not, however, leave out of their calculation the wages which his children might earn for him. If, then, Parliament should insist upon those children spending a portion of their time in schools, the result would be that the earnings of the latter could not be taken into account; and that the farmers would be obliged to pay their labourers higher wages. If the labourers of Dorsetshire and Wiltshire were educated, and knew what was going on in other parts of the country, they would acquire a spirit of enterprize and energy. They would never be content with the miserable wages of 10*s*. a week, but would betake themselves to those localities where they would receive a higher amount of compensation. Agriculture had greatly improved of late years, and had become so much of a science that it was absolutely necessary for the farmers to avoid the loss which must accrue to them from having labourers belonging to an ignorant class. As agriculture now required the use of expensive and complicated machinery, it was absolutely essential that the farmers should have competent labourers, to whom that machinery might be intrusted. Increased intelligence on the part of the labourers vastly increased their efficiency, so that more wealth would be produced to be distributed in wages to them and in profit to the farmers. He came now to the most complicated part of his measure. It was a serious thing for Parliament to say that the children in the agricultural districts should attend school, if there were no guarantee given that a school would be brought within their reach. The hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. Liddell) used that argument with great force on the previous day in reference to the provisions of the Factories Bill. But it applied with still greater force to a measure like that now before the House. The factories were generally to be found in towns, and there were few towns without schools. Not so in the rural districts. It was provided by this Bill, therefore, that no child should be compelled to attend school, unless that school was situated within three miles of his home. But the farmers and landholders, who were the chief support of the schools in rural districts, might render this legislation nugatory by simply withholding their further support to those schools, the result of which would be that the schools would be shut up. He therefore thought it necessary to insert a provision in this Bill whereby schools should be established in all such districts of a certain size within a reasonable distance of the residence of the children, and that to meet their expense the ratepayers should be required to come to its assistance. Though he had thrown the burden of maintaining these schools on the ratepayers, he was not enamoured of the principle of rating. The Bill gave every encouragement possible to the voluntary system; but if there was not sufficient zeal in a district to provide a school of the humblest kind, then under the Bill the principle of rating would be brought into operation. He did not propose in any way to interfere with the religious teaching in those schools, but left that question to be determined by the majority of the ratepayers. Religious teaching did not simply consist of the knowledge of the Church catechism and of certain doctrines. All kinds of information, such as geography, history, and, in fact, everything that tended to expand the mind, and to bring it more and more in contact with the wonders of nature, might be considered as having a fine moral and religious effect upon the minds of youth. Whilst throwing the burden of those schools upon the ratepayers, they, in their turn, would receive a great advantage from these schools, because, by educating the people they were introducing the most powerful agent to diminish the rates generally, because those rates were chiefly swelled from causes that were directly traceable to ignorance. Whilst providing for the establishment of schools in districts where they were wanted, he did not propose to interfere at all with those schools which were already established, but would allow the principle of voluntaryism to have its full sway. A Commission, it might be said, had been appointed to investigate this subject, and that he ought to wait for its Report. But that Commission was rather directed to an inquiry into the agricultural gang system. They had already the fullest information upon this subject in the Report of the Commission which had been presided over by the Duke of Newcastle. Yesterday, when the Home Secretary urged the House to go into Committee upon the Factories Bill, he said that every week's delay in the matter would probably produce great mischief. He (Mr. Fawcett) believed that remark to be equally true when applied to the state of education in the rural districts. He thought that as far as possible legislation upon this subject should be uniform, otherwise it would probably cause discontent amongst the manufacturers and others, who would complain that the measure treated one district differently from another. He had confined his Bill entirely to children under thirteen. The object of legislating for young persons between the ages of thirteen and eighteen, engaged in manufacturing industry, was to prevent them from being overworked or kept too long in crowded and unhealthy rooms. Agricultural pursuits were, however, of a different character. The work was healthy; it was carried on in the open air, and the children could not be often overworked. He had also treated boys and girls alike in his Bill — differing in this respect from Lord Shaftesbury's — because light agricultural work was not unsuitable to young females. He had no hope of passing this Bill during the present Session, but he desired to have an expression of the House in favour of its merits, and an approval of the principle it contained. If the Bill were met by a direct negative he should divide upon it; if the objections were as to time or details he should not. This was a subject on which he had thought long and anxiously. It was melancholy to reflect that, when a measure for extending the franchise to every other class was before the House, the stoutest and staunchest Liberal — if a proposal had been made to confer it on agricultural labourers engaged, though they were, in the most important industry of the country — would, have deemed them to be in a condition which rendered them unfit to be intrusted with the duties of citizenship. He therefore appealed to the

Government to whom he felt grateful for the Factory Acts Extension Bill, to complete that legislation by applying similar provisions to the agricultural districts. The conduct of those who in past years assumed to represent agriculture, not so much by looking after the condition of the labourer as by maintaining a vicious monopoly, would be forgotten if they now showed they were anxious not to promote measures which would add to the rent of the landlords or promote the benefit of the farmers, but to support a measure which would raise the condition of agricultural labourers and make them worthy of the country and of the industry to which they belonged.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

MR. ARTHUR PEEL said, that he seconded the Motion. He regretted that the Bill introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Merthyr (Mr. Bruce) had not been accepted by the House and referred to the Select Committee to which he should have wished this also to have been referred. The mixture of compulsion and voluntaryism, which was the principle of that Bill, would have done much to remedy the present state of educational destitution; and the School Commissioners proposed under that Bill would have brought before the country the full state of our educational destitution. With regard to the religious teaching, he thought Mr. Fraser had been misunderstood. It was said that Mr. Fraser was the strong advocate of the denominational system, but that, in consequence of what he saw and heard in America, against his predilections he felt himself bound to prefer the secular system. Mr. Fraser did no such thing. On the contrary, he warned the country of the dangers to which secular education would lead, by showing that in America the upper classes were looking forward to its result with apprehension and dismay, and he drew therefrom the favourable and just conclusion that morality without religion was a cold and lifeless substitute, and that to be a warm and living principle it must be based upon religious teaching. It was useless to say that children should be compelled to be educated if they did not provide the means for doing so. As a general rule they said these children must be educated; yet they proposed to give the magistrates such large powers of granting dispensation that it would be difficult to know what was the rule and what was the exception. The Privy Council system, though it had presented a model of education throughout the country, was not expansive enough to meet the requirements of the age. It had failed to reach the most destitute districts, leaving those districts destitute of relief which were most destitute of funds. The only means of remedying that destitution seemed to be a compulsory rate and a compulsory attendance at school for children in rural districts. He did not mean to contend that there was no other method of replacing the deficiency except by making attendance at school compulsory; but he asserted that in places where the agricultural children were entirely destitute of the means of education, it was necessary to rescue them from ignorance by some contrivance or other, and to interpose in some way between parent and child, when the former sought to gain an addition to his earnings at the expense of the entirely neglected condition of the child. He should be willing to sanction even more decided measures than had been proposed, because he was convinced that if, by such means, they could once educate a whole generation of children, the benefits so gained would never be lost, for they would be so appreciated that they who had thus been educated would be most anxious that their children, in their turn, should participate in the blessings which they had themselves enjoyed.

MR. BEACH said, he moved as an Amendment that the Bill should be read a second time that day three months. He did not deny that it was a crying evil that the agricultural population should be suffered to grow up in a state of ignorance; but he considered that the means proposed in this Bill to remedy that state of things were utterly impracticable. The children of agricultural labourers generally were most imperfectly educated, and it was most desirable that something should be done to improve their condition in this respect. It was a question of grave importance how they should attain the object they all had in view. The non-attendance of children at school in the agricultural districts was to be attributed chiefly to the desire of the parents to supplement their small weekly earnings by the addition of the pay received for their children's labour. He did not, however, attribute it to avarice on their part; but from a natural desire to eke out their means of living. Parents were not sufficiently alive to the advantages of education, and it was of the greatest importance that they should be convinced that those who had the benefits of education in early life generally attained a better pecuniary position from their becoming skilled labourers than those who did not possess that advantage. Much of the present evils was due to the deficiencies of the opportunities of education. The grants made by the Privy Council were more for the benefit of large town parishes than for the agricultural districts. The disproportion was far greater than many supposed. He found from a Return that had been published that in parishes of 5,000 inhabitants and upwards, 587 schools were aided and 31 unaided; in parishes of from 1,000 to 5,000 inhabitants, there were 1,787 aided and 837 unaided schools; in parishes of 500 to 1,000 inhabitants, there were 1,118 aided and 1,756 unaided schools; in those which might be especially called agricultural parishes, where the population did not exceed 500, there were 981 aided and 7,780 unaided schools. It might be said it was the fault of the smaller parishes that they did not avail themselves of the conditions prescribed by the Committee of Council; but the conditions very properly made indispensable for aid in large parishes were inapplicable in small parishes. For instance, a certificated schoolmaster or schoolmistress was insisted upon; and that might be a very valuable security for the efficient conduct of a school; but in small parishes it could hardly be expected that a certificated teacher could be employed. If some scheme could be devised under which national aid might be extended to small parishes, a great step would be taken to encourage the spread of education in agricultural parishes. As the Commissioners said in their Report, aid was not obtained by the very schools which most needed it. It was said that this, to a certain extent, was a labour question; that the parents were obliged to put their children to work at an early age to increase their earnings, and allusion had been made to Dorset and Wilts. That was not the case. In many parts of Dorset wages had been raised 2*s.* per week without having the effect of inducing the labourers to work more efficiently than formerly. The small amount of weekly wages paid to agricultural labourers in many parts of those counties arose from a circumstance peculiar to those districts. In many parts they did not work as other labourers did; and there were some districts where they insisted on having two hours for dinner time in the middle of the day. What was required was something that would practically produce a change for the better. In 1850 the percentage of children under ten years of age who were at school throughout the country was 62 per cent; in 1866 it was 71. It appeared from the Reports of the Inspectors that the children were taken from school at an earlier age in mining districts than they were in agricultural districts. This Bill only proposed to deal with parishes strictly agricultural; but it thus appeared that there were other parts of the country not agricultural where there was a deficiency in the means of education. When, therefore, they proposed to apply compulsory legislation to only one section of the community, they ought to bear in mind what was the state of things existing in that part of the community which was to be exempted from this compulsory legislation. The attendance of children after a certain period of life decreased, which arose from the fact that they were sent to school earlier now than formerly, in order to be out of the way. The hon. Member for Brighton proposed to deal with this question by the application of the alternate day system—namely, that children should be at work and at school every other day. This might be a very good plan if applied to manufactures, but in agriculture it could not be carried out. The farmer's operations depended on the weather; but if on any day — no matter what the weather might have been—a farmer wished to send a boy with a team, he would not be able to do so unless the boy had been to school the day before. He did not see how the alternate system could be carried out without the employment of a double number of children. Then, according to the Bill, the magistrates in Petty Sessions were to decide on the necessity of making a rate for school buildings. This would convert the magistrates into a local Committee of Council on education, who would have, moreover, to decide on the education to be received in their districts—an onerous and oppressive duty. This duty would also tend to embroil the magistrates with their neighbours. The neighbours would ask who were the magistrates; and the answer would be that they were not appointed by the ratepayers, but by the Lord Lieutenant. This, again, would give rise to the question, whether the magistrates ought not to be appointed in another manner? Then, as to religious instruction. On the religious education of the child in early life depended very much his future life. The Bill provided that the time given to religious instruction should not exceed half an hour; and that the ratepayers should determine the kind of religious instruction to be given, and that the parent might withdraw his child from such instruction. This would be equivalent to saying that there should be no religious instruction, for the children not withdrawn from it would not like the performance of what they would regard as a task, while their withdrawn companions went out to play. It was not likely that sectarian or doctrinal instruction would be given in the schools, and therefore there was no reason for permitting any of the children to absent themselves at the time that it was communicated. He thought he had said enough to show that this Bill could not be carried out in a practical and efficient way. Some legislative measure was, no doubt, very desirable; but the subject required more consideration than it could receive at this period of the Session. If the matter were referred to a Select Committee next Session certain principles might be arrived at which would form the foundation of a satisfactory legislative measure. The provisions of this Bill, however, were wholly impracticable. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that every man had his opportunity, and if a legislative measure could be brought forward to give the House that opportunity, he thought the House would rejoice. Believing that the present Bill could not be carried out, he moved that the second reading be deferred for three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Beach.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. BANKS STANHOPE said, that the reason why he opposed the Bill was that he believed it was thoroughly and entirely impracticable, and would rather prevent than promote the education of the classes for whom it was intended. It was impossible that children employed in agricultural operations could attend school all the year round. In the summer they must at all favourable opportunities be employed in the fields; in winter they might go pretty regularly to school. The young men who succeeded best as labourers were those who went early into the field. Therefore it was both natural and proper that with a view to their children's own advantage the parents should send the lads out as soon as they could rather than keep them at school. He always thought the gang system a very bad one, and was glad a Bill had been introduced to regulate it. He was glad to say there were only two parishes in North Lincolnshire, the county he had the honour to represent, in which the gang system existed at all, and that only to the extent of 400 children. The alternate day system was altogether inapplicable to agriculture. He admitted that the education of agricultural children had become a necessity, more especially as agriculture was becoming more and more a skilled employment. At a meeting of the Central Chamber of Agriculture held in London the other day all the speakers admitted the importance of educating agricultural children, but all opposed the Bill of the hon. Member for Brighton, on the ground that its provisions were impracticable. All especially objected to the permissive powers which it would confer on the magistrates. The Bill threw the whole onus of levying an education rate on the magistrates. This was not a fair position for either magistrates or ratepayers to be placed in; besides which the operation of the enactment would be unequal, varying, in fact, with the circumstances of the localities. Another objection to the Bill was that it enacted that the religious instruction to be given in the schools was to be determined by a majority of two-thirds of the inhabitants. But according to this scheme the religious instruction might vary from year to year as the majorities varied; and this would bring religious teaching into disrepute with the rising generation. It was most undesirable that every vestry should be divided by theological disputes. Even if he approved of all the provisions of the Bill, this was not the time at which they ought to legislate upon this subject. A Royal Commission had been appointed to inquire into the employment of children, young persons, and women in agriculture, to ascertain to what extent, and with what modification, the Factories Act could be adapted to the purposes of agriculture with a view to giving the best education that could be devised. The Reports of that Commission must be in the hands of the House before any legislation on the subject could be advantageously adopted. Those counties with wages at 9*s.* a week, were very different from counties in the east of England, where the agricultural labourer received from 12*s.* to 15*s.* The Commission was collecting information from all parts of England. It was only on such complete information that satisfactory and sound legislation could be founded. The hon. Member for Brighton had framed his measure to meet the circumstances of Wilts and Dorset, the two counties with which probably he was best acquainted. What was good for those counties might be bad for the rest of the country. They wanted to know what was the state of things in the other counties of England, and until they had that information they were not in a condition to pass any measure of this kind. He should be perfectly willing to assist in the promotion of any scheme which might be considered best fitted to extend and improve the education of the labouring classes, without having the effect of destroying agriculture throughout England. He hoped that the hon. Member for Brighton would not press for a division, as its result might create a false impression as to the feelings of the House upon this subject. If he did he should be compelled to vote against him.

Mr. INGHAM said, the last speaker was not justified in assuming that the proposed measure was impracticable. The division of the day into portions—one devoted to labour, the other to school—had certainly failed on account of the necessity and difficulty of a change of clothes. But the system of employing double the number of children at the same rate of wages had been well received and had operated most successfully.

Mr. LIDDELL said, the half-time system was adapted for children working in numbers, but would not work well with regard to children whose employments were dispersed. He quite agreed in the opinion that the half-time system had proved successful in some respects, and especially as a protective measure in shortening the hours of labour of persons of tender age. But the hon. Gentleman had made no reference to its unquestionable failure in an educational point of view. The framers of the system had thought only of quantity, not of quality. He had presented a Petition against this Bill from the Chamber of Agriculture of Northumberland. The members of that chamber fully recognized the importance of educating agricultural children, and only objected to the measure because they believed that it could not be worked in the shape proposed. The hon. Member for Brighton had stated that the state of agricultural education was disgraceful; an assertion the accuracy of which he must entirely deny, so far as it affected the North of England, where the education given to the agricultural population was highly creditable. In the rural districts the hon. Member for Brighton had stated that the education of the children was in a disgraceful state, the schools being bad and the teaching far below par; and yet he wished to force the children into the places of education he had so much condemned. But, even assuming with the hon. Member that the teaching in the agricultural schools was below the mark, did not that result from the poverty of the schools, and was it not a proof that the Privy Council system had failed to reach them? The defective part of the present system of education was that, while the rich districts were assisted, the poor districts that were unable to help themselves got nothing. The hon. Member said he apprehended hostility to the Bill on the part of landlords and farmers, and he was far from saying that those anticipations were ill founded; but therefore he proposed to give the magistrates in Petty Sessions power to levy a rate to carry out its objects. In his opinion that was the most objectionable feature in the Bill. It was most unadvisable that two magistrates should have power to levy a rate in Petty Sessions where the ratepayers were not represented, the opinion of the neighbourhood as to its propriety not known. The hon. Gentleman had compared this Bill to the one which had been introduced into the other House by a noble Lord who was peculiarly conversant with this question; but while the Bill of the noble Lord was practicable that of the hon. Member was impracticable. While it was quite practicable that agricultural children should attend school a certain number of days in the year, and such a proposition would be generally acceptable to all concerned, it was impracticable to require them to attend school during a certain number of hours each day, or a certain number of days in each week. The vicissitudes of our climate rendered it absolutely necessary that the whole labour on a farm should be available on certain occasions, when the weather was favourable, while at other times it might be partly withdrawn without injury to the farming interests. "Make hay while the sun shines" was the golden rule of agriculture. He hoped that under these circumstances the hon. Member would not press this Bill, especially at a time when there was a general feeling in the country that the existing educational system had broken down. Public feeling was ripening upon the subject of education generally, which it was felt must be dealt with in a large spirit, and this great question would probably be one of the first that the Reformed Parliament would turn their attention to with the view of establishing a "National system" worthy of the country, and commensurate with the requirements of its people.

MR. M'LAREN said, he did not think that more information on this subject need be laid before the House before they legislated upon it. His impression was that a great deal more information had been laid before the House than Members had time to read, or at all events to digest. He thought the time had arrived for taking some step in advance. He could not say that he approved of everything in the Bill, but he was very much in favour of taking some step forwards. A Paper with a rather odd title, namely—*Mortality and Marriages*, was laid before the House last week. One would scarcely expect to find in that Paper information on the subject of education; but it showed how many persons of each sex were able to sign their names in the marriage register. He thought that no man or woman would like to register themselves to endure for all time, as so ignorant that they could not write their names unless it was really fact that they could not. And those who could not sign their names would be found in most instances unable to read. He found from the Return referred to, that in all England, in 1865, 20 out of every 100 men, and 31 out of every 100 women could not sign their names. It was quite true, as the hon. Gentleman opposite had stated, that the Northern counties of England were not badly educated when compared with the rest of England. Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland were by far the best educated counties in England. The northern division of Yorkshire was also very good. In Northumberland and Cumberland only 9 out of every 100 men were unable to sign their names. In Westmoreland—marvellous to say—only 3 out of every 100 men were unable to sign their names. But, in the case of the women, the proportions were 14, 18, and 11, respectively out of every 100 in the three Northern counties. In nearly all cases the women were behind the men. In dealing with the question of the education of the very poor, it was more important to see whether the mothers were educated than whether the fathers were, because the moral and religious education of the children of the poor depended more upon the instruction they received from their mothers than their fathers, or upon any moral or religious instruction imparted by schoolmasters or ministers of religion. So far from the statement that the agricultural districts were badly educated being an unfounded allegation, as had been said in the course of the debate, the fact was confirmed by the Return laid before the House. By that Return in seven counties upwards of 40 out of every 100 women could not sign their names, and there were three counties in which upwards of 50 out of every 100 women could not sign their names. The proportions as to women were as follows:—In Monmouthshire 52 out of every 100, and in South Wales 54 out of every 100 could not sign their names. In the North-western counties, 45 out of every 100, in Bedfordshire 34 out of every 100, in Cornwall 42 out of every 100, in Worcestershire 43 out of every 100, in Nottinghamshire 40, and in Lancashire 49 out of every 100 could not sign their names. There was an extraordinary difference between those divisions of counties that contained boroughs and those that did not. In boroughs there was generally a much higher education than in the agricultural districts. Without going minutely into the information supplied by the Returns before the House, he would observe that those Returns showed very clearly that there was an enormous amount of ignorance in the agricultural districts; and he thought it was the duty of the House to attempt to remove that ignorance. The Privy Council system of supporting education was a failure. The State ought to give aid to a school which enabled the children of the poor in rural districts to pass a satisfactory examination, whether that school was conducted by a certificated teacher or not. If such children could read a chapter in the Bible tolerably well, write a verse from dictation without blunders, and do a sum in simple proportion, the inspectors ought to class the school in which those children were educated as being one deserving of State support, even if it were a dame school. A great deal of money was at the present moment, in effect, wasted in educating to a high standard, children whose parents were quite capable of giving them a good education without the interference of the State. He should prefer to see more attention than was at present given to this branch of education. It was the paramount duty of the House to attend to the interests of the very poor. He knew of no plan of furthering the education of such children equal to that of judging by the results, and allowing a certain fixed sum for their education, when duly tested, without inquiring minutely where they got their education. He did not look forward to any material improvement as regards the poorer classes until a system was introduced of paying for the education of every child in proportion to the quality of that education, without respect to the place where, or the person by whom, it was given; or until an entirely free system was substituted, without any school fees being chargeable.

Mr. HENLEY said, he regretted that the hon. Member had not brought forward this Bill at an earlier period of the Session, when it might have been considered under, perhaps, somewhat different circumstances. The hon. Member had placed the House in a somewhat difficult position by saying that, if the Bill were to be met by a direct negative, he should divide upon it; but that, if it were merely said to be out of time, or the objections were to details, he should not divide upon it. The hon. Member had said he wished the principle of the Bill to be affirmed; but it unfortunately happened that the Bill was curiously framed, having no Preamble. The only affirmative principle it contained was that which declared that no child under thirteen years of age should work unless it went to school on alternate days—a principle which he had declared, in reference to another Bill, to be an impossible one to carry out. Under such circumstances, the hon. Member asked them to affirm some vague and undefined principle which he did not lay before them in a definite form. This he thought it would be unwise for them to do. Few persons were to be found who would not admit that the education given both in town and agricultural districts was defective. But was the Bill before the House calculated to remedy that defect? The hon. Member who had just sat down had read some extracts from an interesting document, which gave the number of persons who could sign their names to the marriage register; but the inferences to be drawn from the figures given in that Return were open to some qualification. In some districts, for example, where work was not abundant, the younger and better educated part of the population might leave in search of more remunerative employment in other districts, where they would settle and marry. Thus the amount of their education would not appear in the statistics of the county in which they were reared, but in those of the town to which they had probably removed. That Return had, however, shown a considerable improvement of late years in the number of people who could sign their names. He did not think that the chief reason that children did not attend schools was the apathy of their parents. He had been told by many parents that they could not afford to allow their children to attend school, because they earned from 3*s.* to 3*s.* 6*d.* a week, being 25 per cent, or, in the case of two boys, 50 per cent, of the father's earnings. The hon. Member endeavoured to meet that fact by a rather curious argument. He said if the children's labour were kept out of the market, that of the parents would rise in value. This, however, was a complete fallacy, for the labour of the child and of the man did not compete with each other, and therefore by withdrawing the labour of the one that of the other would not be increased in value. The hon. Member said that in some of the agricultural districts the farmers met together, and, having calculated the price of the food which the labourer and his family would consume, fixed the amount of the wages accordingly. He had lived among farmers all his life, but had never heard of such an occurrence. Perhaps the hon. Member had mixed up two or three things together, and, having read in some of the blue books he had dug up that formerly relief to the poor was regulated by the cost of their food, he had confounded that system with the principle upon which the amount of wages was regulated. Everybody knew that the amount of wages was regulated by the quantity of labour which happened to be in the market, and not by any fixed rules which the farmers might lay down. The hon. Member urged the House to legislate upon the subject of the Bill at once, on the ground that it was a matter that could not wait. He forgot that there was not the same cause for haste in legislating with regard to agricultural labour as there was with reference to factory labour. The health of the children was not injured in the former as in the latter case by confinement, bad air, gas, and late hours. The work being performed in the open air, and Providence shortening the hours of labour during certain seasons of the year, the urgency was much less pressing. Then the hon. Gentleman told them that another cause why they should legislate without delay upon the subject was that the agricultural labourers were so ignorant. He denied that there was any foundation for such a charge being brought against the agricultural labourers. He would admit that a certain proportion of them—but not a larger proportion than was to be found among all other classes of labourers—could not read or write; but he entirely denied that they were ignorant of the knowledge necessary for their particular occupations, or in knowledge of their duty to God and man. As a further inducement to the House to deal with this question, the hon. Member said that if the children were better educated they would do their work better, and so would add to the general wealth of the community. Could a lower or more sordid argument possibly have been used than this in favour of educating the agricultural children? Was there a man in that House that believed that the efforts that had been made by the right-minded people of this country for the education of these poor children had no higher motive than to get a greater amount of profit out of them? If this were true, those persons must be the very impersonation of Mammon. To educate children merely that they might be more profitable was an abominable motive, and if it were acted on by employers would cut their own throats. Thirty-four years ago the House had been asked and prayed to check the seething mass of corruption among the lower classes by establishing a system of religious education, a system that he thought some hon. Members might not object to see abolished.

MR. FAWCETT said, that he never, in the least degree, intended to confine the advantages of education to material advantages; but he thought it necessary to show that, for any temporary pecuniary loss which might follow from the proposed legislation, the farmers and landowners would be compensated by the material advantage which would result from it. He deemed the moral advantages resulting from education to be of far higher importance than any material advantage which could result from it.

MR. HENLEY said, he was indifferent as to which horn of the dilemma the hon. Member and learned Professor chose to place himself on. If he did not defend education on the ground that it would result in material advantage, why did he hold out such an inducement to the farmers and landowners? But it was not true that farm labourers were uneducated. Whether they looked to ploughmen or carters, to the men who attended to the cattle, or to any other class, he contended that they would be found to be better educated for the fulfilment of their duties than the lower classes of any other country in the world. With the exception of Belgium, perhaps, where agriculturists were employed in almost garden farming, no country could produce more highly-skilled farmers. No country produced as much per acre as England, or stock which could compete with ours; and the skill of the farmer was well aided by the efforts of the labourer. Yet the hon. Member spoke of the ignorance of the labourers, and urged that on that account it would be for our interest to pass his Bill. With respect to the provisions of the Bill itself; no child was to be allowed to go to work until he was thirteen years of age, and without a certificate of his attending school. The immediate effect of the Bill would be this—that all boys under thirteen years of age would be discharged; the younger children would not be sent to school as they were at present, and the amount of education, instead of being increased, would be lessened. But that was not all. Few people who knew anything of agricultural work, spoke of the practicability of attendance at school on alternate days, and for this reason, that most of the boys were employed about cattle, and they could not be one day at work and another day off. Unless hon. Members were certain they could do good, it behoved them in a matter of this kind to pause, lest they did evil. Hon. Gentlemen seemed to imply that in some cases persons were unwilling to send their children to school. He asked them whether they thought those people would be made willing by inflicting such injuries upon them as would result from depriving them by law of their children's earnings, and so preventing them from contributing to the support of the family. But did a prejudice exist against education? He believed that people were becoming more and more desirous every day of procuring education for their children, because they were becoming more sensible of its value. It would be true wisdom, therefore, to take care that no mischief was done by rudely stopping this natural growth which he believed had set in, and would gradually permeate throughout the land with most favourable results. Let the endeavour be to make the growth as smooth as possible by the removal of obstacles. Let measures be adopted to enable poor people to send their children to school as much and as long as possible. Let every allowance be made for the parents, but let them on no account be coerced. It had fallen to his lot more than once to distribute prizes to agricultural labourers, and among them on one occasion was a boy, of whom he asked, as he often did of others, how long he had been at school, and the answer was "Father died and mother was hard up and could not afford to put me to school long, and I've had very little of it." Yet this boy had come from a class whom the hon. Member described as ignorant. The appearance of that boy's countenance when he said he had helped his mother showed he possessed something of more value to him than reading and writing; something which had enabled him to strive hard and draw himself out from the crowd, so that by his superior skill he was probably earning men's wages in order to support his brothers and sisters, whereas, under the Bill of the hon. Member, he would have been prevented from doing anything of the kind. He had heard it said that agricultural labourers seldom attained excellence if they did not begin their work early. He could not give a positive opinion on that point; but he knew for a fact that those children who were kept in the workhouse rarely commenced work on the farm until thirteen years of age, because there was no one who could take care of them. The consequence was, as he had often heard, that those boys never turned out as skilled as those who had gone to the field earlier. For these reasons among others he asked the House not to agree to the second reading of this Bill, which contained no principle, had no Preamble, and commenced with a provision which the hon. Member knew had been condemned already by the Upper House. It would be better if the Bill were withdrawn so that hon. Members on his (Mr. Henley's) side of the House might not be falsely represented as having no wish to improve the condition of the people, as it was probable they would be if they rejected the Bill from conscientious motives. The hon. Member had chosen to charge upon Gentlemen, who, he said, were intimately connected with the landed interest, that they had had no care for their people beyond what would enable them to increase their own rents.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he was sorry to be obliged again to correct the right hon. Member, but he had misrepresented him in almost every sentence he had spoken. Just now he had accused him of having charged the people with being brutally ignorant, whereas he had made use of no such expression. Now, with similar injustice, he charged him with having accused landowners of doing nothing for their labourers unless they would thereby increase their rents.

Mr. HENLEY: Had not the hon. Member charged the landowners with maintaining a monopoly in order to add to their rents? He used those very words; how then could he have misrepresented the hon. Member? He repudiated as utterly false the charge that landowners had not now and always done all in their power in behalf of those over whom it had pleased God to place them. Moreover this question had never been argued in relation to the question of rent, but simply with regard to the advisability of depriving the poor of the profits of their labour, in order that their condition might be improved in the future. He repudiated the charge the more earnestly, because the hon. Member did not choose to make it in a direct manner; but thrust it out by means of an insinuation which, of course, from the manner in which it was put, fell with more deadly effect. He (Mr. Henley) again urged the withdrawal of the measure, which, if carried, would certainly fail in its object, and would tend rather to check education than further it, by creating a bad feeling among the people.

Mr. READ said, the measure appeared

to him to be based upon two propositions —one that the employment of children in agriculture should be restricted, the other that education should be compulsory—and there was no doubt the Bill acted on these propositions in the most arbitrary manner. As a practical farmer, he maintained that it was impossible to carry out a provision ordering that children under thirteen should be employed in agriculture on alternate days. The only instance in which it was known to have answered was that of Mr. Paget, who lived near a manufacturing town, and could therefore get as many boys as he wanted on special occasions. He would not object to a Bill preventing boys who could not read from working continually; but by nine a boy had generally obtained a fair elementary education, which he could easily supplement and improve by attending night schools. He confirmed the opinion of the right hon. Member for Oxfordshire, that if boys were not employed in agriculture young they would not prosper. He contended that compulsory education was unnecessary; and he especially objected to an educational rate because it had become the fashion of late to put all such burdens on real property. It was also a most extraordinary proposition, in his opinion, that two magistrates sitting in petty sessions should be invested with the power of buying land and building a school, and of enforcing from the ratepayers the money to maintain the school, while, perhaps, they did not themselves pay rates in that parish. Farmers, as a class, did not object to education; they were, on the contrary, very much in favour of it. He had been present at a discussion on this Bill in the Central Chamber of Agriculture, where a resolution was passed sympathizing with the desire to increase the education of the labourers, but declaring that the Bill would not accomplish that object. What farmers objected to was the style of education that was sometimes imparted to labourers' children. He admitted that in order to work the improved agricultural machinery well it was almost necessary to have a thoroughly well-educated labourer; but a superficially educated man, who knew nothing of his business, was the very worst labourer one could have. He had been in workhouses where he had seen children intended for the farm going through a course of geography, when they should properly have been learning the use of the spade. Education, to be useful, should be suited to the future position of the child. This principle was followed to a great extent among the middle classes; their children could not be indulged in the higher branches of education, and this example should be followed in the education of agricultural labourers. They had been told that the education in agricultural districts was disgraceful, and especial reference had been made in this spirit on a previous occasion to the state of education in Norfolk. Out of the 737 parishes in Norfolk, only 147 were aided by Government in the matter of education. Eighty-three of the parishes had a population of upwards of 1,000, and forty-six of them got some portion of the grant. Of the 498 parishes under 500 population, thirty-nine only were aided, and 459 received nothing from the grant. There were 212 parishes in which there were no schools, but 143 were consolidated for educational purposes leaving sixty-nine without schools. Of these, however, only twenty-two had a population of 150; several had less than twenty, and one contained only six. In 525 parishes that had schools 35,588 children were upon the books, or about one-tenth of the population. There were also more than 6,000 night scholars in the schools; and, as to quality of education, the inspectors reported to the bishop that both in secular and religious education seven-eighths of the schools were in a satisfactory state. There was one point on which he especially desired to offer a remark, and that was with reference to the early age at which children were taken from school, greatly to their detriment. Upon this subject the Rev. R. C. Burton, hon. secretary of the Norwich Diocesan Society, after speaking hopefully of the progress of education in a letter to him, suggested a remedy. He thought it would be a very good thing if employers of labour and managers of schools were to arrange that children should continue at school continuously during certain seasons of the year; to anything in the shape of pains and penalties on employers, and of coercion or interference with the rights of parents, he was altogether opposed. That suggestion was worthy of consideration. On the general question he agreed with the hon. Member for Edinburgh, that Government should pay for results, whether the education was imparted by a duly qualified teacher or not. A certificated master was undoubtedly the cheapest teacher in the end; but it was impossible to have one in small villages. The supply of night schools was increasing, with, of course, a different class of teachers, whose labours, however, were followed by the most satisfactory results. The country owed much gratitude to the clergymen and volunteers who conducted these night schools, and as the villages where they were found contributed in the shape of taxes much more than large towns in proportion to their population, it was the duty of the Government to give to these villages some portion of the educational grant.

MR. SAMUELSON said, there was no reason why the scholars should not be instructed in spade husbandry as well as in other classes of education. The same measure should be meted out to children engaged in agriculture as was meted out to the children in factories. The education should be continuous, because education merely imparted in winter, with long intervals between the periods of instruction, would be comparatively worthless. One of the principles of the Bill was that where there were no schools in parishes they should be provided. How they should be provided—whether in the manner proposed by the Bill or in any other—was a matter which might very fairly be discussed. The only other principle of importance which the Bill sought to establish was that the religious education imparted to the children should not be such as their parents conscientiously objected to. No person desired that religion should be entirely eliminated from the children's education. It was only desired that the children should not be compulsorily instructed in religious principles opposed to those professed by their parents. He approved the arguments offered by the hon. Member for Brighton in support of the Motion, and could not understand why hon. Gentlemen should object to those arguments simply because they were based on economical principles. Instead of the Bill being utterly useless, it contained, in his opinion principles which the House ought to adopt. He gave his support to the Bill.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, that before the discussion closed he wished to express, as briefly as he could, the view which he took of the Bill. The supporters of the Motion for the second reading said they were anxious that the House should affirm the principle of the measure, but they were by no means unanimous in their approval of its provisions. In the first place, the Bill was a novelty in every respect, and, as had been pointed out by his right hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley), there was no Preamble to explain its object. It had been said that the House possessed sufficient information with regard to the system of alternate days, whereas every hon. Member must be aware that the character of juvenile labour was different in different counties. In woodland districts for example, children were employed in occupations perfectly suited to them, such as tying up hops, or peeling hop poles, and it would be extremely inconvenient if their education were confined to alternate days; because many of them now attended schools continuously during a considerable portion of the year. Then there was a clause providing that schools should be supplied by the parishes on a principle absolutely new and contrary to anything which had been hitherto accepted in this country. It was proposed that the magistrates in Petty Sessions should levy a rate on the parish for the support of the school, and practically the ratepayers would have no voice whatever unless two-thirds of them objected to the imposition of the rate. Thus a power would be vested in the magistrates which they never possessed before. The Bill would further provide that the majority of the ratepayers should determine the nature of the religious instruction to be given in each school. That was a question surrounded with difficulties, and which could not be decided without the most careful consideration. These points were of considerable importance, and every clause in the Bill relating to them must be amended before it could be made generally acceptable. The principles of the Bill were open to grave objections, and it was not likely that at so late a period of the Session its provisions could be altered so as to make it acceptable to the House. The hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) who always spoke with great statistical knowledge, had quoted a Parliamentary Return to show the wide-spread ignorance which prevailed in regard to writing. These statistics showed that there prevailed great ignorance throughout the country, but they also showed that there had of late years been a considerable and rapid increase of education. It was remarkable that that improvement had taken place in those districts in which it was most wanted. In London the educational rate was stationary, if it had not actually retrograded. The results which had been attained were by no means unsatisfactory or discouraging, considering that our present educational system could not be said to have commenced until the year 1848 or the year 1849. The hon. Member for Edinburgh said that he was anxious to take some step for the removal of the great ignorance which at present existed among our population. But the hon. Member must be careful in what direction that step was taken. Many persons said that something must be done in the matter; but there might be great danger in acting upon such an impulse. It would be very difficult to retrace a wrong step; and there were at least three proposals in the Bill which, if adopted, might be productive of enormous inconvenience. The passing of the Bill would involve the House in a very grave difficulty, as it would introduce into the agricultural districts a system which had not been introduced into any other districts. Under these circumstances he trusted that the hon. Member for Brighton would be satisfied with the discussion which had taken place, and that he would not press a measure which could lead to no useful result.

Mr. PERCY WYNDHAM said, he hoped that the Bill would be withdrawn, though, if it were pressed to a division, he should vote for the second reading, with a view to affirm the principle that the Legislature should make some provision for the education of children in agricultural districts, as they had already done for the education of factory children; but there were many details in the measure of which he could not approve. The great obstacle to education in the agricultural districts was the shortsightedness of the labourers in preferring the 6*d*. a week or so which could be earned by their children to sending them to school. If boys below a certain age were compelled to go to school, there would be a greater demand for the labour of boys above that age. The North and South of England were differently situated as regarded education. In Northumberland and Cumberland the rate of education was much higher than in the Southern counties. The rate of education was high; the wage rate was also high; good training and high wages went together. He did not think that the circumstance was to be attributed to any greater wealth among our northern than among our southern farmers. He believed that it was entirely owing to the greater value of an educated as compared with an uneducated labourer. That was a conclusion which ought to lead Parliament to adopt every possible means for the promotion of education throughout the country generally. No doubt there were great difficulties connected with the proposed scheme; but, on the other hand, it was recommended by some advantages which the principle of the Factory Acts in towns did not involve.

Sir HARRY VERNEY said, he thought there was a great deal still to be learned respecting the education of the children of agricultural labourers. He thanked the hon. Member for Brighton for having introduced this Bill, which related to a subject of great importance at the present time, when the franchise was about to be conferred on a great number of agricultural labourers. It was not easy to form a precise and definite opinion as to the increase of education; but he might mention that, from his personal experience, he could speak with some confidence upon the subject. In the year 1827 a school had been established near his home in the country. There was no other one at the time within a distance of four miles. It was attended by about eighty or ninety children; and, although several schools had since been founded in the surrounding parishes, the attendance still continued at the same amount. That fact clearly showed that education had become more general in the district, which was a purely agricultural one, during the period to which he had referred. He would appeal to the hon. Member for Brighton to withdraw the Bill, although, if a division took place, he should not like to vote against it. The proposed system of alternate days was altogether a mistake, and he would suggest the advisability of substituting for it a proviso that no child should be employed in agriculture unless he had received a certain amount of education. The present clause would be impracticable, inasmuch as farmers in thinly peopled parishes would find it impossible to dispense with the services of children on every second day. The provision to set apart one half-hour for religious education appeared to him injudicious, as in that matter everything depended upon the fact of the teacher being himself religious or otherwise. He objected to the clause exempting from the operation of the Bill children who resided more than three miles from a school. Many used formerly to come to his school from a greater distance. He particularly recollected one little girl who used to walk several miles every day, even through the snow, in order to attend the school. Her perseverance had attended her through life, and she now kept a large hotel in a continental capital. He appealed to the hon. Member to withdraw his Bill and re-introduce it with alterations next year.

MR. GOLDNEY said, he wished to say a few words in vindication of the county of Wilts. It had been stated that the hon. Member for Brighton had obtained his knowledge from the counties of Wilts and Dorset. If that were the case, the hon. Gentleman must have been very incorrectly informed; in North Wilts there was hardly a parish without a school, and the clergymen and the farmers were most anxious that the children should be educated. He denied that high wages followed education. The Return quoted by the Member for Edinburgh could not be relied on as testing accurately the amount of education, because a great number of people who were able to write felt a timidity at signing their names in the presence of others, and therefore made use of a mark. In considering this question, it should be remembered that in a large family it was often necessary that the children should by their labour contribute to the weekly income, as otherwise they could not be fed. The boys felt a pride in going out to work and earning money. He knew a poor man whose five boys earned between them 22*s*., and, to use his own expression, they "eat every bit of it." How could that man, without such assistance, rear his family, having but 12*s*. a week to live on? Children were proud of doing a little work and being somewhat independent. If they forcibly compelled the children of the agricultural population to go to school they would both destroy their capabilities for work and lessen the probability of their educational improvement. As the law at present stood, these children received a fair amount of education, and made themselves useful in the occupations in which their after-life was to be passed. The Bill, however, while it would not effect that improvement in point of education which was expected, would prevent the children being taught the very things which were to be useful to them in their vocations. The children were as anxious to go to school as was the hon. Member for Brighton to send them. The farmers, too, were generally anxious that they should be properly educated; but the grave question remained, whether it was not as necessary to instruct the children in the duties of the farm as to imbue them with the learning of the schools. At the present day the children of labourers were taught reading and writing, and could enter into ordinary newspaper literature. No practical result would be attained if their education were extended and they were taught botany, mineralogy, and other subjects of that kind unconnected with their calling. He thought the Bill was perfectly useless, and he should therefore vote against it.

MR. M'LAGAN said, he hoped the hon. Member for Brighton would withdraw the Bill and bring forward an amended measure on the subject next Session. He had examined the Bill and tried to discover its principles, and had also expected to hear them explained by the hon. Member who introduced the measure; but he had received no explanation. Under such circumstances, he could not support the Bill. He trusted the hon. Member for Brighton would withdraw it, and not place those who were in favour of improving education among the agricultural classes in the false position of having to oppose the measure. He was well acquainted with agriculture, and from his knowledge on the subject he did not see how the provisions of the Bill could be carried out. He himself would be in favour of a scheme somewhat similar to that which was adopted in Scotland—the education of the children at alternate seasons. In the summer time they were employed in the work of the farm, and during the winter months they were sent to school. This system had been found to work well in that country, and might advantageously be extended to England. In the last Report of the Education Commissioners it was stated that in Glasgow the best teachers would not receive factory children as scholars, because by doing so they would unsettle all their arrangements, and a similar result would no doubt take place in a far greater degree in the agricultural districts if the alternate day system were introduced. To mix up in the same class children who attended on this system with others who attended every day, would interfere with the progress of the latter, and entirely disturb the arrangements of the school. He should have preferred to make a certain amount of education the qualification for employment, instead of a certain length of attendance at school, for the mere sending a child to school was not education.

GENERAL DUNNE said, that this Bill was certainly not required in Ireland, where, if children were kept away from school, it was due solely to the poverty of their parents. That country was amply provided with schools under the national educational system, and great zeal for education existed amongst young men and others in the rural districts. It was found that recruits coming from the rural districts of Ireland could all read and write. Children in the agricultural districts were frequently in the habit of working during the day and attending school in the evening; and it was generally found that there was no unwillingness on the part of the children to go to school. He greatly objected to the clause empowering a magistrate to impose a fine of £10 on any person who employed in any agricultural pursuit a child under thirteen years of age. There was hardly anything which the son or daughter of a labourer could do which did not amount to agricultural employment. Under this clause, if a boy drove a donkey for his father, or if a girl fed her father's pigs or chickens—all of which was agricultural employment—the parent might be taken before a magistrate and fined. This was one of the most absurd Acts ever introduced into the House of Commons.

MR. FAWCETT said, he had too many acquaintances among the classes of which he was accused of speaking disrespectfully, and felt towards them too much respect, to have made use at their expense of the language attributed to him by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley). He had not intended to attribute any want of zeal in the cause of education to the clergy or landowners; on the contrary, he admitted that they had given good aid in building and supporting schools. Many of the remarks of those who opposed the Bill were not so much against its provisions as in opposition to the system of administering the education grants in this country. By a vote of the House yesterday it had been determined that the half-time system should be applied to an industry such as brickmaking, and if children under thirteen years of age were not to be employed in brickmaking which was an outdoor employment, he was at a loss to understand upon what principle such children were to be allowed to be employed in agriculture. Parliament had affirmed the principle that in every industry in the country, except agriculture, children under thirteen should not be allowed to be employed unless they had had a certain amount of schooling. All he wanted was to get the same principle extended to agriculture. The provisions of the measure itself and the arguments which he had advanced in support of it had been freely criticized in the course of the debate; but of that he had no complaint to make. As, however, Gentlemen at both sides of the House, for whose opinions he entertained respect, had pressed him to withdraw the Bill, he was quite prepared to do so, provided the hon. Member for Hampshire (Mr. Beach), would also withdraw his Amendment, thereby leaving the House in the same position with regard to this question of agricultural education as it occupied at the commencement of the Session.

Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

MASTERS AND WORKMEN BILL
(*Lords*).—[BILL 77].

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 5 (Quorum to form Council; Committee of Conciliation to be appointed by Council).

MR. LEATHAM: I rise to move the Amendment which stands in my name on this Clause—after council leave out "by both parties," and insert "on the written application of either party in dispute." My object, Sir, in moving this Amendment in the clause is to prevent the Bill becoming inoperative. The House will observe that there are two Committees mentioned in the Bill—one of Conciliation, and one for Arbitration. My Amendment applies only to the former. I have been informed that if you wait until both parties agree to apply for a Committee of Conciliation, you may wait for a long time; but if either party be allowed to apply, there is a chance of some good being done. I do not wish that the Committee for Arbitration should act without the consent of both parties in dispute, but the Committee of Conciliation may effect a great deal of good, and prevent the necessity of arbitration at all. The matter is investigated at the very outset, before any heat is engendered by the dispute. A strike, for instance, might be avoided by this Committee of Conciliation. The Amendment which I move is one suggested by a friend, after the perusal of an able article, in a well known periodical, from the pen of Mr. George Potter. The difficulty I feel is, that my Amendment is not approved of by the noble Lord who has introduced this Bill in "another place," or by the hon. and gallant Member who has charge of the Bill. If the hon. and gallant Member should state to the House that the Amendment would be fatal to the Bill, I cannot persist in the Amendment; but I place myself in the hands of the House. I cannot but believe that the Amendment would be a great improvement to the Bill. If the application of either party being made in writing is objected to; I have no objection to the application being made personally, or in any other way.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, that if one party were allowed to commence proceedings due notice ought to be given to the other.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the terms of the Bill had been settled by a Select Committee after careful consideration. The consent of both parties was required before the Council obtained power to act, as it was not felt right to give the Council any compulsory power over the community.

Mr. HENLEY said, he thought the Bill one of such importance that they ought not to proceed with it in the absence of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, to whom the House naturally looked for advice and guidance. Very onerous duties were proposed to be entailed upon magistrates, who at the same time might be fixed with damages. He accordingly moved that the Chairman do report Progress.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the Bill last year, after being referred to a Select Committee, from whom it received very careful consideration, passed through the House of Commons with the consent of the present Government and their predecessors, and was sent up to the House of Lords, but did not get further. This year the Bill, word for word, had been sent down from the Lords to the Commons, so that it might be said to have passed both Houses. He could not concur in the apprehensions entertained by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley). If postponed, they might lose the Session. The most important provision of the clause had been agreed on—namely, that, instead of disputants going before arbitrators appointed by a magistrate, they should go before the Council of Conciliation.

Mr. HENLEY said, the clause would place disputants in a very different position from that they at present occupied as to fine and imprisonment.

Captain MACKINNON said, that the Bill originally had been introduced by a Member of the present Government, and had then been turned over to his care. All the clauses had since been minutely examined by the Law Lords who passed the Bill. He hoped the Motion for reporting Progress would not be pressed.

Mr. HENLEY said, it certainly would be unless he heard from some Member of the Government that the Bill had their approval.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, he was not in a position to pledge his right hon. Friend (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) to any unqualified approval of the Bill. But as the measure would certainly be endangered by the postponement, the better course would be to allow it to pass through its present stage, and to offer opposition—if opposition were felt to be necessary—upon the Report.

Mr. HENLEY said, that on the understanding that due notice would be given of the next stage of the Bill, he withdrew his Motion.

Motion *withdrawn.*

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Counsel, &c., not to attend Hearing).

Mr. GOLDNEY said, there might be some hardship attendant on the exclusion of counsel or attorneys in every case. He accordingly moved the insertion of words enabling professional assistance to be obtained, "if consented to by both parties."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Appointment of Clerk).

Mr. GOLDNEY said, he wished to ask what provision was made to cover the expenses?

Mr. AYRTON said, that the machinery would only be set in motion by persons anxious to benefit by it, who accordingly would have to pay the necessary expenses.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, he wished to know, for example, what payment would be given to the clerk, upon whom he observed that a penalty was imposed if he failed to discharge certain duties?

Mr. AYRTON said, that any person undertaking the duties before doing so would take care to ascertain what these were, and to see that he was properly paid.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 15 *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (To make List of Fees, Byelaws, &c.).

Mr. GOLDNEY said, he moved the addition of words providing that, in addition to their other duties, the Council should "declare by whom and in what manner such fees and expenses are to be paid."

Mr. AYRTON said, that it was impossible for the Council to give beforehand a decision which properly ought to wait till the case was at an end.

Amendment *negatived.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* with an Amendment; as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next.

COMMONS INCLOSURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 151.]

(*Mr. Neate, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. NEATE said, he moved the second reading of this Bill. The object of the measure was to remove certain legal difficulties which had arisen under the Commons Inclosure Act, 1845.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Neate.*)

Mr. LEEMAN said, he must oppose the Bill, on the ground that its operation would be most mischievous, as it would unsettle and disturb the awards which had been made during the past twenty years, under the Act of 1845 and under previous statutes. He moved, as an Amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Leeman.*)

Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," put, and *negatived.*

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *put off* for three months.

SALE OF LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

(*Mr. John Abel Smith, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Baines.*)

[Bill 96.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. J. A. SMITH said, he moved that the order for the second reading of this Bill be discharged. At this period of the Session there was no chance of passing it. On an early day next Session he would ask for leave to bring in a Bill of a similar character.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

METROPOLITAN BUILDINGS AND MANAGEMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Tite, Bill to regulate the construction and use of Buildings, and the formation of Streets and of Sewers and Drains, in the Metropolis; and for other purposes connected therewith, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Tite and Colonel Hogg.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 293.]

QUINAGH AND PARSONSTOWN DRAINAGE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hunt, Bill to confirm Provisional Orders for the Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage Districts respectively, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Hunt and Lord Naas.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 294.]

House adjourned at Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, August 1, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Report*—On Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication) (No. 278).

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Metropolis Subways * (279).

Second Reading—Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act (1865) Amendment * (247); Agricultural Gangs (268).

Committee—Representation of the People (227); Dundee Provisional Orders Confirmation * (257).

Report—Railways (Guards and Passengers' Communication) * (278); Dundee Provisional Orders Confirmation * (257).

Third Reading—Wexford Grand Jury * (258); Tyne Pilotage Act (1865) Amendment * (157); Industrial and Provident Societies * (253), and *passed.*

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY (CARLISLE DEVIATIONS) BILL.

THIRD READING.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^a."

LORD OVERSTONE *presented* a Petition from Preferential Shareholders in the Company against the clause introduced into the Bill by the Select Committee. The company, finding itself in difficulties, had submitted to Parliament a Bill which proposed to raise further capital as pre-preferential stock; but the Select Committee to which that Bill was referred, acting in consistency with principles of wisdom and justice, at once rejected the proposition. A watchful and astute counsel, however, presented the same proposition in a new and disguised form, and persuaded the Committee afterwards to pass a clause in direct contravention of the principle they had previously sanctioned, and which, if carried into law, would involve injustice to the bondholders and preferential shareholders, as it would increase their responsibilities without extending their security. The clause would enable the company to set aside the rights of bondholders and preference shareholders, not only without their concurrence, but without any notice to them. He would not undertake to say how far it might be possible now to suspend further proceeding with the Bill in the form which it had now assumed; but he wished to express his concurrence with the Petitioners in their emphatic protest against the principle involved in this clause, and his hope that, as the Bill would have to go back to the House of Commons for further consideration, the clause might there be so modified as to remove the objections to which, in its present form, it is exposed, or, at all events, that this might not be made into a precedent for future legislation.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND, as Chairman of the Committee, said, he should be the last person to advocate the establishment of the principle of pre-preferential shares, which was one that ought not to be adopted except under the stress of special difficulty; but in this case, there was an absolute necessity for some arrangement such as that which the Committee had sanctioned, as it seemed to be the only means of extricating the company from its embarrassments. The case of the North British Railway was a most unfortunate one. The original share capital amounted to £5,000,000; there were £8,000,000 of preferential shares; and beyond this and the large debenture debt there had been incurred a debt of £1,843,000. The Committee were placed in a position of great difficulty, and in considering this very complicated case had to take into account the interests of the public as well as of the parties before them; and in the decision they came to after due consideration they were supported by the precedents of the Great Eastern Railway Company last year, and of the Cambrian Railway Company this year. If sufficient capital could have been raised by means of original shares to meet the difficulty that would have been the proper course to pursue; but it was calculated that in the depreciated position of the original stock, the additional issue required would not have been less than £4,000,000. No injustice had been done to the preferential shareholders; and it was only because a difficulty was found in raising money without throwing the burthen on the shareholders that the Committee resorted to this expedient. They found the revenue to be improving, and that there was every prospect that the state of difficulty would only be temporary. Under these circumstances, he trusted their Lordships would not take the very unusual course of reversing the decision of the Committee.

THE DUKE OF MONTROSE thought their Lordships would not be justified in reversing the decision of the Committee in consideration of a petition containing only two signatures, one of the names being that of an attorney, who he believed had a very small interest in the concern. The preference shareholders had assented to the measure as the only way of extricating the company from its difficulties. If a ship were stranded and required repairs in order to go to sea again, the requisite money might be raised on a pre-preference mortgage over-riding the existing mortgages on the ship or its merchandize, and this railway was in precisely the same position. Under such circumstances, it would be a very unusual course to reverse the decision of the Committee.

LORD REDESDALE said, that no one had less preference for pre-preference shares than he had; but this Bill stood in a particular position; and, besides, had been very much improved since it came up from the other House of Parliament. Both preference and debenture holders had agreed to a clause to be presented on the third reading, which clause he held in his hand. The noble Lord then handed in the clause, which was to the effect that until the capital authorized to be raised had been raised the debentures to be granted under this Bill should be postponed, in order that existing priorities might be preserved. Under these circumstances, he thought their Lordships ought to read the Bill a third time.

After a few words from Lord OVERSTONE,

Motion *agreed to*; Bill read 3^a accordingly, with the Amendments; a further Amendment *made*; Bill *passed* and *sent* to the Commons.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

QUESTION.

Earl GRANVILLE: Seeing, as I am sure all your Lordships do, with much pleasure, the noble Earl at the head of the Government again in his place, may I ask him, Whether any arrangements have been made for the postponement of the business which stands on the Paper before the Representation of the People Bill? Some of the Bills to which I refer may give rise to cosiderable discussion, and I think it would be the most convenient course that they should be postponed.

The Earl of DERBY: I am obliged to my noble Friend on the other side for the kind manner in which he has spoken of my appearance in the House. I trust that the occasion of my involuntary absence for some ten days will be taken as some expiation of the many misdeeds with which I have been charged in connection with the question of Reform. I believe that an understanding has been come to that the business which stands before the Committee on the Representation of the People Bill should be postponed, and that the general opinion is in favour of that course. As far as I am concerned, I should think it my duty not to throw any impediment in the way of the discussion of the Amendment of the noble Earl (Earl Grey) or any other Amendments that may be proposed.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL.—(No. 227.)—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

COMMITTEE.

House again in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 15 (Certain Boroughs to return one Member only).

Earl GREY: My Lords, the immediate object of the first Amendment which I have to move is to increase the number of seats placed at your disposal for distribution, by proposing that not more than one Member be returned by boroughs having a population not exceeding 12,000. The Amendment which I have to propose is to strike out the word "ten" and insert "twelve." But this Amendment must be considered in connection with other Amendments which I propose should follow if the Motion which I shall now make be adopted. The general effect of the arrangements will be to enlarge the scheme of re-distribution contained in this Bill. My Lords, on a former evening there was a good deal of discussion on the sufficiency or insufficiency of the plan of Her Majesty's Government. Now, I would remind your Lordships that on that occasion, while great exception was taken to the Resolution moved by my noble Friend behind me (Viscount Halifax), the objections made to it were rested almost exclusively on the form of the Motion and scarcely at all on the ground that the distribution of seats in the Bill as it stands was satisfactory or sufficient. On the contrary, my Lords, several noble Lords who stated their intention of voting against the Resolution of my noble Friend expressed at the same time their decided opinion that the scheme of re-distribution contained in the Bill was one which stood in need of amendment, and even those Members of Her Majesty's Government who resisted the Motion, and especially my noble Friend the Lord Privy Seal, did so almost exclusively on the ground that it was inexpedient to disturb the arrangement on this subject which had been come to by the House of Commons. Now, my Lords, I would venture to assume from what passed that evening that it is the opinion of a large portion of your Lordships—and, as I believe, it is the universal opinion outside the walls of this House—that the scheme of distribution as it stands is unsatisfactory and inadequate to the necessities of the case. With regard to the only argument advanced against disturbing the proposed distribution—namely, that we should be reluctant to interfere with an arrangement deliberately made by the other House of Parliament—I would venture to point out that this is a subject of all others with respect to which we have special advantages as compared with the other House of Parliament in dealing with it. No man, my Lords, is ignorant that if the scheme of re-distribution now before us is insufficient, no very great blame can be attributed to Her Majesty's Government on that account, because we all know that an extensive and complete scheme would have provoked so much hostility from those whose personal interests would be thereby affected, and so many persons would have thought themselves bound to resist a proposal which would diminish the political influence of the constituencies by which they have been returned, that an opposition would have been excited which might have been fatal to the whole measure. And if I rightly understand the remarks which are reported to have been made by the right hon. Gentleman who represents the Government in the other House of Parliament, this was his reason for proposing so small a scheme of re-distribution as that originally contained in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman is reported to have said that he had no objection to a larger scheme of re-distribution if the opinion of the House of Commons was prepared to support it, but he did not believe that to be the case, and was therefore content with the very moderate measure proposed. My Lords, I would venture to submit that this is a subject upon which you may most properly and most judiciously carry further what has been intended by the other House of Parliament. The Amendment which I am going to propose is not inconsistent with the principle of the Bill, it is not calculated to diminish its efficiency or to cripple its operation. On the contrary, the whole scope and purport of that Amendment is in strict conformity with the principle of the Bill; it is intended to render the measure more complete and its operation more perfect; and being free from all disturbing influences of personal interests or the wishes of constituencies, if we can apply ourselves to the consideration of the measure and make it more perfect and complete, I believe there is no man that will not feel that we have rendered a service to the public. My Lords, I venture to express an opinion that it is most important that we should take this course — in the first place because I hold it to be most undesirable that this question of Parliamentary Reform should again be brought immediately under the consideration of the new Parliament. I can conceive nothing more injurious to the public interests, nothing more calculated to interfere with the proper progress of legislation on other subjects, than that at the moment the new Parliament, elected under the provisions of this Bill, should be summoned, its attention should be called to the necessity of amending and extending this portion of the measure. There is another reason which, with me, weighs very considerably in favour of considering this part of the subject in the way that I recommend, and it is this:—On Tuesday night last the House, by an overwhelming majority—a majority which I think represented, if that be possible, a still more overwhelming superiority in argument — on the Motion of a noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns), whom I do not see this moment in his place, decided in favour of an alteration in the mode of electing Members for places returning three representatives. That Motion was carried with an almost unanimous expression of opinion on the part of this House such as I do not remember ever to have seen equalled. But the noble and learned Lord, in moving his Amendment, stated distinctly that as the Bill stands, the proposal which he made would be of very restricted operation, that it would apply only to a very small number of seats; and he intimated his own opinion that much less importance was to be attached to the Amendment he proposed on account of its immediate effect than because, in the inevitable changes which must take place at no distant time, its operation would be almost certain to be extended. My Lords, I am anxious to carry this principle to a greater extent without delay. Having now stated generally the arguments in favour of attempting some improvement in the scheme of re-distribution contained in the Bill, I will now, with your Lordships' permission, state in substance the mode in which I propose to carry that improvement into effect. In the first place my Amendment adds twelve to the number of boroughs which will lose one Member each. Most of your Lordships, no doubt, have before you a list of the towns to which this

Amendment will apply; and if you look over that list I am sure you will concur with me that there is nothing in the character or the importance of these towns which makes it undesirable they should, every one of them, give up a portion of the representation which they now enjoy, in order to afford a means of extending the representation to other places. I do not wish to be invidious, or I might point out that several of these towns are far from bearing a very high character in the matter of election purity—especially one of them, to which my noble Friend on the Bench behind (Earl Fortescue) referred the other day, a town in his own county, and of which he knows a good deal. Quite irrespective, however, of any consideration as to the purity of these places, I venture to say that none of them are of such importance or of such a character that they would not be adequately represented by a single Member; and when they are compared with some of the larger and thriving towns to which you are going to give a single Member under the Bill as it stands, I think no man who considers the subject with any care will deny that to withdraw one Member from these places is a most reasonable proposition. I do not think it would be fair or right to submit this Amendment to your notice without endeavouring to explain the Amendments by which I propose to follow it up. I do not mean to pledge your Lordships in the slightest degree to those ulterior measures. The simple question upon which you will be called to vote, in the first instance is, whether you will or will not extend to these twelve towns the same principle which you are going to apply to boroughs of somewhat lower population. At the same time, it will be convenient that your Lordships should have before you the further Amendments which I propose. If the present Amendment should not be adopted, of course these will fall to the ground; but, should it be adopted, I should further propose to add to the end of the clause words which would provide for the union of certain boroughs in order that they may jointly return Members to Parliament, instead of enjoying a separate representation. I perceive that a noble Friend behind me (Lord Lyveden) has given notice of a Motion which, I presume, he offers as a substitute for this Amendment, disfranchising altogether towns containing less than 5,000 inhabitants. Now, I have no insurmountable objection to that proposal: though I do not consider this to be the best mode of dealing with them, I think it would be better to adopt this suggestion than to leave these very small towns in the state in which they will be left by the Bill. To leave these small places with such privileges would, in my opinion, be, in the highest degree, objectionable and dangerous. Some of those boroughs are really mere villages, swelled to an apparent population—but even then having no adequate claim to a separate Parliamentary representation—by including in them surrounding districts which are essentially rural, and possess nothing of an urban character. I think this most objectionable. In the first place, the existence of these petty places returning Members to Parliament will provoke such invidious comparison with other and larger towns which only enjoy a smaller privilege, and will form so grossly inconsistent and absurd a distribution of political power, that it cannot, in my opinion, hold good for more than a very short space of time. The existence of such towns with such a representation seems to me calculated to insure the immediate re-opening of this question, to which, as I have said, I entertain very great objection. Further than that, I most extremely object to the retention of these small towns with the new franchise which you are going to establish, because I think that to do so would be to insure the existence there of very gross venality. At present many of these small towns are under the territorial influence of certain proprietors. As a matter of fact, they do return Members who are, in a great degree, nominated by certain large landlords. That is an arrangement to which, I think, there are just and valid objections, but which, at the same time, is attended by some undoubted advantages and convenience. I am not going to trouble your Lordships by recapitulating those advantages, because they have often been pointed out. But when, in these towns, you extend the right of voting to every ratepayer, and thereby practically confer the power of giving seats in Parliament, now so much coveted, on a very small number of persons in an extremely humble condition of life, it is contrary to all that we know of human nature to suppose that inducements will not be offered to them to sell their votes—inducements which it is impossible to expect that they will resist. These small boroughs, therefore, will lose whatever advantages they have possessed under the existing system, and under the new franchise they will become seats of venality and corruption. I am aware that an opinion has been expressed not within these walls, and I hope and trust that it is entertained by none of your Lordships—that the probable extension of venality as a result of this measure is not really to be viewed with alarm, but, will, on the contrary, act, to a certain degree, as a safeguard and protection against the very democratic tendency of the whole measure. My Lords, I cannot help feeling that that hope is entertained; and, in my opinion, it is a hope as fallacious as it is shameful. I believe that venality will prevail if you leave these small boroughs as they are; but I deny that this venality is likely to act as a corrective of the extreme democratic tendency of the Bill or to increase the influence of the landed aristocracy. I believe that the persons who will offer the highest inducements in the way of bribes to the voters who will be able to dispose of these seats, will be persons who have become rich by successful speculations and other means—including means sometimes not of the most reputable character—persons who, having raised themselves to sudden wealth, are anxious, by every method in their power, to acquire also a higher social standing, and, with that view, wish to obtain seats in the other House of Parliament. Having that object before them, they will not be niggardly in promises as to the measures they will support any more than in money. I believe that they will appeal as much to the passions and prejudices as to the interests of those who have the control of these seats; that they will flatter their very worst prejudices, and in this way, as well as by the free use of money, will very often obtain seats. In short, the tendency of the measure as it now stands is to substitute for the influence of old connection and the territorial power of great families, the bare influence of money in its lowest and most degrading form. I say I believe that is likely to be the effect of leaving these small boroughs in possession of the right to return Members to Parliament under the franchise you are now going to establish. If, therefore, the choice lay between continuing these boroughs as they stand in the Bill or adopting the proposal of my noble Friend, I should, without hesitation, concur in adopting that proposal. But I submit to your Lordships that there are strong reasons for preferring the plan of uniting these boroughs in groups for the purpose of forming constituencies sufficiently numerous to give a hope of their independence. I venture to think that by uniting these boroughs together, and in some cases adding to their constituencies, towns at present unrepresented, you will raise the constituencies to such a number as to afford a rational prospect that they may in future be independent, and not more liable to the temptation of bribery, than I am afraid most places will be under the franchise you are about to establish. The adoption of this plan would also involve a much less departure from the principle of the Bill than that recommended by my noble Friend. We are told that principle is to avoid complete disfranchisement, and I think it is a sound and just principle as far as it can be applied in reference to other and higher considerations. It is highly desirable in passing this measure that we should not subject any constituency, against which no charge has been preferred, except that of its being small, to the mortification of being entirely deprived of the electoral power it now possesses. This advantage would be attained by uniting together existing boroughs. And further, it appears to me that, by adopting the system of entire disfranchisement proposed by my noble Friend, we are placed in this difficulty. If we confine ourselves, as he proposes to confine himself, to places having less than 5,000 inhabitants, we still should have many constituencies which, in my opinion, would be much too small; they would not be adapted for the purpose we have in view, and they would be liable to those objections I have stated to your Lordships. If, on the other hand we carry that limit higher—if we make it considerably higher—we incur this other inconvenience, that we should completely eliminate from the future representation the element of small towns. It was on a former occasion argued with great force and with great justice that it is desirable to keep this element of the small towns in the representation. They answer the useful purpose of providing for the admission into the House of Commons of some valuable Members who would not otherwise find seats in it. The smaller boroughs have hitherto and may still be expected to return to Parliament a different class of representatives from the large towns. I believe the representatives that would be likely to be elected by them, would be of extreme use in producing that variety of composition in the House of Commons which has been, hitherto, one of its main recommendations; and for one I should greatly regret to eliminate this ingredient out of the House of Commons to the degree that it would be if we were to adopt the principle of total disfranchisement, and to carry it far enough to prevent our leaving any unduly small constituencies. By my plan of uniting these towns together, and strengthening them, when necessary, by towns at present unrepresented, you will maintain the character of small town representation; while at the same time there will be, as I believe, no practical difficulty in creating constituencies large enough to give a certainty of their independence. Such, my Lords, are the views which induce me to prefer the scheme which I now venture to commend. By a separate Motion, I propose to add at the end of this clause the words of which I have given notice, and which will provide for uniting together certain towns to form a joint representation. I may add that in doing so I am following the precedent of Scotland and of Wales. From all that I can learn, in both those countries this system of uniting towns for joint representation has been found very succesful. In Scotland, especially, I hear that is the case. It is, I believe, known that the effect of uniting several towns in representation has been to produce a considerable diminution in the facilities for bribery, and particularly in the worst forms of bribery that take place at the close of the poll. If your Lordships should adopt the suggestions I make, and consent to add the words I propose at the end of the clause, it will then be my duty to propose an addition to the first Schedule of the Bill describing the towns which would be dealt with. I hold in my hand a sketch of the arrangement which I have prepared, and I shall be ready to lay it on the table if your Lordships sanction my Amendment. I candidly tell your Lordships I am not altogether satisfied with this part of the scheme I am proposing. I have found it a matter of very great difficulty to draw up an arrangement for forming groups of boroughs which could be confidently recommended. I am not in possession of the local information which would enable me to form a conclusive judgment as to what would be the best arrangement, because there are various considerations to be taken into account which I cannot properly apply to the case without a fuller knowledge of the facts. In the first place I think it is important, as far as you can, to withdraw a portion of their representatives from those districts of the kingdom which are at present over-represented in proportion to their importance. I think it is also desirable, as far as possible, that you should unite together towns which are within a convenient distance of each other; and also that you should deal with those of small population; and, in regard to population, I think it very important you should have regard to that which is urban. In the Returns laid on our table there are various boroughs which appear to have a large population, a great proportion of which is really rural, while the town population is extremely small. There is one such case I happen to know of; it is the borough of Midhurst, which is really a village rather than a town, but is swollen to the size of a respectable borough by the addition of a strictly rural population. I say, therefore, that the scheme I lay before your Lordships will require revision in regard to the Schedules; but, if the principle is adopted, I have no doubt that the Government, with the means at their disposal, will be able very easily to amend the scheme which I suggest, and to correct the faults which may be found in it. What I propose is merely intended to give your Lordships some assistance in coming to a conclusion. I for one shall be most happy to concur in any Amendment of my scheme. But of this I am perfectly persuaded—that, whether by the scheme I suggest, or by some other scheme, it is perfectly practicable to group some of these small boroughs so as at the same time to continue to them the right of being represented and to obtain the number of seats which I think are wanted to meet the claims of larger boroughs to additional representation. I will not disguise—indeed, I at once plainly avow—that both in regard to the line taken for depriving towns of half their representation, and also in regard to the grouping I propose, I have been mainly guided by the consideration of what I know to be required in order to meet the demands for increased representation. It is, therefore, necessary I should lay before your Lordships a sketch of what I believe to be a proper mode of applying the seats which I hope may be gained by the adoption of the first Amendment. The number of those seats is twenty-three, of which twelve are gained by depriving boroughs under 12,000 in population of half their representation, and eleven are obtained by grouping. Assuming that we have these twenty-three seats to dispose of, then I will state how I would distribute them. I have already stated that my main object is to extend the application of the principle so ably supported the other night by the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns). I therefore propose that these twenty-three seats should be applied in creating constituencies to return three Members to Parliament. The first new constituency, and which I think would be the most important of all, would be that of the Inns of Court, and to that I had proposed to give two Members. But in making that proposal I coupled it with the further proposal that in this new constituency what is called the cumulative vote should be adopted. I think that a better and a simpler mode of applying the principle recommended by the noble and learned Lord than that which he has suggested. I am convinced that the object in view would be better attained by allowing each voter to unite all his votes in favour of a single candidate, than by restricting each elector to two votes when three Members are to be chosen. But while I hold this opinion, I acknowledge that in the majority of instances the operation of the two modes of voting would be practically the same; and as the House has adopted by a large majority the plan proposed by the noble Lord, and it appears to me desirable that we should proceed as far as possible on one uniform principle, I have thought it right to vary the Amendment of which I originally gave notice, by proposing to give three Members to the Inns of Court; so that this new constituency will then fall under the operation of the general clause proposed by the noble and learned Lord. I confess that I regard this as a most important constituency. It is of the highest consequence to the State that men who stand high in the estimation of the legal profession should be Members of the House of Commons. It is very necessary that those who from their professional eminence are most likely to be selected as Law Officers of the Crown should possess seats in the other House of Parliament, and, under the changes you are about to make in the Representation of the People, it seems doubtful whether that will always be the case. When, therefore, you are making extensive changes in other directions, which will diminish the existing means for bringing them into the House of Commons. you ought to provide some new facilities for the entrance into Parliament of men distinguished for their professional eminence and high character at the Bar. When, too, you are about to increase very largely the proportion of electors who have but little education, and when by such changes it must be expected that the proportion of men distinguished for their acquirements and abilities who will be returned by these electors will be considerably diminished, I think it desirable that the number of representatives to be returned by constituencies composed almost exclusively of men of high education should also be increased. I confess that, for my own part, I should like to carry the principle even further, and to increase the number of representatives which this Bill will give to the Universities. But though this would, I think, be highly desirable, I only venture to propose that three Members should be given to the Inns of Court. By this part of my proposal I have disposed of three seats. With regard to the remainder, I would venture to suggest that a third Member should be given to the largest and most populous counties or divisions of counties and to the largest and most populous boroughs. I propose, therefore, that all counties, and divisions of counties possessing more than 150,000 inhabitants should have a third Member given to them. These counties and divisions will be Middlesex, the North Riding of Yorkshire, West Cornwall, North Durham, East Kent, two divisions of North Lancashire, two divisions of South Lancashire, and three divisions of the West Riding. That will give twelve additional seats to the counties. I propose to adopt the same figure in the case of the boroughs, and to give an additional Member to Bristol, Sheffield, Wolverhampton, Marylebone, Finsbury, Lambeth, Westminster, and Southwark. I ought, perhaps, to say that in one case the population is not quite as large as the figure I have taken. This increase of electoral power in the counties and boroughs I have referred to is, I think, due to their wealth, to their population, and to the intelligence and activity of their inhabitants. Under the clause adopted at the instance of the noble and learned Lord, too, my proposal will, I think, insure the return of men who may be depended upon as men not holding extreme views and who, while they represent the opinions of a large and important class of the community, will not be in any way likely to lend themselves to sudden and violent changes. In the boroughs it will, I think, have the effect of giving representation to a very important class in this nation who are now altogether unrepresented. I will first take the case of the metropolis. I know that many persons view with extreme alarm any increase to the Members for the metropolis. But what is the present state of things? In point of fact the representation in the metropolis is monopolized by one single class of opinions; and men of the highest intelligence are practically deterred from attempting to exercise the electoral privileges which they theoretically possess because they know that it is impossible to secure the return of persons with whose views and opinions they sympathize. So that there is a large class now practically disfranchised. By the proposal I have made, therefore, in conjunction with that of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns), you will in reality enfranchise men peculiarly qualified to enjoy the right of voting, and enable them to return to the House of Commons a most useful class of representatives—men who, without being Conservatives in the party sense of the word, may, in a higher sense, well lay claim to the title. I have now, my Lords, laid before you, as clearly as I can, my proposal for amending the re-distribution portion of this Bill, and I have not proposed it to your Lordships without consulting others, better acquainted with the facts of the case, and more competent to form a sound judgment than myself. I am, however, far from being wedded to this particular scheme. I am quite willing—I am quite ready—to join with your Lordships in rejecting preconceived notions, in considering carefully, dispassionately, and indifferently what is the best mode of applying the seats which may be found available, with the view to secure the best representation of the people in the House of Commons. And if Her Majesty's Government will take up this question, and will, with the more extended means and information at their command, undertake to revise their scheme and provide for a more adequate change than that which is contained in the present Bill, I shall be only too glad to resign the task into their hands, and leave them to suggest to the House the best mode of accomplishing what I believe to be our common object. But, my Lords, I do submit to your Lordships that you will be throwing away a great opportunity of doing a most material service to the country, of averting a serious future danger, and of earning for yourselves a new title to the respect and esteem of the country if you decline to make a more adequate revision of the existing distribution of the political power of the nation. I venture to say that the country looks to you for this. The people know how much private and local influence necessarily warps and biases the House of Commons in dealing with such a question; and they know that your Lordships are free from those disturbing influences. Therefore they look, and they have a right to look, to your Lordships to use the advantages you possess to make this portion of the Bill more acceptable to the country, and better calculated to ensure its future good government. My Lords, these are the observations which I venture most earnestly to press on your consideration. By adopting my scheme you may not provide an absolutely permanent arrangement of political power; I am not sanguine enough to expect that to be the case. In order to accomplish that object it would be necessary to make far more extensive changes in the Bill than we could make now. If I had only my own opinion to consult, the changes I should ask you to adopt would be considerably larger; but the propositions which I have submitted to your Lordships can be adopted without departing from the principle of the Bill. They merely involve an extension of that principle. I do trust that your Lordships will not neglect the opportunity now afforded to you—that you will not allow the question of re-distribution to stand over to the future. I believe that the scheme I have laid before you, if it do not insure—and I have admitted that it does not—absolute permanency of arrangement, will establish an arrangement which for many years at least will be found equal to the wants of the country, and which when the necessity for revising the system hereafter arises will render Parliament more capable of dealing with the question than it would be if the Bill were left in its present incomplete state. In conclusion, I beg to repeat that the vote given by any of your Lordships for the Amendment which I am now about to propose cannot be regarded as pledging you to my ulterior views in respect to re-distribution, or as implying any intention on the part of those who may agree with me so far, to support my subsequent Amendments.

An Amendment *moved* in page 7, line 14, to leave out ("Ten thousand") and insert ("Twelve thousand").—(*Earl Grey.*)

THE EARL OF DERBY said: My Lords, I must confess that when I came down to the House this evening, at some personal inconvenience, I was under the apprehension that your Lordships might be induced by the arguments of the noble Earl who has just sat down, to consent to an Amendment which would place Her Majesty's Government in a position of very considerable embarrassment. But I must add that having heard the statement of the noble Earl, and having heard his arguments, I am in a great degree relieved from my apprehensions, because I cannot believe it possible that your Lordships on the 1st of August will enter on a plan so extraordinary, so immature, so crude, and so absolutely incomplete, even in the mind of the noble Earl who has proposed it, as that which he has sketched out for your Lordships. I cannot imagine for a single moment that with the view, as the noble Earl says, of settling this great question, which has occupied Parliament for six months, you would enter upon the consideration of what is practically a new Reform Bill—that you would undertake a re-examination of the whole distribution of the voting power of the country—that you would take up new and wholly untried principles, opening up a range of speculation which, had it been brought before your Lordships on the 1st of May instead of the 1st of August, might well have occupied your attention, and taxed all your energies, for the three months of the Parliamentary Session then before you. I object, my Lords, to the incompleteness of the measure proposed, or rather suggested, by the noble Earl; but I object, in the first place, to the principle on which he proceeds. The noble Earl tells us—I deal first with his original proposal—that he would first increase the number of the towns which are to lose one Member by taking one from each town which has fewer than 12,000 inhabitants, instead of allowing the partial disfranchisement to be confined to towns with fewer than 10,000 inhabitants. My Lords, the principle on which Her Majesty's Government proceeded in framing this measure of Reform, was that the principle of disfranchisement must be subject to the principle of enfranchisement — that we should look out first to find those great bodies, whether in counties or commercial towns, at present unrepresented, or requiring additional representation, and then ascertain how we could with the smallest possible sacrifice of existing rights, supply that want. In considering the wants of enfranchisement, we took into consideration, not only great counties and great towns, but the due distribution of representation among the manufacturing, commercial, and landed interests. Our main principle was this—that we would not, except in cases of gross corruption, deprive any Englishmen of the rights they at present enjoy of contributing to the representation of the country at large, beyond what was absolutely necessary to enfranchise those great communities which have grown up of late years, and which are now not adequately represented in Parliament. That is the principle on which we proceeded. But the principle on which the noble Earl proceeds is exactly the reverse. Proceeding further than the House of Commons, which has decided that all boroughs with a population of less than 10,000 should lose one Member, the noble Earl proposes to partially disfranchise every borough which has between 10,000 and 12,000 of population. Now, why? The noble Earl has not favoured us with the slightest reason why we should partially disfranchise boroughs of that size, which, as far as I am aware, have exercised the franchise respectably and honourably. I find there is not one of those towns that the noble Earl speaks of with such contempt, which has not grown in population and importance since 1838. They are not declining towns. If they were, that might be a legitimate reason for saying they had forfeited their right to that share in the representation which they have hitherto possessed. I find that there is not one of them which since the year 1831 has not largely increased in wealth and population; yet, for no reason on earth, except that they have a population of between 10,000 and 12,000, the noble Earl—without their representatives having been heard, without the House of Commons being consulted—because at this time saying that the House of Commons can be consulted on the matter is next to a mockery—proposes to deprive them of one-half of their representation. I thought at first that the partial disfranchisement of boroughs with a population of less than 12,000 was the extent to which the noble Earl was prepared to go. But, the noble Earl goes further. He turns round to the noble Lord behind him (Lord Lyveden) and announces his readiness to support the noble Lord in his proposal for the total disfranchisement of a number of small boroughs. I recollect the noble Lord spoke the other night very much in favour of small boroughs, and said he did not think they ought to be deprived of their present share in the national administration. But the noble Lord behind him has declared that he proposes totally to disfranchise all boroughs, whatever may be their merits, which have a population of less than 5,000, and the noble Earl says he will accept that proposal, not as a substitute for his own, but as an addition to it.

Earl GREY: I never said so. I said that I deprecated such a measure, and that I should prefer another scheme; but that I should rather accept it than pass the Bill in its present form.

The Earl of DERBY: But what was the other plan of the noble Earl? He said that he was prepared to accept a scheme which was submitted to the House of Commons last year, and which then met with universal disfavour — namely, a scheme which would really, although not nominally, disfranchise those small boroughs by grouping them with other boroughs, and thus overwhelming their present voters. The noble Earl says that is not disfranchising the small boroughs. But, at all events, the noble Earl will recollect that that is a matter quite beyond the scope of his original Amendment as he has placed it on the Notice Paper.

Earl GREY: I beg the noble Earl's pardon: it stands on the Paper.

The Earl of DERBY: I see on referring to the Paper the words "and at the end of the clause add 'the boroughs enumerated in the second part of the said Schedule shall only return Members to Parliament jointly in the manner therein described.'" I beg the noble Earl's pardon—I was not aware that he had given that notice. But the noble Earl's project is this—he proposes, for no reason at all that I can understand, to partially disfranchise every borough having a population of between 10,000 and 12,000, and he says that his Amendment will prevent the Bill of the Government from being so inadequate and incomplete as it is now. Let me remind your Lordships that this Bill goes further in the way of partial disfranchisement than any Bill which has yet been submitted to Parliament. In 1854 it was proposed to disfranchise nineteen boroughs and to take one Member from thirty-three boroughs, with populations under 10,000. I will not say anything about the Bill of 1859, because the noble Earl probably would not admit that to be an authority. [Earl Russell made an observation.] I am talking of the question as between boroughs with a population of 10,000 or 12,000, which was the original Motion of the noble Earl; and I say that no Bill has been introduced into Parliament which proposes partially to disfranchise boroughs above 10,000. The Bill of 1860 took one Member from each of twenty-five boroughs with populations under 7,000. The Bill of 1866 took away one Member from all boroughs with a population under 8,000, returning two Members at present, and grouped certain other boroughs together. Therefore, when the noble Earl proposes to take away one Member from all boroughs under 12,000, on the ground that the limit of 10,000 would be too insignificant, he has no warrant whatever for the assertion in any measure brought forward by either side of the House. And what has happened in the other House of Parliament? Her Majesty's Government, acting on the principle which I explained to your Lordships at the outset, that disfranchisement should not be carried further than was absolutely necessary to provide for pressing claims for enfranchisement, proposed to fix 7,000 as the limit of population for the return of two Members. The House of Commons entered upon a discussion, and the result was that an Amendment, emanating from the Liberal side, was carried against Her Majesty's Government, extending the partial disfranchisement to boroughs not of 12,000, but of 10,000 population. The House of Commons judged that the withdrawal of one Member from towns of 10,000 would be an amply sufficient measure of partial disfranchisement. I have, therefore, the authority of all former precedents — the authority of the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell), the authority of all noble Lords, wherever they may sit, who were Members of preceding Governments that have proposed Reform Bills, and I have the sanction of the House of Commons, deliberately expressed this year, for the assertion that 10,000 is a fair and sufficient basis to take as the limit below which towns shall only be entitled to return one Member. It would require, accordingly, a very strong case on the part of the noble Earl to show why the House of Lords should go beyond the House of Commons in insisting on a large measurement of disfranchisement. And I may add that although on the question of disfranchisement your Lordships may feel a strong interest and possess a perfect right to exercise your judgment, the question, from the fact that it affects the seats of individual Members and the influence of particular constituencies, belongs at least as much to the House of Commons. If they are of opinion that 10,000 is a fair and reasonable limit, at any period of the Session, I say that more especially on the 1st of August, it is unreasonable to ask the House of Commons to go back on the consideration of a question to which they have given long and serious deliberation, and to review a decision which they have deliberately expressed. But the noble Earl does not confine himself to this question of extending the limit of partial disfranchisement in boroughs, important though that may be, but he says—"I will obtain twenty-three seats in all, twelve by disfranchisement and eleven in other modes." Suppose he obtains them; for what purpose? Why, my Lords, for the purpose of introducing an entirely new principle of re-distribution. The principle, as far as it was carried by the Amendment of my noble and learned Friend (Lord Cairns), which was adopted the other night, went to but a very limited extent, and affected only a few special constituencies; but the noble Earl now proposes to extend over the whole of the country a principle which is new to the British Constitution—namely, the representation of minorities. If I had been present the other night I should have had great difficulty in acceding to the proposal of my noble and learned Friend, supported though it was by a large majority of my political Friends; but the experiment then proposed was to be tried on a very limited scale, and applied equally to borough and county constituencies. It was a matter unquestionably of very considerable difficulty and doubt; but as long as the application of the principle was so very guarded and limited it might, no doubt, be safely adopted. But as to the extension of that principle all over the whole country, nothing could be more mischievous or more inconsistent with the principles of the Constitution and with the prevalence and predominance of that system of majorities by which all our institutions are carried on. Nothing could be more obnoxious, nothing could work more harshly or unequally than a representation of minorities carried out by means of a system of three-cornered constituencies. I will not enter upon a discussion of this question; it is not raised here, further than the noble Earl himself raises it, by his admission that one of his objects is to obtain a certain number of seats, whereby in counties above a certain population, and represented mainly by Conservative Members, he may introduce a third Member, and thus, under the pretence of protecting the minority, secure a proportion of Liberal representation for these counties. When the noble Earl comes to say what he will do with the seats of which he seeks to obtain possession, in one way or another, without saying where he proposes to obtain them, he reads out immediately a list of the boroughs that would be partially disfranchised by the limit of population; but he does not read to us the list of the boroughs that he proposes partially to disfranchise by the system of grouping. Now, on the 1st day of August, he invites your Lordships to consider this extensive measure of partial disfranchisement, and comes to the question of what he is to do with the seats thus obtained, he sees all the difficulties of the case; he admits that he is not possessed of the information requisite to enable him to frame a scheme himself, but he invites Parliament, and he calls on Her Majesty's Government, at the very close of the Session, to take up his crude, indigested, ill-concocted scheme, and to make sense out of what at present is nonsense. ["Oh, oh!"] Well, at all events, it is not a scheme, for it does not give us the slightest idea or sketch of a scheme. I should like to know what the noble Earl would have said if Her Majesty's Government had come down to this House and had made the proposition which he now makes; if now, on the 1st of August, we had invited the House of Lords in opposition to the House of Commons to assent to a general proposition for partially disfranchising twelve boroughs, and destroying in some other way the influence of other boroughs, and had declared that when that general proposition was assented to we should then be prepared to state what boroughs we proposed to enfranchise, the names of those that would be partially disfranchised, and what others we had it in contemplation to group. Why, such a proposition, coming from Her Majesty's Government, would have been scouted, and justly scouted; and yet that is the very proposition which your Lordships are now invited to accept, and that, forsooth, with a view of settling the question! How it could ever have entered into the conception of the noble Earl to bring forward a proposition which, if carried, can only throw everything into confusion, undo all that has been done or agreed upon in the House of Commons, and launch a new plan impossible to be carried out in the present Session, I am at a loss to understand. The only result must be to leave everything unsettled, in confusion, in absolute chaos; and yet this is proposed, in the hope perhaps that in some future year somebody may throw light on the darkness, and produce order out of all this confusion—a result to which the noble Earl has certainly lent no assistance. If the noble Earl had brought forward a proposition of this kind three months ago, backed up by the power and ability which he always displays, and the attention which he always bestows upon questions of this kind, it would have been a very fair subject for the House to take into its consideration; and I might then have asked for an adjournment to enable the noble Earl to lay before the House his scheme, and enable the House to judge of it as a whole. But when at this time of year, at this period of the Session, and in the present stage of the Bill, the noble Earl brings forward a proposition such as was to-night submitted, I say that its adoption can be productive only of one result—to throw the whole subject into confusion, and to put an end to the great progress which has been made towards the settlement of a very doubtful and difficult question. I have no hesitation in saying—I hope I shall not be considered as using the language of menace—that if, unhappily, so crude an Amendment as that of the noble Earl be carried, it will be at once my duty to move your Lordships to report Progress in order that I may consult with my Colleagues what course we should pursue. [Earl GREY: Oh, oh!] The noble Earl cheers; but I say I cannot undertake on the part of my Colleagues to accept an Amendment that appears to unsettle everything and settles nothing—that introduces the vicious principle of disfranchisement for the sake of disfranchisement alone—that casts us blindfold into a struggle for the disposal of seats which have not been forfeited by any misconduct on the part of those who at present hold them, and that holds out no clear and intelligible view of the manner in which those seats are to be disposed of.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, the noble Earl who had just sat down had hardly done justice to the proposal of his noble Friend. His noble Friend at the head of the Government seemed to forget the great object of that proposal. The House had, by a large majority the other night, virtually declared that it attached very great importance to the principle that they should endeavour—especially in the very large constituencies—to secure the representation of the different classes of society by providing a third Member, who should not be elected by the votes of the majority. Their Lordships saw in that principle a means of escape from some of the evils connected with that Bill. Was the noble Earl blind to the dangers of that measure? Did he or did he not share any of the apprehensions of those who thought it too democratic? Did he or did he not share in the feeling common to almost every man in that House, and to very many out of it, that the Bill required to be looked at very closely indeed in order to see if some element of safety might not be introduced into it? Many of those who voted the other night for the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) in regard to three-cornered constituencies did so in the hope of its being extended to other large places, and in the belief that to be of any avail it ought to be carried further. That proposal was not one for the mere purpose of disfranchisement, but for enfranchisement. It sought to afford representation in large constituencies to educated men of moderate, independent, and Conservative opinions, who would otherwise be without representation. That was the sentiment which induced so many of their Lordships to vote with the noble and learned Lord the other night. It was a Conservative, and not a revolutionary proposal, its object being to extend the influence of the Conservative element in those large constituencies—using the term Conservative not in a party but in a broad, constitutional sense. Unless they did something of this kind, what security had they for the free expression of different opinions in the large towns? By that Bill they were absolutely handing over the representation of every Parliamentary borough to the lower and least instructed classes, and those who had the least sense of responsibility. The protection for the stability of our institutions was to be looked for in the counties; yet as compared with the Bill of the noble Earl (Earl Russell) in 1854, the present Bill gave twenty-one fewer Members to the counties, while at the same time it lowered the franchise much further. Another defence was the development of the Conservative element in the large towns. The proposal made for the representation of minorities was therefore carried the other night not from the mere desire of change, or only for the sake of experiment, but in order that they might accompany the great and fearful changes which that measure would effect with some degree of security and stability.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL thought that both sides of the House had some reason to complain of the intimation made at the close of the speech of the noble Earl at the head of the Government, which placed them in a difficult and very unfair position. That intimation amounted to telling them that they were not free to discuss the great question of the distribution of seats—it amounted to telling them that, in regard to that part of the Bill which, he must remind them, lay more near to the root of Reform than the question of the franchise, the mouth of the House of Lords was closed; and that, too, in respect to a measure which had come up to them at a period of the Session as early as they could ever expect a measure of that character to come up to them. Remembering that, he did trust that a great majority of the House, and of both sides of the House, would assert their freedom and independence by voting, if they thought it right, for the Amendment of his noble Friend on the cross-Benches. He said "of both sides of the House," because he believed the feeling of both sides of the House was in favour of the Amendment of his noble Friend. He deeply regretted the other night that the Motion of the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax) was regarded by noble Lords opposite as in the nature of a party Amendment. Perhaps under the circumstances of the case that impression on their part was unavoidable, notwithstanding the earnest and sincere protestations of the noble Viscount that he was not actuated by any party spirit; because the Benches on which a noble Lord sat might be thought, after all, to give a certain character to any Motion he made. But that night they had a Motion which was substantially the same as that of the noble Viscount, except that it went into more minute details, and pointed out the manner in which the general principle of his noble Friend (Viscount Halifax) ought to be enforced—that night they had a Motion coming from his noble Friend on the cross-Benches, whom no man could accuse of party feeling, who had viewed that question in all its aspects in the character of a political philosopher, and who unquestionably made that proposal, in the highest and best sense of the word, in a Conservative spirit. One of the most serious objections brought against the Reform Bill of last year was that the late Government attempted to divide the two subjects of the franchise and the distribution of seats. Their Bill on that ground was complained of as an incomplete measure, and it was demanded that both branches of the question should be dealt with at the same time. Their object in desiring to separate those two branches was, as stated at the time, that it was almost impossible, from the personal and party feeling which was invariably developed in the House of Commons when they came to the question of the distribution of seats, to carry through in one Session of Parliament a measure which should be complete upon both branches of Reform. But an unfortunate speech made by the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright), advising that course with a view to what was called "a greater leverage" in the new Parliament for a further re-distribution of seats, inspired men's minds with such fear and suspicion that they, perhaps not unnaturally under the circumstances of the case, refused to deal with the question of the franchise without a complete measure of re-distribution. If, however, they were to deal with the question of re-distribution at all, they ought to do so in a sufficient manner. They ought not so to deal with it as to insure that it would be raised in the new Parliament elected under the new franchise. But that was exactly what Her Majesty's Government were now doing. No man pretended that the re-distribution of seats in that Bill satisfied any theory or even any of the practical demands made by the country. He did not object, so far as it went, to the principle of the re-distribution of seats proposed by the Government. There was, indeed, no essential difference in point of principle between any of the plans of re-distribution which recent Governments had recommended to Parliament. But he affirmed confidently with his noble Friend on the cross-Benches that this Bill did not go far enough, that it did not satisfy the demands and the expectations which the Government themselves had raised and encouraged, and that it left many constituencies in this country which it would be the first object, and, he would add, the first duty, of the new Parliament to deal with under that extended franchise of which so many noble Lords were afraid. He did not say that any measure which could now be proposed would give them finality in respect to the distribution of seats; but surely they ought to look for something like a fair pause and breathing time on that subject; and they ought not so to frame their re-distribution as that by an infallible necessity it would be raised in the new Parliament in a spirit of considerable excitement, and certainly of great jealousy and hostility, as regarded those very small constituencies which he believed many noble Lords opposite were anxious to preserve. The noble Earl at the head of the Government said the principle they had gone upon was this—that they had measured their disfranchisement by the demands for enfranchisement. He begged to question that proposition of the noble Earl, at least so far as to say that it had not been carried out consistently. The Government had themselves promised to several large towns Members whom they were afterwards absolutely compelled to withdraw from them; he meant that they thought themselves absolutely compelled to withdraw them. The House of Commons thought that a certain number of the largest constituencies should have additional Members given them. The Government had determined not to gain a greater number of seats by disfranchisement; and in order to satisfy the demands of the House of Commons for the very large constituencies, they were obliged to cut off several towns of very great and rising importance to which they had promised representation. [The Earl of DERBY: That was the effect of a vote of the House of Commons.] All he said was that the Government had not cut their cloth according to the dimensions of their coat—that they had not met the demands and expectations which they themselves would infallibly have raised in the new House of Commons — again, the whole question of the Scotch representation had been placed by the Government upon the footing that it would be necessary to increase the Members of the House of Commons if the most moderate claims of Scotland were to be satisfied. There were very great if not insuperable objections to such an increase, and it was more than questionable whether such a measure could be carried through Parliament. He had never set up the claim of Scotland as against England in the distribution of political power. That would be placing it upon a false issue. The principle he would lay down was that if there were either in Scotland or in England very large constituencies to which, on account of their wealth, population, and growing importance, Parliament would naturally give Members, they ought not to refuse to bestow such Members upon those constituencies merely because they were across the Tweed. Take, for example, the rising town of Dundee; the great county of Lanarkshire, with its mining and manufacturing interests, and a population very much greater than some English counties having a third Member, and the City of Glasgow with a population under the new boundaries of more than 500,000. Was it reasonable or just that they should refuse Members to those constituencies because they happened to be in Scotland? or would it be wise to insist that no Members should be given to those constituencies unless an additional number of Members were given to the House of Commons? With these demands upon them could the Government expect that all the very small English boroughs, decaying in population and importance, could retain the power of returning representatives as in the present scheme? It was impossible. The Prime Minister had not ventured to assure the House that the present was a scheme which would settle the question of distribution; but he had threatened their Lordships that if they exercised an independent opinion on this part of the scheme, he would abandon the Bill. If the plan of grouping were found impossible, he should prefer to vote for the total disfranchisement of a considerable number of these boroughs. His objection to the latter proposal was that if they drew the line at a population of 5,000, they would leave above that line many small, insignificant, and dwindling boroughs, which would be exposed to attack in the new Parliament. In grouping they must remember that many things were advisable that were not possible. There were many interests concerned in resisting grouping. Not only were the Members for the boroughs opposed to the scheme, but those who exercised a predominant influence in these small boroughs would often be found to prefer total disfranchisement to sharing the representation with others. In addressing their Lordships, most of whom were entirely disinterested in this question, he would avow that he supported grouping as a mitigation of the severity of disfranchisement. The grouping of boroughs of a small and insignificant character would still leave them some importance among the constituencies. The objection arising from the existence in small boroughs of some exclusive individual influence would to a certain extent be met by the plan of grouping. It was found in Scotland that local interest and influence was greatly neutralized, and that the constituencies became practically independent. Then, although it was not to be expected that the system of grouping would do away with the evil of bribery, yet it would at least tend to impede and diminish corruption. Another advantage of the system of grouping, which ought to have weight with Conservative Peers, was that it would tend to give greater permanence to the representative system. At whatever figure they might draw the line of total disfranchisement new demands would be made by the rising population of great towns, and successive crops would be taken away from the small boroughs—a process which could only lead to their extinction. He was able to state that the late Sir George Lewis, who had watched the system of grouping, was of opinion that it had worked favourably and well in Wales, as it had worked well in Scotland, and that it ought to be extended to England when it was necessary to deal with the small boroughs. The plan of grouping, moreover, tended to mitigate the very large displacement of Members from different counties which would take effect if total disfranchisement were carried out to any large extent. As matters now stood the number of borough Members belonging to many of the counties was undoubtedly excessive, and could not be maintained. The county of Wilts, besides its county Members, had 14 borough Members, and under the new Bill would still have 11 borough Members, with a borough population of 95,000; Hants had now 14 borough Members, and would still have 11 under the Bill, with a borough population of 190,000, including Portsmouth with 94,000, and Southampton with 46,000 persons; Devon now had 18 borough Members, and would have 15, with a borough population of 213,000; Dorset had 11 Members, and would have 8 with a population of 54,000; Cornwall now had 10, and would have 9 Members, with a population of 62,000; Sussex now had 14 Members, and would have 12, with a population of 184,000, including Brighton with 87,000 inhabitants; North York now had 11 and would have 9 Members under the Bill, with a population of 100,000. Thus, if the small boroughs under the line of say 6,000 came to be wholly disfranchised there would be a much larger displacement of representation from these counties than if a system of grouping were adopted. There were two or three plans of grouping. One was to take boroughs of a certain population and amount of importance and group them *inter se.* That led to geographical inconvenience. Arundel, for example, was the smallest English borough. If it were grouped on the *inter se* principle, it would leap over several other boroughs, and the more convenient course would be to add that borough, if grouped, to the nearest town of Chichester. These, however, were questions of detail with which the Government were naturally the most competent to deal; and he believed he could sincerely say, on the part of noble Lords on his own side of the House, that if the Government would reconsider their scheme no factious opposition, but on the contrary every assistance and co-operation would be offered to them with regard to points of detail. It would manifestly be a great folly for those who desired a settlement of the question to take objections on such points; for within certain limits it might almost be said that one plan was as good as another, provided it afforded a prospect of settlement for a reasonable time. Noble Lords opposite should remember that public feeling might arise on this question as rapidly and as irresistibly as on the question of the franchise. Last Session no strong feeling was aroused in favour of a reduction of the franchise; but during the recess—partly owing to the resignation of the late Government—so strong a feeling was excited, that the present Government had been driven step by step to a much more extensive measure than had formerly been proposed. Such might be the case with regard to re-distribution, unless the question were settled at once, and on that subject, as on the franchise, noble Lords opposite might find their Leaders asking what right anyone had to suppose that Radical principles were the monopoly of the Radical party.

Lord CAIRNS: I venture thus early to ask your Lordships to consider the two very different questions which arise upon this Amendment—first the merits of the scheme of re-distribution indicated by the noble Earl (Earl Grey) as compared with that proposed by Her Majesty's Government; and secondly—and it is a very important question—the position in which you stand at the present moment, and the effect which any vote you may give on this Amendment may have upon the fate of the Bill. Now, with regard to the question of the re-distribution of political power—which is no doubt one of the largest questions connected with the Representation of the People—I may frankly say that there are many things in the Government scheme which I should gladly have seen different from what they are. I should gladly have seen a different arrangement with regard to the counties; and I should have been willing to embrace a proposal for a larger amount of disfranchisement of small boroughs. In that respect I agree with several remarks which fell from the noble Earl who proposed the Amendment. From one proposition, however, which he advanced—I mean the grouping of small boroughs—I must entirely dissent. Without going at any length into that question I may say that, in my opinion, you would contrive by that plan to obtain every vice and disadvantage attendant upon a small borough without obtaining a single benefit or advantage resulting from a large constituency. It may, indeed, be well to group boroughs which have never had a separate representation, as was the case with the Scotch and Welsh boroughs. They grew up under that system, and possibly its operation deserves all the praise which has been lavished upon it. If, however, you take boroughs which have for years had a separate existence, which have their own influences, traditions, and prejudices, nay, their own local expenditure—for that is a matter of no small importance—and if you group them together, you will not, I undertake to say, please any one of them; you will link together communities dissimilar in their feelings and sentiments, and you will obtain a constituency without a single homogeneous element, enabling it to exist with advantage to the State. As far, therefore, as the question of grouping is involved in the Amendment, I take exception to it altogether. But without supposing that any scheme of re-distribution could please everybody, or would not be open to some objection, let me ask your Lordships to turn to the much larger and graver question—the position in which you now stand. If Her Majesty's Government had thought it right themselves to propose alterations in their scheme of re-distribution, if your Lordships thought fit to assent to those alterations, and if, these changes having been adopted, the Government afterwards submitted them for adoption to the House of Commons, there might, indeed, be a reasonable probability of their acceptance by that House, and of no serious delay occurring in the progress of the Bill. But suppose your Lordships, against the wish of the Government, were now to enter on the consideration of what is practically a new scheme of re-distribution, I have no doubt that in the course of two or three weeks, by assiduous attention night after night, we might settle a scheme of re-distribution which possibly might be an improvement upon that contained in this Bill. But what is to happen afterwards? After those two or three weeks, in the middle or toward the end of August, the scheme would go down to the other House. It cannot be supposed that any scheme determined upon by this House would be accepted without discussion by the other. They were occupied, I believe, three or four weeks in serious discussions upon the scheme contained in the Bill, and as a matter of course, three or four weeks would be occupied in discussing the new scheme. Our Amendments would be met by counter Amendments, these if carried would come back to your Lordships, and you would have to consider them. Now, can any noble Lord seriously suppose that that process would be gone through in any period short of something like a month or six weeks? I believe it to be utterly impossible, and without referring to what the noble Earl at the head of Her Majesty's Government has said, your Lordships cannot fail to perceive that the result of any such undertaking would be that a Government put at this time of the year in that position would be obliged, honestly, to say that they could not hope to pass the Bill during the present Session. Not, therefore, from any menace on the part of the Government, but from the very nature of the case, the result would be an abandonment of the measure within a very short time. Then, again, I ask you to consider another view of the case which has weighed much with me. The noble Earl proposes to disfranchise twenty-two or twenty-three seats. Now, in the case of every one of those seats there are personal and individual interests which are deeply affected. I do not for a moment suggest that such interests should stand in the way of any measure of public advantage; but there is something like fair play in these matters, and it certainly seems to me that for us now to disfranchise twenty-two or twenty-three seats at present filled by Members of the House of Commons would have an aspect of the greatest unfairness. Observe how the matter stands. The Bill, as originally introduced in the other House, proposed to disfranchise twenty-three seats. An Amendment came from the Liberal side of the House, proposing a line which would disfranchise thirty-eight seats. That proposition occupied the House a considerable time, and the Members for the boroughs, both above and below the line, were all heard. They adduced their arguments, those below the line unsuccessfully and those above it successfully, and the proposition was carried. Now, I think the boroughs which thus ran the gauntlet and escaped disfranchisement might naturally think themselves safe, and might take it for granted that the House of Lords would not go beyond a proposition emanating from the Liberal side of the House of Commons, and that no further danger awaited them. The Members interested in those boroughs would make their arrangements under that belief. Now, any of your Lordships occupying the position of those Members would surely urge that, for a change affecting those seats to be made at this period of the Session, when it is impossible to collect the House of Commons together, to re-consider the question would bear the aspect of great harshness and unfairness. It is for these reasons that I am unable to vote with the noble Earl who proposed the Amendment. I say first of all that the Amendment involves the question of grouping, and commits this House, if adopted, to what I think one of the most vicious principles which could be introduced into English boroughs. I oppose it, secondly, because the Amendment, if carried, must of necessity lead to the destruction of the Bill for this Session—a responsibility in which I should be sorry to bear any part; and, in the third place, I oppose it because the Amendment would seriously affect the interests of individuals—interests which I admit ought not to stand in the way of the public advantage, but with regard to which the persons concerned ought to have an opportunity of stating their case and making their defence in the ordinary way in the middle of the Session.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I cannot avoid saying that your Lordships are placed, as a House of Parliament, in a very extraordinary position. At the commencement of the Session both Houses of Parliament were told that the question of Reform was to be immediately brought forward. It was brought forward in the shape of Resolutions. Those Resolutions, after a time, were abandoned, and notice was given that a Bill would be introduced. A Bill was introduced, and that Bill, after a day or two, was abandoned likewise. The consequence was that, I suppose, at least a month was taken up at the commencement of the Session with those changes on the part of Her Majesty's Government. Well, the House of Commons for a very considerable period—I believe for about five months—was engaged in the consideration of this question, and when this important subject comes before us in Committee, changing as it does the Constitution of this country—a Constitution upon which the welfare of the nation depends—we are told that it is the 1st of August, and that it is impossible to consider any proposal made to amend the Bill. However useful the proposal may be, however much it may tend to the stability of the Constitution of this country, you refuse to entertain it; you say that it is the 1st of August, and you cannot consent to alter in any degree the propositions of the Government. I must say that I think no House of Parliament was ever placed in a more painful and humiliating position than this House of Parliament is placed in by the declaration of the noble Earl at the head of the Government. A proposition has been made by my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey), who for some time past has taken no party views of public transactions, and it has been made in a spirit as remote as possible from anything like a party view, seeing that he has taken into account the welfare of the country only in his proposal. For my own part, I have carefully avoided making any proposition during the Committee for the alteration of the Bill as it stands. I know that my right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone), having proposed certain Amendments in the Bill, was immediately placed under the ban of the Government, and the Conservative Members of the House of Commons, by a Circular addressed to them, were told that if any Amendments of Mr. Gladstone were adopted in Committee the Bill would be at once thrown up, and the throwing up of the Bill would be immediately followed by an appeal to the country. And that did not affect merely the great point of the franchise, which I must confess to be the basis of the Bill introduced by the Government; but among the propositions of Mr. Gladstone was one that one year instead of two years should be a sufficient term of residence for the voter. It was said that, if he carried that proposal, the Government would at once give up the Bill, and of course there would be a dissolution of Parliament. But another Member made the same proposal—the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets—it was carried against the Government, and then it was immediately accepted. Considering myself under the same ban as Mr. Gladstone, I thought all along in this Committee that if I ventured to make any proposition, however Conservative it might be, however useful it might be in the opinion of a great many in this House, the sole fact of my having ventured to propose it would be decisive against the Motion; and this Government, which, in the first month of the Session, so strongly recommended moderation and forbearance, which we were told were so absolutely necessary for the passing of the measure of Reform, reserved that moderation and forbearance entirely for the other side of the House, and have displayed no moderation, and no forbearance towards us. Well, let us now consider what is the proposition which my noble Friend (Earl Grey) has made in so temperate a speech. It resolves itself at once into this question — whether your Lordships wish to have a settlement of the Reform question or not? Last year, when we brought forward a measure dealing with the franchise alone, we were told by Lord Grosvenor in the House of Commons that the House was anxious for a settlement, and was ready to adopt propositions which would tend to a settlement. But if we talk of a settlement now, it is always said, "Do you think anything can be perpetual? Do you think you can make a perpetual settlement of the question of Reform?" Well, that was the question upon which 270 Members of the Conservative party supported Lord Grosvenor. We fully admitted that it was desirable to make a settlement. We said it might be better done in two years, instead of one, but they said, "The whole must be put together," and they would not allow us to propose the extension of the franchise without re-distribution; but I say, and everybody must admit, that it is still more faulty to have an imperfect distribution—a distribution which invites further change, and makes it, in the opinion of the country, absolutely necessary that the question should be considered in the new Parliament. Now, my Lords, I am most sincerely desirous of a settlement; but I say that this is an imperfect settlement. If you meant to propose a settlement next year I should be satisfied; but to propose a settlement which is no settlement, and to say that you cannot alter it in the slightest degree because it is the 1st of August, is hardly consistent with the dignity of this House or the importance of the subject. My noble Friend's proposition is, that you ought to go on to 12,000 instead of stopping at 10,000. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby) says that such a proposition was never made before in any Reform Bill. Technically, so far as the numbers go, he is right; but in 1854 the Government of Lord Aberdeen proposed that fifty-eight seats should be taken, that four seats then vacant should be given to new places, and thus sixty-two seats were to be distributed. My noble Friend (Earl Grey) proposes that twenty-three additional seats should be given, which, added to the thirty-eight taken from the small boroughs, make sixty-one, and, with seven from the four disfranchised boroughs, would give a total of sixty-eight seats. Now, I confess it appears to me that there are great counties and cities whose population and wealth ought to be considered, whether you extend the three-cornered plan or not. Now, I observe that in the Bill of the Government which I have often remarked upon—namely, the unfairness with which the counties are treated. You have, as you all know, about 9,000,000 population in the boroughs, and about 11,000,000 in the counties, and these 9,000,000 have twice the number of representatives that the 11,000,000 have. Well, the Government have taken in the present plan of distribution the two towns of Darlington and Stockton, which have about 34,000 inhabitants in the whole, and they are to return two Members. Then they take a division of Lancashire with 340,000 people, and they give it only two Members. Therefore they require ten times as many people in a county to justify them in giving two Members, as there are in the boroughs. I say that it is not a fair distribution of political power. It appears to me that the great counties of Lancashire and Yorkshire ought to have in their several divisions a sufficient number of Members to represent the wealth and population. The question at present is not whether you would give three Members to one division, which I should like very well; but whether these great counties require more representatives than they have. To me it is quite clear that they do, and that it would be for the advantage of the country that they should have that increased representation. I should be quite ready to vote for the proposal of my noble Friend if he makes it as to the future distribution; but I do not think that I am bound to that distribution, nor is any one of your Lordships. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby) said that if my noble Friend were to succeed he would at once move to report Progress. Well, if the Government were themselves to settle the question, I think it would be a very good Motion, and for my own part I would much rather consider the new plan which they might propose than that of my noble Friend. Then the argument recurs, and it is the only argument, that this is now the 1st of August. Well, I remember with regard to another Reform Bill fighting it through Committee in July, all through the month of August, and up to the 20th of September. Certainly I do not wish to go through that labour again; but if a measure for altering the Representation of the People in Parliament can be amended and improved, I do not think it is a conclusive argument to say that at the 1st of August we have arrived at so late a period of the Session that it is better to pass an imperfect Bill than a really complete measure. When Mr. Laing carried his Amendment, which I believe he would much rather have carried further if he could have hoped to do so successfully, and when this measure of partial disfranchisement was extended from towns of 7,000 to towns of 10,000 population, the Chancellor of the Exchequer took five or six days — certainly not a whole week — in order that the Government might consider their plan, and a new plan of re-distribution was accordingly brought forward. That may have taken some days for consideration by the House, but it was finally adopted by the House, and I really do not see why your Lordships upon a question of this kind are not to have the same privileges as the House of Commons—are not to be allowed to alter the Bill if you think proper, as the House of Commons did upon Mr. Laing's Motion. I do not see why your Lordships are not to undertake the consideration of the question in a fair and impartial spirit, and why we should not ask the Government to produce their amended scheme, and consider it by comparison with the scheme brought forward by my noble Friend. I do not know that I shall concur in the plan of grouping, because that leads to much dispute as to the particular boroughs to be joined together, and would really require a very long time for consideration and settlement. I think the plan of grouping is the better plan of the two; but it raises such difficulties that I should rather prefer the plan of my noble Friend behind me (Lord Lyveden)—total disfranchisement of small boroughs, as in 1832, and partial disfranchisement in the case of boroughs with a moderate population—that is a very fair plan—and, at the same time, I would give to the Government the choice of the counties or boroughs to which they would give representatives. If the scheme proposed in the Bill should be left unaltered, we are quite sure of renewed agitation; and that of itself is a great misfortune. If a cotton manufacturer could not furnish you with the stuff you require because his steam-engine was under repair, or if a farmer could not let you have the corn you wanted because his thrashing machine was out of order, you might take that answer once; but if it were repeated next year, you would have your own opinion as to the business capacity and the prudence of these persons. So, likewise, in this case, remembering, as we are bound to remember, that next year and in the year following Parliament will have to consider such questions as education, the state of Ireland, and the proposals which some persons will make for the re-organization of the army, it will be a serious thing if we then say, "We have not yet settled the question of Reform; we are obliged to re-open it now, and to re-consider the distribution of seats." For our side of the House it might perhaps be an advantage in a party point of view if this question should remain unsettled. But I am not disposed to look at it as a party question; and I own that, in my opinion, the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby), whom we are all glad to welcome back among us in such health and vigour, will commit a great political blunder — not the least of those he has heretofore made—if he does not attempt a more complete settlement of this important question.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I feel we have arrived at a very critical point in the progress of this Bill, and that your Lordships' decision upon this Amendment may determine whether we are to have a Reform Bill this Session or not. I give to the noble Earl who has brought forward this Motion (Earl Grey) entire credit for sincerity. I believe that he has not the least wish to impede or obstruct the progress of this Bill, that he really desires to amend and improve it, and that, regarding the re-distribution scheme of the Government as defective, he thinks that he can frame another which will be more worthy of acceptance by your Lordships, and which will lead to a permanent settlement of the question. Now, I am disposed to agree with the strong language of my noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) the other night—that if an angel from heaven were to frame a scheme of re-distribution, it would not be satisfactory. I quite agree with the noble Duke (the Duke of Argyll) that it is extremely desirable that we should have some pause and resting-place: but why should not the present scheme furnish us with that pause and resting-place, and give us breathing time? Why should you now endeavour to disturb the arrangement which has been come to, and do so without the slightest prospect of thereby necessarily attaining a final settlement? As far as I can gather, not a single objection is urged to the Government scheme of re-distribution as far as it goes. The only objection is that it does not go far enough. In the very able, judicious, and temperate speech of the noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax), upon moving a Resolution before going into Committee, I did not understand that he objected to our enfranchisement of certain boroughs, but he thought we should extend the disfranchisement. When he said, "You have given a Member each to Stockton and Darlington, with populations of 16,000 or 17,000," he went on to urge that St. Helens, Barnsley, and Keighley should also be enfranchised, they having as large an amount of population; his argument was that having enfranchised certain boroughs, it was necessary to advance and extend the franchise to some others: but he made no objection to the scheme as far as it goes, only he claimed the franchise for other towns. Now, let us consider calmly and deliberately what prospect there is of a final settlement of the question if your Lordships adopt this Amendment. It has been said more than once that this scheme is the result of concession and compromise—and, as I consider, of wise concession and prudent compromise. That arrangement having been come to after considerable debate and discussion, has been sent up to your Lordships' House, and you are now to consider whether you will accept that scheme or not, or whether you will adopt another—and nobody has suggested that it is not open to you to do so—which is likely to be more satisfactory and more conclusive. Originally, as your Lordships have heard, it was proposed in the House of Commons to take one Member from all boroughs with a population of not more than 7,000, and thus, with the Members from the disfranchised boroughs, thirty seats were to be obtained. A Motion came from an independent Member on the other side of the House to extend the partial disfranchisement to towns with a population of 10,000. That Motion was agreed to, and there were then forty-five seats to be disposed of. Now, the noble Earl (Earl Grey) says that the limit of 10,000 is too small, and he proposes one of 12,000 as a final settlement. But why stop at 12,000? Why is that to be considered to constitute a final settlement when 10,000 is not? That is the difficulty. There is no particular reason why 12,000 should be accepted as a conclusive stand-point any more than 14,000, 15,000, or 20,000. In this very Bill there are elements which may unsettle the limit of 12,000, because you have given to towns containing a very large population only one Member. Why are other boroughs above 12,000 to have two Members, while some with a population of 40,000 are to have only one? It is perfectly clear that the elements of unsettlement are contained in all propositions which involve what is familiarly called a "hard and fast line." So far from the suggestion of the noble Earl being accepted as a final settlement of the question, my noble Friend opposite (Lord Lyveden) says that it will not do at all, that it is not enough to get twelve seats by taking one each from boroughs under 12,000, and he proposes to disfranchise all boroughs under 5,000, and thus to gain ten more seats. So much for the settlement provided by the plan of the noble Earl as a settlement which is to be final. Where, then, is the resting-place, where is the limit? There is not the least reason why you should stop at 12,000 and why this limit should be considered more a settlement than that agreed to by the House of Commons, after long debate and after concessions and compromise; and I do think it would be wisdom for us not to disturb this settlement, but to take, at all events, breathing time, see whether it is satisfactory, and not attempt anything which could not be otherwise than unsatisfactory after what has taken place. I object very strongly to the Amendment proposed by the noble Earl. It appears to me to disturb everything and to settle nothing; it leaves us in uncertainty as to the disposal of the seats which are to be gained. I quite concur in the praise bestowed upon the speech of the noble Viscount the other night (Viscount Halifax). In the course of it, alluding to the proposal to extend the limit of boroughs to 12,000, he said, "You must first decide upon the enfranchisement necessary, and then, and not till then, you will know to what extent to carry your disfranchisement." Now, the noble Earl (Earl Grey) has entirely reversed that order, and he asks you merely to disfranchise; and the noble Earl says he is quite content to obtain the twelve seats by disfranchisement, and to leave the disposal of them to future arrangement. I do not think that is a wise, prudent, and just manner of proceeding. Suppose any one of us had built a house, and a speculator came and said, "Your house will not last long; let me pull it down and build something else in its place;" the prudent answer would be, "I should like to see your plan; let me know what you propose to substitute." This is like the proposal of the noble Earl. He says, "First of all give me twelve seats, and let me group the boroughs in Schedule B, which will give me twenty-three seats, and then I will proceed to dispose of them on some plan which I have in my own mind, but which I don't give to the House until they concede the seats I require." The noble Earl objects entirely to the system of grouping; and therefore I think my noble Friend (the Prime Minister) was perfectly correct in calling the scheme of the noble Earl, which is at present undeveloped, a crude and undigested scheme. It may be digested in his own mind, but this House is not informed what it is. The noble Earl proposes to group the boroughs in Schedule B, which have had two Members and are only to have one; but he would leave ungrouped those boroughs which have now only one Member. That appears to me very extraordinary. The noble Earl proposes that the Government shall take the matter in hand. It is like the speculator saying, "Let me clear the site for a new building, and I will leave the design of it to you." With great respect, I think it is not right of the noble Earl to force such a task upon the Government. If the noble Earl thinks the scheme of the Government is so imperfect that it should be amended, and that its amendment is necessary for the tranquillity of the country and to prevent future agitation, and if he has in his mind a complete scheme, it is his bounden duty to bring it forward and to propose it as his Amendment. Of course it would be received at the proper time with great respect, considering the quarter whence it came. But if the noble Earl has no scheme, he has no right to force upon the Government a task which properly belongs to himself. I do think that the period of the Session at which we have arrived is an important consideration. I do not mean to say that if the noble Earl had presented a perfect and satisfactory scheme, likely to meet with acceptance here and in the other House, your Lordships would be indisposed to discharge your duty, and remain at your posts until the task was completed. I have had as much labour as any of your Lordships; but if I saw any way to the substitution of a scheme for that which is proposed, and its acceptance by both Houses, I would not grudge the time necessary for its discussion; but I think it is rather hard at this time to expect us to entertain an imperfect scheme, or rather the first and disfranchising half of one, and to trust to the future for the development of the other half. Suppose we mature another scheme, are we sure that the other House will accept it? Your Lordships will remember this scheme was adopted after long debate, and complete devotion to the subject; and do you think that the House of Commons will be content now to accept your scheme in substitution of their own? Would they not rather say, "We will adhere to the whole of our scheme?" and after a conference would not your Lordships' decision be reversed? Under the circumstances it seems to me that the noble Earl (the Prime Minister) was justified in saying that, suppose you agree to this Amendment, he would feel it to be his duty to consult his Colleagues before proceeding further with the Bill; and I am quite sure your Lordships would consider that to be your duty under similar circumstances. It is by no means a threat, but it is well that we should perfectly understand our position; and I am satisfied that if we were to accept the Amendment of the noble Earl, imperfect and unsatisfactory as it is, and if we were to take the first part, which is the disfranchisement part of his scheme, we have no chance, even if we agreed as to the disposal of the seats, of inducing the House of Commons to accept our scheme; which, after all, would be adopted without the deliberation which is required upon a matter of such extreme importance. The result would inevitably be that the Bill must be lost this Session; and, under these circumstances, I must oppose the Amendment.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, I differ in some respects from the noble and learned Lord who has expressed so forcibly his objections to the Amendment, and I wish to state shortly the grounds upon which I am inclined to support it; and I desire this all the more that I gather from the speech of my noble and learned Friend who has just addressed us that there is some misconception on the part of the Government as to the nature of the Amendment proposed. My noble and learned Friend argued as if my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) proposed a scheme of disfranchisement, in the first instance, and of grouping in the next, throwing the seats as it were before the House, and leaving them to be scrambled for with no definite plan of his own. Now, I understand my noble Friend, in asking for these seats, to propose to apply them to a certain specific and well defined object, though I also understood him to say that he placed himself entirely in the hands of Her Majesty's Government, and that if they will agree to his proposal for the partial disfranchisement of some boroughs and the grouping of others, he will be satisfied with any modification of his own views or with any reasonable scheme which they may bring forward for the employment of the seats. Now, my noble Friend divides his proposal into two parts. First of all, you have to consider what seats can be obtained; and, secondly, in what manner they should be distributed. Some of the towns which my noble Friend proposes partially to disfranchise are doubtless associated with historical names. Tamworth and Tiverton belong to the history of our country, and will live in our memories as long as our Parliamentary institutions endure. There are, however, others of a more doubtful character, and I do not think that any one would feel disposed to place Barnstaple and Bridgewater in the same category as Tamworth and Tiverton. With great respect to my noble Friend at the head of Her Majesty's Government, I must venture entirely to differ from him when he says that a great proportion of these boroughs are towns of increasing growth and prosperity. That some of them are larger and more populous than they have been I will not for a moment deny; but I cannot admit that they have any of that material expansion and increase of prosperity which either deserves attention in itself, or which will bear comparison with the relative growth and increase of prosperity of other towns. If they are not actually diminishing they are being distanced in the race of numbers and industrial success. I ought to add, because I think it is strongly in favour of my noble Friend's proposal, that if we examine the last returns from these twelve boroughs, we shall find that they selected as their representatives twelve gentlemen who are nominally Conservative and twelve who are nominally Liberal. I do not think, therefore, that any fairer scheme of partial disfranchisement could be proposed than that which has been suggested by my noble Friend. But my noble Friend is repeatedly asked what is the reason for such a disfranchisement? I am afraid the only answer is the simple one—that the Bill of the present Session has entirely altered the state of things. Last year I should have opposed the disfranchisement for which my noble Friend now asks; but looking at the fact that the Bill of Her Majesty's Government so changes the whole condition of things under which we live, I feel that the only chance for securing permanence in any redistribution scheme is to give that scheme as large, wide, and liberal a basis as possible. If the scheme of the Government passes unaltered you will infallibly have a renewal of agitation in one form or another which will lead to results which the wisest cannot foresee. These political agitations are fevers which consume, as it were, the public life of the country, and not only do they weaken the public life of the country, but they make the Constitution itself much more susceptible to future attacks. But then we come to the next part of the scheme, the grouping of boroughs. Now, there are two alternatives, which as a matter of fact are before the Committee —the grouping of a certain number of boroughs, or the total disfranchisement of all boroughs with less than 5,000 inhabitants, as proposed by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Lyveden). In itself, it might, perhaps, be better to select the latter alternative; but I feel so strongly the argument used by my noble Friend at the head of Her Majesty's Government, and which was so frequently urged in the House of Commons, that this is a Bill which is not open to the taunt of being a disfranchising measure, that, individually, I am prepared to accept the alternative of grouping. Now, I readily admit that there are many objections to be urged against a system of grouping—objections which my noble and learned Friend below me (Lord Cairns) has stated, as he always does, with great force and ability; but there never has been, and never could be, a scheme of this sort not open to objection of some kind. On the other hand, there is at least this argument in favour of my noble Friend's scheme of grouping—it has been tried with some success in Scotland and in Wales, and though, as my noble and learned Friend says, it has not been tried in England, that is obviously not an argument why it should not be, or why it should not work successfully. In the Welsh and Scotch boroughs to which this system has been applied there has not been, as far as I know, any pretence of intimidation and scarcely any charge of bribery. Indeed, the grouping system is antagonistic of bribery; and there is, amongst other reasons, this one in particular—As the House knows very well, bribery and corruption become most rife at the last hour and a half of an election, when a small number of voters are oftentimes enabled to determine an election; but in a constituency scattered over two or three towns at some distance from each other the means of intercommunication are sufficiently tardy to greatly diminish, if not altogether to put a stop to practices of this nature. On these grounds I think my noble Friend (Earl Grey) has a fair case in favour of his proposal as regards his system of grouping. But the more important question is the appropriation of the seats to be obtained. My noble Friend, as far as I understand him, proposes to get twelve seats by partial disfranchisement, and ten or eleven by grouping. Now, there is one point to which I wish to call for a moment the attention of Her Majesty's Government, because it seems to me that it is a point on which my noble Friend at the head of Her Majesty's Government fell into error. My noble Friend proposes to distribute all these seats on the principle of the representation of minorities, which has been assented to by the House—with this condition, that the limit of 150,000 population should be adopted, and that the constituencies with that population should receive a third Member. We will take the case of the counties. My noble Friend proposes to give a third Member to five counties—to Middlesex, the North Riding, West Cornwall, North Durham, and East Kent. These constituencies are over 150,000 each, and are all of great importance. It must further be observed that these five counties do not receive any additional representation under the Bill of Her Majesty's Government. On these grounds my noble Friend (Earl Grey) rests, and most reasonably rests, his proposal. But my noble Friend at the head of Her Majesty's Government said that my noble Friend on the cross-Benches applied the third Member to the Conservative counties in order to insure the return of Liberal candidates. I cannot think that this argument is just or personally fair. If the House will consider which are the counties affected by the scheme of my noble Friend, they will find that so far from their being represented by Conservatives they are almost uniformly represented by so-called Liberals, Middlesex is entirely represented by Liberals, the North Riding returns one Conservative and one Liberal, West Cornwall two Liberals, North Durham two Liberals, and East Kent one Liberal and one Conservative. Injustice, therefore, has been done to the motives of my noble Friend, who certainly is not open to the charge of having framed his proposition from a party point of view. From my personal knowledge of his character I know that, in a matter of this nature, he could not be actuated by such considerations. But my noble Friend also proposes to give a third Member to seven Divisions of counties —the two Divisions of North Lancashire, the two Divisions of South Lancashire, the three Divisions of the West Riding— and to give a third Member to five of the existing metropolitan constituencies, and to three large towns possessing more than 150,000 inhabitants, bestowing the remaining seats upon the Inns of Court. My noble Friend at the head of the Government stated, in opposition to the scheme of my noble Friend on the cross-Benches, that it was a new Reform Bill. I cannot concur in that objection. The recommendation of the scheme, if I may so say, is its perfect simplicity. It disturbs no single arrangement under the Bill, it conforms to the general provisions on the Schedules of that Bill; and Her Majesty's Government may accept it without loss of principle, and without any alteration whatever in the character of the measure. I desire, however, before sitting down, to say a word or two on my noble Friend's proposal in reference to county representation. The representation given to the counties under this Bill cannot, I think, be considered adequate. Even under the Bill of last year there was a larger amount of representation given to the counties, and the Bill of Lord Aberdeen's Government would have given them a representation, larger by twenty-one seats, than that which is now proposed. On the second reading of the Bill now before your Lordships' House my noble Friend at the head of the Government pointed out the disproportion not only in population and wealth and rental, but in the number of Members returned by the counties and that returned by the boroughs. But under this Bill that disproportion is but slightly corrected, the number of county Members will be 186, and the number of borough Members 309—that is to say the percentage of county Members is 37½, and that of borough Members 62½. That of itself shows the disproportion which this Bill recognizes between the two classes of representation. On the other hand the percentage under the Bill of last year was 38½ to counties and 61½ to boroughs. I would further point out that, while you are thus feebly and inadequately increasing the county representation under this Bill, you are in many cases altering the character of the constituencies. Whether that is good, or the contrary, is another question; but of the fact there can be no doubt, as I can easily show by a few figures. I will not weary your Lordships with going through a long list of counties, but will take merely a few by way of example. I assume that the £12 rating adopted by the Bill of this year corresponds for all practical purposes with the £14 rental in the Bill of last year, of which we have statistics. In East Surrey the present electors are 9,913, the additional electors will be 12,984, making the percentage of increase 130; in West Kent, the present number 9,811, the addition 10,411—percentage of increase 105; in South Lancashire, the present number 21,555, the addition 14,751—percentage of increase 68; in Cheshire the present number 12,852, the addition 7,851—percentage 63; in North Lancashire, the present number 13,006, the addition 8,228—percentage of increase 64. But, my Lords, what class of men in the counties have been regarded as the especial representatives of the agricultural interest? I think it will be admitted that the £50 occupiers were that class. Well, what will be the proportion between the new constituencies in the counties to which I have referred, and the voters who are on the register as £50 occupying tenants? In East Surrey the addition will be 12,984, the £50 occupying tenants, 2,339; in West Kent, the addition 10,411, the £50 occupying tenants 2,060; in South Lancashire, the addition 14,751, the £50 occupying tenants, 4,076; in Cheshire, the addition, 7,851, the £50 occupying tenants, 3,645; in North Lancashire, the addition, 8,228, the £50 occupying tenants, 3,961. Let no one in the face of such figures deceive themselves as to the extent of the change which must take place in the character of the county constituencies. It is too late now to obviate this, though it may be partially corrected by the addition of third Members, whose function it would be to represent and protect the interests of the minorities. But the counties, changed though the character of the constituencies may henceforth be, may turn out to be the steadying principle in your new constitution, and it is still possible to remedy, in some degree, the inadequate representation accorded to them in the Government Bill, by accepting the proposals of my noble Friend. I would therefore ask your Lordships not to put off to another Session the grave question of re-distribution, when no man living can tell what the consequences will be of the change which is now being made in the franchise. We are now considering the question of re-distribution under very different circumstances from those of last year. Last Session I should have opposed the Amendment of my noble Friend on the cross-Benches; now I earnestly advocate it. Things which were objectionable last year are desirable now; things which were Radical last Session, have become Conservative this Session. We are making enormous changes in our electoral system, and our best chance of safety lies, not in clinging to the broken, and now meaningless, shreds of that system—not in sewing new cloth on an old garment and so making the rent greater; but in considering our position as a whole, and in bringing its different parts into such consistency as will at least save us from the jars and collisions of an impracticable Constitution.

THE EARL OF CARDIGAN: My Lords, I am anxious to express a few words to your Lordships upon the question before you. I have been in Parliament nearly fifty years, in this House and the House of Commons, during the whole of which time I have firmly supported a Conservative Government, and I confess that I have been much surprised at the Radical and Liberal course which the present Government have adopted with regard to the Reform Bill. To such an extent has this gone that for some time I considered I could not support the Bill. But the question of Reform stands now in a peculiar position; it has been argued and discussed during a long Session in the House of Commons, and it does seem most desirable that the measure should be passed. The tide of Reform was stemmed for a long time by that great man, Lord Palmerston, but since his death the feeling for Reform has greatly increased, and I question whether now it would not be very dangerous to stop its progress; and I say, my Lords, we may hope for luck in this case which has before occurred in others. The question of the Repeal of the Corn Laws was greatly objected to and opposed; but I believe that in the results there never was a measure more thoroughly successful, and that it was one of the best measures which ever passed through the Parliament of this country, conferring a great benefit upon every class of the community. Hoping that we may have the same good luck with regard to the Reform Bill, I shall give my vote in favour of the Bill as it now stands, firmly believing that if this Bill were not successful we should only obtain a more Radical and a more dangerous one from the party opposed to us in Parliament.

THE EARL OF AIRLIE said, he had watched with very great surprise the striking contrast between the speeches uttered by noble Lords opposite and the votes which they had given. To judge from their speeches, especially upon the second reading, they were the only real friends of Reform. Loyalty and affection to the institutions of the country were not, according to them, the possession mainly or exclusively of the upper classes, of the ten-pounders, or even of the seven-pounders; it was necessary to dig down to the substratum before finding the vein of virgin gold—the class of men who would rally round the Throne. But whenever any attempt was made to improve the scheme of re-distribution — and nobody yet, not even the noble Earl at the head of the Government, had defended that scheme upon its merits—whenever it was sought to distribute the voting power more equitably among the people, to remedy existing anomalies, and to give their just share of influence to great and growing constituencies, noble Lords opposite stepped forward with the objection that the scheme as settled by the House of Commons could not be touched; that it was a compromise must not be interfered with — nay, the other night it even assumed the sacred form of a compact. On the other hand, when the supporters of the Government came forward and proposed Amendments for raising the copyhold vote from £5 to £10, or for increasing the lodger qualification from £10 to £15, they heard no more of arrangements, or compromise, or compact, and the 1st of August was never mentioned. They were told that by accepting the proposal of the noble Earl (Earl Grey) they would be flying in the face of the House of Commons. But if their Lordships looked at the course taken by the House of Commons they would find that by accepting the proposal they would only be carrying out further the policy which the House of Commons had forced upon the Government. Those who sat on the same side of the House as himself had been taunted with being afraid of the democratic character of the Bill. Personally, he did not share in those apprehensions; for he believed that as the feeling of the country become more democratic, it was only right that the institutions of the country should be conformed to the growing sentiment. The new House of Commons, he believed, would be able to deal with many questions which were now coming to the surface much more satisfactorily than that assembly as at present constituted. Even yet, however, there were many glaring inequalities which the

Bill wholly failed to touch. Take the representation of some of the Southern counties of England, and compare this with the representation of counties in the North. Berks, Wilts, and Dorset, with a population of 620,000, and a gross estimated rental of £3,500,000, returned thirty-three Members; Lancashire, with a population of nearly 2,500,000 and a gross estimated rental of £12,000,000 — that was to say, with four times the population and four times the rental also—returned exactly thirty-three Members. The case of Lancashire was the case of Warwickshire, Yorkshire, and Staffordshire — in fact, of all the great manufacturing counties; comparing these with any of the Southern counties, it would be found that the latter were enormously over-represented. The proposal of the noble Earl, if adopted, by getting rid of many of the small borough Members, would go far to remedy some of these inequalities. He believed that the existence of the small boroughs, coupled with the large extension of the franchise, would constitute no inconsiderable evil. In the large boroughs the voters who would be enfranchised by the Bill could at all events have their opinions, and it would be right that they should be represented; while the middling-sized boroughs were a valuable link between the town and the county representation; but in the case of the very small boroughs what were the political opinions of the lower class of voters? What, for example, were the opinions of the agricultural labourers in Ashburton, Arundel, and similar places? Some might think the small boroughs were a Conservative element in our system of representation, and a sort of counterpoise to an extended suffrage; but he believed that those who entertained that idea were leaning on a broken reed. From the history of the past they might judge of the future. The policy of resisting the downward extension of the borough franchise had now ended in capitulation, and the present Bill went a long way in the direction of manhood suffrage. In the same way, if they persisted in maintaining those small and half-rotten boroughs, which could not be defended by any reason or argument, they would give occasion to just dissatisfaction and well-grounded discontent, and sow the seeds of an agitation which he feared would begin almost before the measure passed the two Houses, and he thought that not many years would elapse before they would be forced to take a step, and that a long one, in the direction of electoral districts.

Earl STANHOPE said, that in the earlier stages of that Bill they had to deal to a great extent with abstract Resolutions. One abstract Resolution was proposed on the second reading by the noble Earl (Earl Grey), and, on the Motion for going into Committee, another abstract Resolution was brought forward by a noble Viscount (Viscount Halifax); and on the present occasion they had had another of the same character, moved by the same noble Earl who had moved the first. On the two former occasions he had no difficulty as to his vote. He had a strong objection to abstract Resolutions on questions of that kind. He thought their tendency—he did not say their object—was rather to attack the Government than to improve the Bill. The present Amendment was one of a more practical character, and he was, therefore, prepared to give it a dispassionate consideration. Indeed, on coming down to the House, while reserving himself on the details of that question, his general disposition had been to give his support to the Motion of his noble Friend on the cross-Benches, feeling that the scheme of re-distribution proposed by the Government was defective, and that any practical scheme for its improvement deserved their attention. But with all respect for the eminent ability shown by his noble Friend (Earl Grey) on so many other occasions, he hoped his noble Friend would forgive the frankness with which he expressed himself if he said, as he must do, that his speech of that night seemed calculated to produce exactly the opposite effect to that which he must have intended. Although he thought his noble Friend was right in being specific as to the precise point up to which he wished to take away the second seats, he doubted greatly whether he was wise in going into such exact details as to the manner in which those seats to be obtained should be applied. The very reverse of that course had been pursued in the House of Commons, when it was decided, on the Motion of Mr. Laing, that a larger measure of partial disfranchisement than that originally recommended by Her Majesty's Government should take place. The Government proposed a limit of 7,000, and Mr. Laing proposed one of 10,000; and the latter was adopted; but, instead of proceeding to dictate to the Government, as his noble Friend now sought to do, how those seats should be applied, the House of Commons had invited the Government itself to take that subject into its consideration, and the result was that the Government proposed a scheme. It had been quite open to the House of Commons, as it would be to the House of Lords, to reject it; but the initiative of the scheme, as he contended, ought to rest in the first case with the responsible Advisers of the Crown. That was his first objection to the proposal of his noble Friend. Then, again, passing to another point, who could have supposed that any statesman at the present day would have introduced a proposal for the grouping of boroughs — a proposal which, more than anything else that could be named, had led to the downfall of the late Government? ["No!"] He saw that a noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Argyll) disputed that statement; but he could assert from conversations he had had on the subject that there was no part of the Bill of last year which inspired more dissatisfaction or was open to more general objection than the scheme for grouping boroughs together. Boroughs that, as it were, had never heard each other's names—that were scores of miles distant from each other—that had not the least affinity in trade or commerce, in their modes of industry, or their state of feeling—that were some of them most prosperous and thriving, and others sunk into decay—were suddenly startled by the news that they were henceforth to be united in one and the same representation. There was nothing like it except the freak of the ancient tyrant who linked dead bodies to living ones. Yet that was the scheme which, after such a complete and utter failure, their Lordships were now invited to revive. Then his noble Friend proposed to give three Members to Finsbury, Marylebone, and each of the other metropolitan districts. But, surely, had they not from past experience seen that two were enough? True, under the proposal of his noble Friend they would deal with those places according to the principle which, he rejoiced to say, the House affirmed the other evening. But he must observe that, confident as he was of the good working of that principle, there was no constituency to which he should see it applied with less of sanguine hope than to any of the London districts. He must admit in passing that he adhered most strictly to the principle which their Lordships had established by an overwhelming majority on Tuesday night; and so much importance did he attach to that principle that he said deliberately that if —which he trusted would not be the case —if they were invited to reverse that vote, or to go in any manner in opposition to it, he would prefer to risk the loss of the Bill rather than depart from it. But, on the other hand, he scarcely thought it right on the part of his noble Friend under the circumstances to seek to cut up the island into three-cornered constituencies. He scarcely thought it wise, just, or generous at the very moment when the victory had been gained, that they should try to push it to the very furthest and most extreme limit, by proposing such an extensive application of the principle which they had succeeded in establishing in spite of the strong opposition of the Government. Therefore, although he had entered the House with a favourable disposition towards his noble Friend's scheme, taken as a whole; although he knew that many noble Friends of his in that House had taken a similar view, yet having spoken with several of them since the commencement of that debate, he found their inclination to be the same as his own, and neither he nor they thought it consistent with their duty to support that Amendment. He confessed he should have been very well pleased if the Government had themselves been willing to give some extension to the plan before their Lordships; but there was the greatest difference between independent Members being able to force a measure of that kind on the attention of an unwilling Parliament and the Ministers of the Crown undertaking it on their own responsibility. Something had been said rather in derision of the argument that that was the 1st of August; and he admitted in theory that they ought to sit there as long as the public service required it, disregarding all personal considerations. But he put it to their Lordships whether in practice they could expect that to be done? He said nothing about the 1st of August, but he was afraid that when the 12th of that month came circumstances would not be favourable to the due consideration of questions like the present. There was great weight in the arguments urged by his noble and learned Friend (Lord Cairns)—namely, that it would not be fair to deal with the seats of Members at a period of the Session when they would have no opportunity of defending them. He certainly should have been glad if his noble Friend (Earl Grey) had confined his Amendment to obtaining twelve new seats as an experiment. Among the dangers from an extension of the suffrage which threatened to come in the train of this Bill he was glad to see one security and safeguard in the increased representation of counties; but he did not think that full justice had been done to them in this respect. East Kent might well have claimed another Member, one or two more should have been granted to Suffolk, and West Cornwall ought not to have been passed by. It was strange, he might observe in passing, that in this country where the agricultural proprietors were sometimes said to carry all before them, the representation of the boroughs should be one-third greater than that of the counties. It would be well, moreover, if the Government had fulfilled the promise held out to Barnsley, Luton, and other towns, that they should have a Member, for it was vain to suppose that they would be satisfied when the promise once made to them was withdrawn. Considerable improvements might, no doubt, have been made in the Bill, but at this period of the Session they could hardly be made by any other hands than those of the Government. The part of his noble Friend ought consequently rather to have been to indicate the source from which increased representation should be derived than to draw up a positive plan of his own, and lay it before their Lordships for their adoption. In conclusion, he would say that he was not satisfied with the distribution scheme of the Government, but that he was still less satisfied with the Amendment of his noble Friend, and, upon the whole, he should feel it his duty to vote against it.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, that the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope) could hardly have listened to the speech of his noble Friend who moved this Amendment; for, while he certainly shadowed forth a scheme of his own, he said distinctly that he should much prefer to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, and to see the substitution for his own plan of any sufficient scheme proposed by them. The other night the noble Earl was opposed to abstract Resolutions; but now, when a scheme was proposed, the noble Earl exclaimed, "What imprudence, to bring forward a positive scheme!" The speech of his noble Friend (Earl Grey), in introducing the Motion, seemed to him careful, wise, temperate, and statesmanlike, and he regretted that the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope) had decided to oppose the Amendment. The noble Earl supported the other night the proposal of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) with regard to minorities; but he seemed to have very little confidence in the application of the principle. He (the Earl of Kimberley) was not one of those who attached so much value, as a large majority of their Lordships appeared to do, to the representation of minorities; but he should not have supposed that the noble and learned Lord who introduced that Motion would have risked a difference of opinion between the two Houses upon a proposition which only affected eleven seats. If the argument were good for anything it was good for the London constituencies; but the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope) declared his reluctance to apply the principle to them. Now, in his (the Earl of Kimberley's) opinion, these were the best constituencies to which they could be applied, for the minorities there comprised large numbers of wealthy, educated, and intellectual men. He must say he did not share the apprehensions expressed by some of the effect of the household suffrage to be established by this Bill. One advantage of adopting such a suffrage was that it would be a permanent settlement of the question. But no one supposed that the distribution scheme of the Bill was likely to be permanent; and the object of those who advocated a more extensive scheme was to avoid a re-opening of the question as soon as the new Parliament met. There could not be a greater misfortune than to be constantly changing our constitutional system; and a re-opening of the question hereafter, with the intention of making a moderate change, might lead to conclusions which no party now desired. When it was urged that the present golden opportunity should be taken advantage of, the answer was that the season of grouse shooting was at hand. He could not believe, however, that this argument had been seriously used, or that their Lordships were to slur over a measure affecting the political institutions of one of the greatest Empires in the world, merely because its proper consideration would extend the Session for a week or two. He did not impute to the Government the use of such an argument, for they were naturally desirous that the measure should pass without further alterations; but he thought that, after having made great sacrifices in the settlement of one part of the question, they should respond to the appeals of those who, acting in a friendly and not a party spirit, were anxious to settle for some time to come the other part of it also.

Earl FORTESCUE said, that there were, within his own recollection, several instances in which Parliament was engaged late into August, and he believed into September, on measures of comparatively infinitesimal importance. The question of the Bishopric of Manchester occupied their attention after the 12th of August. He could not see, therefore, why it was too late to entertain so large and important a question as the scheme for distributing the electoral power of the country. The plan of the Government did not do justice to the counties. It had been assumed as a matter of course that the rural population were in a condition of the grossest ignorance, which rendered it unsafe to enfranchise them, while the inhabitants of towns were in such a condition of enlightenment that they might be safely intrusted with the franchise. But a very interesting Return, lately presented to the other House, showed that, while in the boroughs the signatures to the marriage register were 21 per cent, they were 26 per cent in the rest of the kingdom, and that the signatures in Devonshire were 7 per cent more than in Lancashire, and 5 per cent more than in the West Riding. Education in the manufacturing districts was not, therefore, so superior to the average education of the country, or to that of the best rural districts, as had been represented.

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, I flatter myself that I have at least one merit in your Lordships' eyes, and that is that when I promise to be short I perform it. I will be so on the present occasion. Your Lordships may recollect that I ventured the other day to urge on Her Majesty's Government the expediency of extending their scheme of re-distribution, and I expressed my conviction that in adopting that course they would receive the most liberal and cordial support from your Lordships generally. On the other hand, I endeavoured to show that, to an extraordinary degree, the present scheme gave no promise of a settlement of this great question, and that nothing could be so un-Conservative, or so opposed to the interests of the country and to the wishes of those who desire a moderate and reasonable measure of Reform in regard to the re-distribution of seats, as to neglect the present opportunity. Those opinions have received entire confirmation from what has taken place to-night. It is impossible to look upon the Government scheme as a settlement of the question. The noble Earl at the head of the Government declared his belief, on proposing the second reading of the Bill, that it would be a permanent settlement; but when I appealed to him whether he believed that the re-distribution part of it was likely to last even for three years, he refrained from committing himself to any opinion on the subject; nor am I aware that to-night he defended it as a settlement of the question. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns), while offering reasons against adopting the Amendment of the noble Earl, admitted that the present scheme was imperfect in two principal characteristics, and the only argument we have heard in its favour proceeded from the noble and learned Lord who usually occupies the Woolsack. His argument was this—that to the extent it went it was the best possible scheme and the Bill the best possible Bill. He admitted, however, that the scheme might be amended, for he said, "Let us wait awhile and see what the people think of it—whether there will be any agitation on the subject"—thus going exactly in the face of the statement made by the noble Earl at the head of the Government in moving the second reading, when he said that to the best of his ability he had argued against "bit-by-bit Reform," inasmuch as he thought that such a mode of proceeding only stimulated change, unsettling everything and settling nothing. What was the other argument of the noble and learned Lord? That it would be impossible to pass this Bill through the House of Commons if the Amendment was adopted—alluding to "the 1st of August" argument, which was so admirably disposed of by my noble Friend behind me and the noble Earl opposite. I would not treat such a subject with levity, and therefore will not give as a reason why we might sit beyond the 12th of August that the grouse have this year anticipated the fate that usually awaits them. I will not discuss the validity of such a plea in a matter which is of such importance to the character not only of this House but of the other House of Parliament. The noble Earl (Earl Fortescue) reminded the House of instances in which Parliament sat much later—in the case of the Municipal Reform Bill it sat until the middle of September, and instances of the same kind could be multiplied. But with regard to the chances of passing this Bill through the other House of Parliament if an enlarged scheme were adopted, we are all on a pretty equal footing as to the formation of an opinion on that head. My own opinion is as strong as it can possibly be that if Her Majesty's Government, supported, as I am sure they would be, by a vast majority in this House, were to propose an adequate scheme of re-distribution—and I, for one, would sacrifice any bias of my own on the subject—the House of Commons, showing great gratitude for the enormous boon, would make no difficulty whatever about passing the scheme. But even if they did, what would that be compared with a new agitation in another Session, or still more in another Parliament, to the dangers of which I ventured to allude the other day? Now, if there be one characteristic of the present House of Commons which does them more honour than another, it was this — that though they patiently debated the details of the Bill they would not hear of personal interests in reference to the representation. If a Member got up to defend his borough they would not hear him, and Member after Member who did so had to sit down. But there is another question which concerns not only this side, but also the opposite side of the House. We heard a noble and gallant Earl on the opposite side (the Earl of Cardigan), yielding to that feeling of discipline which distinguishes the glorious profession to which he belongs, declare that though this Bill was Radical and dangerous, and fraught with the most evil consequences, he was determined to vote for it, and trust to good luck to escape those consequences. But we are not all military men, and we know there are Peers even on the other side who still adhere to their old opinions. Now, noble Lords on the other side appear to me like the Volunteers at the time of the Fenian attack on Chester. You remember how the Volunteers were anxious to do their duty, but they did not know whether they were to obey their officers or not, whether they were to use their arms or not, or even to defend their arms. They, therefore, demanded instructions from the Government. Well, I think that Conservative Peers opposite are entitled to know what course they are to pursue—whether they are to obey their officers or not, whether they are to defend their principles or not, when the fortress of the Constitution which they so dearly love is threatened from an unexpected quarter. But with regard to the House in general, I think we are bound to know what is the import of that warning given by the Prime Minister this evening. Turning to his Friends with particular emphasis—for I must say he addressed himself particularly to the opposite side—he said that if this Amendment were carried it would be the duty of Her Majesty's Government to move the adjournment of the House, in order that they might consider the steps which they were to take. For my part I cannot believe that after this measure has received so much consideration from the House of Commons, and after Her Majesty's Government have conceded so much, going from the limit of 7,000 to 10,000, if—in accordance with all our views and with opinions out of doors—we are to take a still higher limit and proceed to 12,000 — I say I cannot believe that without consultation with the House of Commons as to whether they would accept it or not, and without knowing what the feeling of the country is, they would throw the whole nation into confusion by throwing up the Bill. I believe that is impossible, and I do the noble Earl opposite the justice to think he did not mean it. But, perhaps, Her Majesty's Government only meant that if the sense of the House were strongly shown it would be their duty to consider in what manner they had better shape the re-distribution scheme. I believe that would be the most praiseworthy resolution for the noble Earl to take, and that it would do him infinite credit, and would be most satisfactory to the country at large.

The Earl of DERBY: My Lords, having already addressed your Lordships this evening, I will only trespass on your time for a few moments for the purpose of adverting to some of the arguments that have been advanced in this debate. In the first place, I must remind your Lordships that the objection which I have taken to the course proposed by the noble Earl (Earl Grey) is not only that he has brought forward an Amendment which would effect a very important change in the measure of Reform which we have brought forward, but that he has done so at a time extremely inopportune, when it was not likely to secure from your Lordships and the other House of Parliament that earnest attention which it would certainly require, but which cannot be expected after the long and laborious efforts of an expiring Session. If the noble Earl had brought forward this proposition in a rather more distinct shape in the month of May, when we should have had full opportunity of discussing it, and of entering into the many arguments by which it is supported, it would have been entitled to the most respectful consideration on the part of the House and of the Government. But I objected also to the principle upon which the Amendment is founded—namely, of proceeding in the first instance to disfranchise according to an arbitrary line, on the mere principle of numbers. I thought it objectionable that we should adopt that arbitrary line for the purpose of disfranchisement, leaving it as a subject for after consideration in what manner that should be balanced by enfranchisements. It is quite true that the noble Earl had the scheme shadowed out in his own mind, and that it was afterwards — I suppose from previous communication with the noble Earl — very fully elucidated by my noble Friend the late Secretary for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon). But I must say that that scheme appears to me to contain the elements of great discord and difference of opinion, introducing several new principles, and necessarily leading to the discussion of details in very lengthened debates. Now I did think that this question of distribution had been already disposed of between the two parties in the House of Commons, the Government having given way on the largest proposal, a proposal, too, which came from the other side of the House. I did think also that at this period of the Session it would be very unwise to send down a large measure of enfranchisement to be taken into consideration by the other House, affecting as it did the interests of a number of boroughs and constituencies which had seen the Bill pass through the ordeal of the House of Commons, and therefore supposed that they were safe for the present at least against further aggression. I think, before insisting on such a disfranchisement, it ought to be shown that there were a certain number of constituencies so important that their immediate enfranchisement was absolutely necessary. I do not deny that, in consequence of a change made by the House of Commons, some important boroughs were obliged to be struck out from our list, as it was decided that four additional Members should be given to four large towns. I should be very glad to find an opportunity of redeeming on the earliest occasion the pledge which the Government had given to the boroughs which were struck out; but I do not consider that the case of those boroughs alone would render it necessary to re-open the question of disfranchisement and enfranchisement. I think that the scheme of the noble Earl, as it has been sketched out, is open to a great deal of comment and controversy. I do him the justice to say that though he did not name the boroughs and counties to receive more Members—[Earl GREY: I read a list of them]—I do not intend to impute to the noble Earl that he selected the constituencies with the design of favouring any political interest; but with regard to the question of the three-cornered constituencies, I thought on the whole that, inasmuch as the counties present a larger field for the introduction of the three-cornered principle than the towns, and in the main the counties are Conservative and the boroughs Liberal, the consequence of the application of the principle introduced by my noble and learned Friend (Lord Cairns), and sanctioned by the House the other night, would, if carried to its full length, be to act unfairly to the Conservative interest of the country. I did not mean to impute to the noble Earl that in making his proposal he had any political object. My objection to the proposal is partly that I think the disfranchisement uncalled for, inasmuch as no sufficient case is made out for the increased enfranchisement; next, that any enfranchisement scheme should have been brought forward at an earlier period of the Session, when the House of Commons might have had time to consider it—though that, I admit, is not the fault of the noble Earl, but also because I think the noble Earl ought to have submitted a more definite scheme. I deprecate his saying that he will give us twenty-three seats to dispose of, for though the present Motion only gives twelve, a subsequent Motion proposes to obtain eleven more seats, and that by a system of grouping which will lead to a discussion of no ordinary length, and to great difference of opinion. The noble Earl says, "Here are twenty-three seats. I feel the difficulty of arranging details; I have not the information necessary for doing so; but I call upon the Government to deal with these seats, and to submit—first, to the consideration of this House, and then to the further consideration of the House of Commons"—a scheme founded upon nothing more than this—that a certain number of seats are vacant which you are to fill up to the best of your discretion. I said that, if a Resolution were carried pledging the House to a disfranchisement of twenty-three or twelve seats, thereby making so serious an alteration in the Bill, and imposing such a task upon the Government at this period of the year and at this stage of the Bill, I should hold it my duty to move to report Progress forthwith in order that the Government might have time to consider the new position of affairs, and the course which, under such circumstances, it might be their duty to pursue. I hope, my Lords, that is an answer to the question put by the noble Earl who has just sat down (Earl Granville), and who asks in what sense it was that I made use of these words. I said expressly that I had no wish to use anything like a menace, but merely indicated the course which I thought it absolutely necessary to take before undertaking to act upon, and adopt, a measure forced upon us in such a manner. My Lords, I should be glad to consider that the Bill, as it at present stands, and the system of re-distribution which it contains, was likely to prove permanently acceptable to the public; I cannot say that I entertain that expectation; but, on the other hand, still less, or quite as little, can I entertain the expectation that, if a plan founded on the proposal of the noble Earl were adopted, that would prove a satisfactory measure. Do whatever you will, you cannot lay down plans of re-distribution according to rule and measure; you cannot attempt to do away with every anomaly in the county and borough representation. All you can do is to correct flagrant abuses, to grant a fair share of representation to places which have risen up in wealth, population, and importance, and to supply the means for that enfranchisement in the best manner you can—namely, by taking away a certain portion of the representative power from the less important constituencies. It is impossible, however, to say of any scheme of distribution, no matter how wise the persons who frame, and how lengthened the time open for considering it, that even after the lapse of a single year there will not be some attempt to alter it. Now, although the Government have no proposal to make for the alteration of that which we have submitted to your Lordships as a fair and reasonable scheme of re-distribution, yet if, in the course of the next Session, a proposition—a definite and distinct proposition—should be submitted, in this or in the other House of Parliament, for a new and extended re-distribution, giving greater enfranchisement to certain places, and providing for it by a sufficient plan of disfranchisement, without pledging myself to adopt such a plan, or, on the other hand, to abide *totidem verbis* by the present system of distribution, we should be ready to consider any arguments for enlarging the present scheme or for correcting any inequalities. I do not wish to lay down the scheme we are now proposing as one absolutely perfect and unalterable; but I say it is one that, to the best of our judgment, the Government might fairly and rightly submit to the consideration and adoption of Parliament; it has been adopted cheerfully, cordially, and readily, by the other House of Parliament; and I do trust that your Lordships will not, at this stage of the Bill, throw any obstacle or impediment in the way of its passing through this House.

EARL GREY: My Lords, as the noble Earl at the head of the Government has made two speeches, I hope that I shall be allowed the privilege of saying a few words—and they shall be few indeed—in reply. The noble Earl begins by objecting to the time at which I make this proposal. He says that it is brought forward too late, and that if such a proposal had been submitted in May it would have been entitled to consideration by the House, and would have been duly weighed by the Government. Now, allow me to remind your Lordships that in the month of March, in presenting a Petition to this House from Wolverhampton, I took the liberty of stating somewhat fully my views of what ought to be the nature of a Reform Bill. At that time the noble Earl found fault with me, and said that the question of Reform should be reserved until the Reform Bill came up from the other House, and that, while it was still under the consideration of that House, it was premature for us to discuss the principles of the measure. I humbly accepted the reproof, and said no more upon the subject. Though I took great interest in what was going on, I waited with patience until the Bill came up, and now, when it is before us, I am taking the legitimate opportunity of submitting my views for your Lordships' decision in Committee. The noble Earl proceeds to argue that I am entirely wrong in proposing disfranchisement first and leaving enfranchisement to come afterwards. Now, I am not the author of the Bill. I am governed by the form in which the Bill comes before us. The disfranchisement clauses come first in the Bill, and therefore, if I am to proceed on the foundation of the Bill at all, if I am not to propound a new Bill of my own, I have no alternative but to propose disfranchisement and enfranchisement in the order there suggested. I did not ask your Lordships to skip the 15th and proceed to the 16th clause, but I took the clauses in the order they appeared. I so far agree, however, with the noble Earl that, as I stated in my original speech, I have proceeded upon the plan of endeavouring to adjust disfranchisement to what I consider the valid claims of enfranchisement. I am afraid I have failed altogether to arrest the attention of the noble Earl, who seems to have misapprehended almost all I have said; but those of your Lordships who did me the honour to listen to my speech can hardly have forgotten that I distinctly stated that both in drawing the line of partial disfranchisement at towns with 12,000 inhabitants, and also in the extent to which I carried the principle of grouping, I was governed by what I thought the legitimate claims of enfranchisement. It was because I thought there were certain constituencies which had a claim to further representation—important districts in which the main strength of the country lies — that I endeavoured to devise a fair scheme for carrying further the proposals of the Government, strictly adhering to the principles they had laid down, but making disfranchisement somewhat more extensive than they did. In the next place, the noble Earl objects to my scheme because, he says, it is so indefinite. Now, I ask the noble Earl to reconcile that statement with the criticism of the noble Earl behind him (Earl Stanhope), who said his objection was that my plan was too definite and went too far. "You," said the noble Earl—"you, an individual Member, with no influence or power in this House, have no right to come and ask Parliament to agree to a cut and dried scheme. It is for the Government to originate such a scheme." Well, I wish with all my heart that the Government had originated it. I said distinctly that I was not wedded to these views, that I was perfectly ready to withdraw my Amendment if the Government would assure us that they would propose something a little more suitable to the demands of public opinion than the miserable measure they have brought forward. But the noble Earl (Earl Stanhope) is more correct in his view of my proposal than the noble Earl the First Lord of the Treasury, because that proposal is certainly more open to objection on the score of being too definite than of being too vague. It will be in the recollection of your Lordships that I stated in the fullest detail the whole of my scheme. I did not trouble you with reading the names of the boroughs to which partial disfranchisement would apply, because the list was on the table, and most of your Lordships had it before you; but I referred to that list, and you knew perfectly well which were the twelve boroughs that fell within the line I proposed. I also read the names of the various counties and towns to which I proposed to give additional Members; and I showed precisely how I intended to dispose of the twenty-three seats. The only point on which I expressed any doubt was as to the particulars of the scheme of grouping; but I stated very fully my views as to the principles on which the grouping ought to be effected. I said that without some further statistical information I could not satisfy my own mind as to the details of the scheme; but I will venture to say it would not take the able persons who have drawn up this Bill, with the required information before them, and your Lordships' assent to my principle, two hours to discover a satisfactory mode of applying it. I think these are all the important points I have to notice, except one in the speech of the noble Earl at the head of the Government; but there remains a most important one. The noble Earl who preceded him (Earl Granville) asked most justly for some explanation of some rather vague and rather threatening expressions which had fallen from the noble Earl at the head of the Government. He asked what was the meaning of the statement that if this Amendment was carried the noble Earl would ask the House to adjourn, in order that he might consult his Colleagues? I do not know whether my noble Friend (Earl Granville) is more discerning than I am; but I confess, after having heard the reply that he elicited, I am almost more in doubt than I was before I heard it, as to what is the real meaning of the noble Earl. My noble Friend (Earl Granville) said, and said most justly, that if the meaning of the Prime Minister was that, if the House decided on the partial disfranchisement of the twelve boroughs he would ask the House to adjourn with the view of consulting his Colleagues, as to the best mode of adapting the Bill to the determination of the House, nothing could be more proper than the course contemplated. My noble Friend asked whether this was what was meant by the noble Earl, because his words admitted of a different interpretation, and might be taken to imply that the Government intended to drop the Bill, if the Amendment should be carried. This was the question put by my noble Friend, and I wish to know from those who heard the answer of the noble Earl which of those two meanings they understand from it that we ought to put upon his original words? For my own part I am totally ignorant. At one time I thought the noble Earl meant to adapt the Bill to the decision of the House if it should agree to my Amendment. Then there came at the end of the speech some expressions which seemed to imply the contrary—which seemed to imply there would be so much to do, and so much difficulty in doing what was required, that he should be obliged to ask the Cabinet to drop the Bill altogether for this Session. I will not take upon myself to say what was the meaning of the language of the noble Earl — that is a riddle which is beyond my solving. But I will venture to say that if it was meant as an intimation to the House that they would risk the Bill by adopting my Amendment — if it was meant by a threat of that kind to induce them to reject that Amendment—it is a threat which can only produce any effect upon noble Lords of very small experience in political matters. It is quite true that if this Amendment should be carried, it will be for the noble Earl and his Colleagues to consider what course their duty to the Crown as Servants of their Royal Mistress and their duty to the country imposes upon them. That question must be decided by their own judgment, and it is not for me to say to what conclusion their judgment may lead them. Although I am aware, from the experience of this Session, that Her Majesty's present Servants take a very different view of what the duty of persons in that high situation is from the view adopted by most preceding Ministries, and although they have shown by their course in the present Session that their view is a very lax one, still I will not believe, if the question arises, even they would think themselves justified in abandoning the Bill, because this House has come to a vote the effect of which is to give more efficiency to the Bill, and to carry into more complete operation the principles upon which it is founded—because it has taken a course which we all know would be supported by public opinion. I say it is impossible for me to believe that on this ground Her Majesty's Ministers would think themselves justified in advising the two Houses of Parliament to throw the country into confusion, and to create all the mischief and all the disturbance which would result from allowing this Bill to be shipwrecked. My Lords, this is a course which is impossible, as impossible as it is for the House of Commons to reject the opinions which public opinion is in favour of. It is because I know public opinion is in favour of a larger measure of re-distribution—because I know, if you adopt the Amendment I now suggest, the opinion of the country will be at your back, that I say, by adopting that Amendment, you do not run the slightest risk. My Lords, I apologize for having detained you by a longer reply than I had intended; but I could not allow the speeches of the noble Earl to pass without making these few remarks upon them.

On Question, That (" Ten Thousand") stand Part of the Clause? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 98; Not-Contents 86: Majority 12.

CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Westmeath, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Cardigan, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harrington, E.
Home, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.

Bolingbroke and St. John, V.
Exmouth, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Oxford, Bp.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Aveland, L.
Bagot, L.
Berners, L.
Bolton, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L.
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Clinton, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colonsay, L.

Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Kingston, L. (*E. Kingston.*)
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Lytton, L.
Monson, L.
Northwick, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Ravensworth, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rollo, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Templemore, L.
Tenterden, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wharncliffe, L.
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cleveland, D.
Devonshire, D.
Grafton, D.
Manchester, D.
Rutland, D.
Somerset, D.

Camden, M.
Salisbury, M.
Westminster, M.

Abingdon, E.
Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cowper, E.
De Grey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Ducie, E.
Effingham, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E. [*Teller.*]
Harrowby, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lichfield, E.
Lovelace, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Morton, E.
Romney, E.
Russell, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Sommers, E.
Spencer, E.
Zetland, E.

De Vesci, V.
Eversley, V.
Halifax, V.
Hardinge, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Sydney, V.

Chester, Bp.
Peterborough, Bp.

Belper, L.
Blantyre, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Churchill, L. [*Teller.*]
Clermont, L.
Clonbrock, L.
Cranworth, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
De Mauley, L.
Dunfermline, L.
Ebury, L.
Foley, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Leigh, L.
Londesborough, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Mostyn, L.
Overstone, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Taunton, L.
Truro, L.
Vernon, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wentworth, L.
Wrottesley, L.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

LORD LYVEDEN rose to move the Amendment of which he had given notice—namely, to insert at the end of the clause words depriving all boroughs with less than 5,000 inhabitants of the right of returning Members to Parliament. The noble Lord proceeded to disclaim the intention of doing anything that would be likely to endanger the passing of a measure which he would have regarded with great satisfaction were it not for the manner in which the Government, in dealing with it, had degraded the Executive and demoralized the House of Commons. If the noble Earl at the head of the Government meant to imply that he would have thrown up the Bill if the Amendment on which they had just divided had been carried, he thought that it was an unwarrantable course, and would have added contempt of their Lordships to the mode in which he behaved to the other branches of the Legislature. There could be no doubt that in our electoral system the influence of the large and important boroughs was counteracted, to a great extent, by the existence of small and thinly-populated towns which were permitted to return representatives to Parliament. The House had, by the vote just arrived at, decided against the system of grouping—a system which had been discussed and rejected by the House of Commons, and which, he believed, whenever proposed, had been repudiated by public opinion. His proposal, however, he believed to be in harmony with the general feeling of the country, and one peculiarly fitted for their Lordships' consideration, as they were free from the selfish interest that unavoidably, and perhaps not quite unconstitutionally, affected Members of the House of Commons upon this subject. In 1832 all boroughs with less than 2,000 inhabitants were totally disfranchised, and one Member was taken away from boroughs with less than 4,000 population. What he now proposed was to advance in the same direction. They had decided to take one Member from boroughs with less than 10,000 inhabitants, and the proposition which he now suggested for the total disfranchisement of the smallest boroughs was in the same proportion as that which had been adopted in 1832. It could not therefore be said that the proposition was a new-fangled one. On the other hand, it was one that had the strongest show of justice. Wednesbury, the new borough in the Black Country, had 92,633 population. The ten boroughs which he proposed to disfranchise had only 39,704. He might remind their Lordships that when the proposition which he now made was brought forward in the House of Commons, it met with no very strong opposition from the Government. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that he could not assent to it unless the opinion of the House was expressed very decidedly in its favour; but the right hon. Gentleman brought forward no arguments against it. He believed that no good argument could be adduced in favour of the retention of those small boroughs. He admitted that there was something to be said in favour of the nomination boroughs under the old system, because, although they gave rise to abuses, by their means distinguished men were returned to Parliament who otherwise might have been unable to procure returns. They were a substitute too for official seats; but among the ten boroughs which his Amendment would disfranchise there were not more than one or two to which the term could be properly applied. He admitted that in the case of re-distribution there could be no permanent resting-place; but a good measure of disfranchisement offered a prospect of something like permanency, and a scheme that did not embrace it offered none. Without a clear necessity for it the public would not be anxious to have fresh disfranchisements. He asked their Lordships to take this matter up before it was made a party question. Assuredly, it would be made a party question if Parliament left the question of disfranchisement as it now stood. He asked them also for their own honour, as they were about to vote for so much as a mere register of the other House, to show they had their own opinions on Reform, upon which they were as well or better entitled to be heard, and for whose advocacy they claimed the approbation of a Liberal public. He hoped the Government would not allow it to be said that the only Amendments they were willing to accede to were such as restricted rather than extended the franchise. He should certainly press his Amendment to a division, for he wished to give their Lordships an opportunity of recording their opinion now upon a subject which was certain to become one of permanent interest hereafter.

Moved at the end of the Clause to insert—

"And every Borough which had a less population than Five thousand at the said Census shall cease to return any Member to serve in Parliament."—(*The Lord Lyveden.*)

LORD ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR reminded their Lordships that they had already sanctioned the principle of having minorities represented. The borough of Arundel was a small one, but its Member represented the largest constituency in England. He represented 1,000,000 Roman Catholics. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had pointed out that peculiarity of the borough of Arundel some years ago, and the case remained the same up to the present hour.

On Question? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 37; Not-Contents 93: Majority 56.

CONTENTS.

Somerset, D.

Airlie, E.
Albemarle, E.
Chichester, E.
Clarendon, E.
De Grey, E.
Ducie, E.
Fortescue, E.
Granville, E.
Grey, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lovelace, E.
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.

Halifax, V.

Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Cranworth, L.
De Mauley, L.
Dunfermline, L.
Foley, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Harris, L. [*Teller.*]
Houghton, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Lyveden, L. [*Teller.*]
Mostyn, L.
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Sundridge, L. (*D. Argyll.*)
Vernon, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Manchester, D.
Marlborough, D.
Rutland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Effingham, E.
Eldon, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Hardwicke, E.
Harrington, E.
Home, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Nelson, E.

Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.

Bolingbroke and St. John, V.
De Vesci, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Sidmouth, V.
Templetown, V.

Gloucester and Bristol Bp.
Oxford, Bp.

Arundell of Wardour, L.
Bagot, L.
Berners, L.
Bolton, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clifton, L. (*E. Darnley.*)
Cloncurry, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
Digby, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Londesborough, L.
Monson, L.
Northwick, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Redesdale, L.
Saltoun, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Stratheden, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Templemore, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wharncliffe, L.
Wynford, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Certain Boroughs to return Three Members).

LORD DENMAN moved the omission of the clause, with a view of transferring the new seats which would thereby be taken from Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Leeds, to Barnsley, Croydon, St. Helens, and Torquay, and said, that if he were as he had been—an elector for the City of London—he should feel much aggrieved by having only three votes for four Members.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 17 to 27, inclusive, *agreed to.*

House *resumed:* and to be again in Committee *To-morrow.*

AGRICULTURAL GANGS BILL.

(*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos.*)

(No. 268.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—*The Duke of Buckingham.*)

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM, in moving the second reading of this Bill, stated that the Bill had been framed for the purpose of placing agricultural gangs, to which their Lordships' attention had lately been drawn, under some regulation. The measure was intended to compel all gangmasters, after the 1st of January next, to take out a licence, and it also provided that females should not be employed in gangs in which males were employed, nor under a gangmaster. The gangmasters' licences were to be granted by magistrates in Petty Sessions, and a penalty would be imposed on any gangmaster who employed persons without a licence, or who knowingly permitted any infringement of that licence.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, August 1, 1867.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—£507,428, Post Office Packet Service.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage * [294].

Committee—Sewage * [260]; Dominica Loan * [291]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* (*re-comm.*) [244]; Courts of Law Fees, &c.* [287]; Militia Pay *; Prorogation of Parliament * [277]; Guarantee of Government Officers * (*re-comm.*) [283].

Report—Sewage* [260]; Dominica Loan * [291]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 6) * (*re-comm.*) [244]; Courts of Law Fees, &c.* [287]; Militia Pay *; Prorogation of Parliament * [277]; Guarantee of Government Officers * [283.]

Considered as amended—Inland Revenue * [239]; Sewage * [260]; Naval Stores (No. 2) * [289].

Third Reading—Customs Revenue * [238]; Sewage * [260], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Tancred's Charities* (*re-comm.*) [207]; Mixed Marriages (Ireland) * [120].

METROPOLIS—HALL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES.—QUESTION.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he rose to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Whether he is aware that the Charter of Incorporation recently granted to the Central Hall of Arts and Sciences was promulgated without consultation with the subscribers;

that much dissatisfaction is felt with respect to certain of its provisions, such as the appointment of an Executive Committee, and the power given to the Provisional Committee to withhold all accounts until one year after the completion of the hall; that under the powers given to the Executive Committee a contract has been entered into of a nature deemed by many subscribers to be improvident, and such as may fail to justify the hopes held out in the statement on the faith of which subscriptions were solicited — namely, that subscribers would obtain for their subscriptions a valuable pecuniary investment; and, whether Her Majesty's Government are prepared on application from subscribers to revise the Charter, and, if necessary, to issue an amended one, affording to subscribers the same powers and the same representation as is usual in joint-stock undertakings?

Mr. BRUCE said, that as the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) had no official connection with that hall, and no official knowledge in reference to it, perhaps as he (Mr. Bruce) was a member of the Provisional and Executive Committee the hon. Member would accept his explanation. The Provisional Committee of the Central Hall of Arts and Sciences was appointed at a meeting of the promoters, who intrusted them with full powers of management until the completion of the hall. The character of the Charter was fully stated in the prospectus, and each subscriber received notice of the Charter, and agreed in writing to accept it. No subscriber had objected to it, nor had any complaint on the subject been received by the Provisional or the Executive Committee. The Provisional Committee being numerous, appointed an Executive Committee, whose appointment was continued by the Charter. The contract was entered into under the powers originally conferred on the Provisional Committee, and continued by the Charter. It was a highly advantageous contract, and no complaint against it had been received by the Committee. It had been carefully examined and approved by the most competent professional authority, and the scale of prices certified by the eminent firm of surveyors, Messrs. Hunt and Stephenson. The accounts were open to the inspection of any subscriber. The management had been conducted in all respects, including even the preparation of legal documents, without any charge to the undertaking. He was not aware that Government had any power to revise the Charter. If its revision were really required by the majority of subscribers, the Board of Trade would probably make no difficulty about advising Her Majesty to assent to a wish so expressed to agree to a revision.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—QUESTION.

Mr. GREGORY said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Council, If Her Majesty's Government, in compliance with the recommendation of the Schools Inquiry Commission, have determined on instituting a special inquiry into the state and effects of technical education abroad?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, in reply, that to issue a Commission for this purpose would be what Mr. Robert Malet, in a letter to the Schools Inquiry Commission, called, "giving the Commissioners a holiday excursion at the public expense." The best suggestion was contained in the same letter of Mr. Malet. It appeared there were six countries in which there was a system of technical education — France, Belgium, Prussia, Austria, Bavaria, and Switzerland, and all possible information on the subject would be found in those countries in a printed form. The best thing would be for the Government to collect that information by means of its diplomatic agents, condense, and publish it.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he was glad to hear that the Government would make use of the services of the Secretaries of Legation, for they had lately shown what excellent Reports they could make. He trusted they would not be merely asked to send the printed documents, but would be requested to furnish Reports.

Lord STANLEY said, he was quite ready to give all the assistance which the Foreign Office could give to this inquiry. As to the precise part which Secretaries of Legation should take in it, he thought that that might well be left to be settled between the Educational Department and the Foreign Office.

THE RECENT COURT-MARTIAL IN JAMAICA.—QUESTION.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, he wished to ask Mr. Attorney General, Whether he has taken into consideration the evidence produced at the trials by Court-Martial lately held in Jamaica on Ensign Cullen and Staff Assistant-Surgeon Morris; and whether it is his intention to institute proceedings against those Officers in the ordinary tribunals of this country? He understood Mr. Morris was now in this country.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: In answer, Sir, to the Question of the hon. Member, I may say, that since this Question was put on the Paper, I have, as far as possible, mastered the details of the evidence and the proceedings of those courts-martial held in Jamaica, and it is not my intention to advise Her Majesty's Government to take any proceedings against those officers before the ordinary tribunals of this country.

NAVY—NAVAL RESERVE AT THE LATE REVIEW.—QUESTION.

MR. GRAVES said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, The number of Royal Naval Reserve Men who took part in the late Naval Review; and if any Report has been made on their conduct and efficiency, to state the nature of same, together with any reasons which may have been given for non-attendance?

MR. CORRY said, in reply, that the number of the Naval Reserve Men at the recent Review was 450, exclusive of officers, and the Controller General of the Coastguard, under whose immediate orders they were placed, had reported most favourably of their conduct and efficiency. No reason for non-attendance was given or required; the attendance was entirely voluntary, as the Naval Reserve had not even been invited by the Admiralty to take part in the Review.

THE WELSH COLONY IN PATAGONIA. QUESTION.

MR. GREGORY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any Report has recently been received as to the present condition and prospects of the Welsh Colony in Patagonia; and, if so, whether there is any objection to its production and publication?

LORD STANLEY, in reply, said, the hon. Member was probably aware that the colony met with great difficulty from the time of its first establishment, and he could not say that even now its prospects were very promising. The last Reports however were of a more satisfactory character, and the Argentine Republic, which had acted throughout with great consideration towards these settlers, had announced its intention of continuing for one year longer the subsidy it at present paid them, after which time a decision would be come to whether it was expedient or politic to continue the colony or not. If it should be thought inexpedient, in that event land would be offered to the settlers in some of the interior provinces of the Argentine Confederation. He had no objection to produce the Papers.

IRELAND—MILITARY AT DOWNPATRICK.—QUESTION.

SIR THOMAS BATESON said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, To state the name or names of the persons upon whose recommendation a squadron of the 10th Hussars and a company of the 89th Foot were marched into the town of Downpatrick on the 11th of July, where they were billeted for four nights; whether the Under Secretary at Dublin Castle was not, on the 7th of July, in possession of a special Report from the Sub-inspector of Constabulary stationed at Downpatrick, declaring that neither was a force of Military necessary, nor was any addition required to the number of Constabulary then under his control, adding that he was fortified in this view by the unanimous opinion of the Magistrates of the district, with whom he had consulted; and, whether the above-named Troops were not sent to Downpatrick without a Stipendiary Magistrate, without the knowledge of the Sub-inspector of Constabulary, and contrary to his Report?

LORD NAAS said, in reply, that no recommendation whatever came from any persons connected with the town of Downpatrick. The Sub-inspector of Constabulary never sent to the Government a special Report stating a force of military was not necessary, and no information as to the opinion of the magistrates on that point had reached the Government. He had also further to state that the troops were not sent without the knowledge of a stipendiary magistrate. Having stated what had not happened, he would now, with the permission of the House, state what did happen. With regard to the distribution of the troops, his directions were that the course taken by the Government last year, which had been perfectly successful in maintaining the public peace, should be adhered to. Troops were sent as usual to where they had been sent in former years. Last year a very large meeting took place in the immediate neighbourhood of Downpatrick, and it was reasonable to suppose that a demonstration of some kind would take place. There was no information at the disposal of the Government to justify them in making any alteration in the arrangements of former years. The Under Secretary was not on the 7th of July in possession of a special Report from the Sub-inspector at Downpatrick, nor was any report received from the Sub-inspector at all. But on the 8th of July, before which (on the 5th) the arrangements were made for all the principal places in the North, Downpatrick among others, a Report was received from the County Inspector (Mr. Heath) stating, among other matters—

> "That the usual exhibition of party feeling is expected throughout this county generally, but particularly in the districts of Ballynahinch, Bannbridge, Newtownards. The Sub-inspector at Downpatrick reports that he apprehends no interruption of the public peace there, as it appears Bangor is to be the principal rendezvous of the Orangemen from Belfast and various other localities."

There is nothing about being fortified in this view by the unanimous opinion of the magistrates, nor any representation from the magistrates themselves. A resident magistrate (Mr. Hort) was ordered to proceed to Downpatrick to arrive on the 11th. Mr. Bannon, R.M., was also ordered to proceed there, but he was ill. Mr. Hort arrived on the 10th; but, finding his services were required at Bangor he proceeded to that place. He was not aware whether it was without the knowledge of the Sub-inspector the troops were sent; but the arrangements were made known to the Inspector General on the 5th, immediately they were made, and there was nothing in the Report of the County Inspector which seemed to make desirable a change in the arrangements already made.

MR. WHALLEY said, he wished to ask a question of the noble Lord relative to one expression he had used. Was "party feeling" intended to convey the same meaning as "Protestant feeling?" He would also beg to ask, whether the Instructions given to the authorities were the same as those of last year? He was present at Downpatrick last year, and he understood Instructions were given to prevent the expression of Protestant feeling.

LORD NAAS: No Instructions were given to the military; but general instructions were given to the magistracy to take such precautions as they thought necessary to preserve the public peace.

IRELAND—CHURCH REVENUES COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

MR. MONSELL said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he can state the names of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Revenues of the Irish Established Church; and, when he will lay upon the table of the House the Instructions to be given to the Commission?

LORD NAAS replied, that he was not yet able to place on the table of the House the names of the gentlemen whom it was intended to ask to serve on the Irish Church Commission; but he hoped to be able to do so very soon. Before the end of next week he hoped to be able to announce their names, and the terms of the Instructions proposed to be given to them.

LIME AND BUDE LIGHTS.—QUESTION.

MR. KENDALL asked, Whether (Sir Goldsworthy Gurney having been in correspondence with different departments of the Government during the past thirty years on the subject of artificial light, having experimented on his Lime and Bude lights for the Trinity Board in 1835, having suggested these lights to the War Office for signalling in 1855, and to the Admiralty in connection with a Coast Line Telegraph for signalling by means of flashing lights in 1859, and also constructed a new light more suitable for this purpose in 1862, which was placed by him in Her Majesty's ship *Resistance* at the request of the Admiralty for the purpose of testing that light) the Admiralty are now, after five years of its continued use in that ship, satisfied that this light is available for ship lighting, and are disposed to extend its use to signalling by means of flashing lights, an apparatus for which was constructed by Sir Goldsworthy Gurney, and the attention of the Admiralty called to the same in 1862; and, whether the light and plan of signalling at present used by Captain Doty and Captain Colomb are not in fact the same, or nearly so, as those of Sir Goldsworthy Gurney, who has been unable to attend to these matters since 1863, owing to a violent attack of paralysis.

MR. CORRY, in reply, said, Reports had been made to the Admiralty on the use of the lights in Her Majesty's ship *Resistance,* and in consequence of their favourable character a gentleman connected with the Department of Controller of the Navy had been appointed to inspect them, and say whether they could be applied generally to ships of war. He had not sufficient information to enable him to say whether the Admiralty would be disposed to adopt them as signals by means of flashing lights. With respect to the last part of the Question, he was unable to express any opinion. The question, if decided at all, should be decided by a Court of Law.

IRELAND—ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.—QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will give a promise that Parliament shall be consulted, and its opinion expressed, before either a Charter is granted to a Roman Catholic University, or before the Government sanctions any other scheme affecting University Education in Ireland.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, on the subject of Irish University Education, and on all other subjects, Her Majesty's Government will conduct themselves to the House of Commons according to the practice and in the spirit of the Constitution. But I decline to enter into any promise on that or any other subject at the bidding of the hon. Gentleman opposite.

INDIA—BANDA AND KIRWEE PRIZE MONEY.—QUESTION.

COLONEL NORTH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, When the Correspondence relative to the property of Narrim Rao, the Rebel Chief of Kirwee, will be laid upon the table of the House; whether the amount of 523,253rs. 4. 6., deducted by the Government of India from the Banda and Kirwee Prize Money for lost Revenue, with interest to the date of distributions, will be issued as a further grant to the troops; and, whether the Government of India have taken any further funds which belonged to the Rebel Chiefs of Kirwee, and which might be claimable by Her Majesty's Prerogative as a droit of war?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, in reply to the first Question of the hon. and gallant Member, that the Correspondence would shortly be placed on the table. The second question had been considered by the Government, and they had referred it to the Law Officers of the Crown, who decided that the amount in question ought to be considered part of the prize money to be distributed to the troops, and a decision to that effect had been announced to the Governor General of India. He was not aware of any other funds claimable as part of the prize money. If his hon. and gallant Friend referred to certain promissory notes stopped by the Governor General, there was no possibility of recognizing them as prize money.

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES AND ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF ACTS.

AN IRREGULAR QUESTION.

MR. SPEAKER said, that a Question which stood next on the Paper, in the name of the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley)—namely,

> "To ask the right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge, whether the Select Committee on the Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts are about to close their inquiry without hearing evidence in support of the present Law; and why the evidence of the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee, which has been offered in support of the present Law, has not been taken,"

was a Question which had reference to proceedings before a Select Committee which had not yet made a Report to the House. It was therefore irregular, and he trusted the hon. Member would not desire to put it.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, as he has stated it to be his intention to proceed with the Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill at this period of the Session, and in its present form, he has adverted to the opinion of Committees of this House that Tolls are a form of taxation—

> "Unequal in pressure, costly in collection, inconvenient to the public, injurious, and a serious impediment to intercourse and traffic?"

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that he had made himself acquainted with the Reports of those Committees.

PARLIAMENT—THE COUNT-OUT ON TUESDAY.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, he wished to call the attention of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer to what had taken place on

Tuesday evening. He (Mr. O'Beirne) had an important Motion to bring forward which stood first on the Paper; but the Speaker had only been a few seconds in the Chair when an hon. Member moved that the House be counted. When the new arrangement as to Morning Sittings was made it had been felt that it was likely to operate unfairly to private Members having Notices to bring forward, but the right hon. Gentleman rather thought that Members would return at nine o'clock refreshed and invigorated. There had been two or three counts-out, and on the last two Tuesdays such a proceeding was very inconvenient. His object was, to see whether he could not get an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that such an inconvenience should not again occur. He could tell hon. Members what was well known, that the Government had the means at their disposal to keep a House if they thought proper to do so, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would prevent the repetition of an occurrence which was so full of inconvenience to private Members. The hon. Member concluded by moving the adjournment of the House.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I entirely agree with the hon. Gentleman. I much regret that the House was not made on the night he refers to. I must say in vindication of myself that I was present on the occasion —and I may add that I have never been absent on these occasions. I think I was justified in the anticipation I originally expressed when the arrangement for these Morning Sittings was made; but we must remember that the Session is very far advanced, and that at this period there is always greater difficulty in making a House than at other times. I made inquiry as to the "count-out" on Tuesday, and the cause of the great failure of business on that occasion, because I had received an assurance from my Colleagues and the Gentlemen who support the Government that they would be present, and I find that a great number of Gentlemen, who were more than sufficient to make a House, were on their way here, and would have arrived a few minutes after the time when the House was counted out. I very much regret what has occurred, and so far as I can influence the House, the hon. Gentleman may rely upon it that I shall always be present and do all I can to obtain a House. I have been always opposed to counting the House, as nothing tends more to delay — and in an unsatisfactory manner — the transaction of public business.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

IRISH RAILWAYS.—QUESTION.

Mr. MONSELL rose to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether Her Majesty's Government intended to propose any measure for the consolidation of the Irish railway system? His noble Friend knew well that upon the necessity for such a measure hon. Members from all parts of Ireland were agreed. He might also say, for fear that hon. Members representing other parts of the United Kingdom should be alarmed, that the scheme he desired to press upon the Government would not involve the expenditure of a single half-penny on the part of the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. From the Report of the Board of Trade for 1865 it appeared that 1,838 miles of Irish railways now open were divided amongst thirty-five separate companies, each having its separate Board of Directors, and its separate secretary and general staff, their aggregate income being £1,700,000; while that of the English North-Western Railway Company, which was under one management, alone amounted to upwards of £6,000,000. Therefore, in Ireland, they had thirty-five separate boards to manage a concern which was not one-third as great financially as a system in England managed by one Board of Directors. The results of the divided management in Ireland were obvious. Mr. Cawkwell, of the London and North Western Railway, said, if the Irish railways were amalgamated, the result would be that the rates would be reduced, trade developed, and larger returns obtained. The rates charged on the Irish railways were as high, and frequently higher than those on the English lines, and very much higher than those on the Continental lines of railway. If they compared the rates of the Great Southern and Western Company, the best managed line in Ireland, with those of the Caledonian Company and the Lancashire and Yorkshire Company, they would find for travelling 100 miles first-class in Ireland 18*s.* 4*d.* was charged on the Great Southern and Western line, while on the Caledonian line the fare was only 10*s.* 2*d.*, and on the Lancashire and Yorkshire 11*s.* The rates of the other classes showed the same difference. Taking the foreign railways, which were managed upon a system which they desired to see adopted in Ireland, they would find the difference far greater. From Brussels to Ostend, a distance of ninety miles, the first-class fare by express was only 4*s.* 9*d.*, second-class 3*s.* 2*d.*, and third-class 2*s.* 4*d.* The difference in the case of goods traffic was still more remarkable. In the article of coal the price of its conveyance was in many instances more than double that on the English lines. Captain Huish, who was for eighteen years manager of the London and North Western Railway, stated the result of this system in a few words—namely, that as regarded the Irish railways, the rates were very high, the speed was very low, the trains were very few, while the remuneration to the shareholders was very small. This was a tolerably fair account of the working of the Irish railway system. Hon. Gentlemen could not be surprised that throughout Ireland there existed a general and earnest desire that this system so unsatisfactory, both as to its working and its financial results, should be changed. This feeling was intensified by the knowledge of the fact that this was not the system originally intended for Ireland. The Irish Railway Commission in 1838 reported in favour of a system of Governmental management and central control. Mr. Drummond prophecied, in the absence of some such system, precisely those results which they now witnessed. Many of the greatest landed proprietors in Ireland were prepared to give their land without compensation if the system recommended by the Commission were adopted. The measures necessary to carry it out were submitted to Parliament by the late Lord Carlisle. Parliament refused to sanction them. Could it be wondered at then that great dissatisfaction prevailed in Ireland at the condition of the railway system? He had ventured in 1865 to give expression to that dissatisfaction, when the right hon. Member for South Lancashire referred the matter to the Royal Commission which was then sitting to hear evidence on the subject of the railways of the United Kingdom. There was great dismay among the Irish people, who were interested in the matter, when the Report of that Commission was published, which, ignoring altogether the evidence that had been laid before them, advocated the maintenance of the present system. Nor was the astonishment of the Irish people lessened by the reasons which the Commissioners gave in their Report for coming to that determination. Their first reason for not interfering with the existing Irish railway system was that it was of more importance to encourage private enterprize and self-reliance in Ireland than it was to do so in Great Britain. They taunted the people of Ireland with a want of private enterprize and self-reliance in this particular matter; but when it was considered that in Ireland there had been a greater number of railways made, which had afterwards turned out unremunerative, than in any other part of the kingdom, that taunt would be appreciated at its value. The next statement of the Commissioners was that the admitted failure of the Irish railway system was owing to the want of commercial activity and mineral productions in the country, and that in countries where commercial activity and mineral productions did not exist it was utterly impossible that railways should prosper. But the evidence taken before the Royal Commissioners showed that that was not the case in foreign countries and particularly in some parts of Prussia, where, with quite as little manufactures as there are in Ireland, the railways were prosperous. They also stated that cheap fares would be of little importance in Ireland because the mileage to be travelled was so small; but they appeared to forget that the produce of the country travelled eastward for England, and not to the nearest seaport; and, consequently, a larger extent was travelled over in Ireland in proportion to its size than in England. Another statement which took the people of Ireland with surprise was that no particular object would be gained by reducing the cost of the transit of coal, because there was so much bog in the country that the people usually burnt turf; but, in reality, there were large portions of Ireland where there were no bogs at all. Besides, the difficulty of transporting turf was very considerable, on account of its great bulk, and experience had shown that coal at no great distance from a bog would be cheaper than turf if English coal rates were introduced into Ireland. It was further said that if the railways were subsidized the canals must be subsidized also. Now, no one ever desired that the railways should be subsidized, but it was a remarkable circumstance that the canals were subsidized already, and that one of them was absolutely in the hands and under the management and control of the Government. The House would not be surprised to learn that these reasons weighed very little with the Irish people. In consequence of the prevalent feeling, a meeting was held of Gentlemen connected with Ireland belonging to both Houses of Parliament to consider the evidence taken by the Royal Commissioners and their Report. The suggestion that the Government should advance money to the railways in order to relieve them from their liabilities was considered. That, however, was regarded as an inadmissible proposition—its adoption, though it might benefit shareholders, would be of no advantage to the public. Another suggestion that voluntary arrangements for promoting the amalgamation of the Irish railways should be facilitated was likewise rejected, and the meeting eventually came to the conclusion —he believed unanimously—that the only means of putting the railways on a sound basis was their purchase by the Government. They had then to ascertain for what sum the railways could be purchased, and in so doing they considered, of course not what the railways originally cost, but what they were now worth; the liabilities of the railways were not taken into account. That was a question as to the distribution of purchase money and in no way affected the value. The conclusion arrived at that the market value of the railways was somewhere about £19,525,083, calculating the ordinary shares at twenty years' purchase, the preference shares at twenty-two and a half years' purchase, and the debenture loans at their market value, and adding 10 per cent to the two first on account of the sale being compulsory. These figures had been verified by the officers of the Board of Trade, and the only point which was open to controversy was the sum to be paid for those railways which at present paid no dividend. He was informed that experienced persons could estimate their value as easily as the value of land or houses could be estimated. The original shares of the non-paying railways amount to £2,534,946, and the non-paying preference shares to £1,231,108. The contingent value of such shares, dependent as it is upon the future prospects of the railways, must, of course, vary much according to the circumstances of each railway; but the best calculations lead to the conclusion that an amount which would average 20 per cent on the original, and 30 per cent on the preference shares, distributed according to the circumstances and probable prospects of each railway, would be a sufficient payment. Now, the yearly interest on £19,525,083 at 3¼ per cent would be £634,560, whereas the annual net profits of the railways at the present time amounted to £900,500, so that there would be about £260,000 a year, which might be applied to reducing the fares and giving increased railway accommodation. Several persons, and among them the late Mr. Dargan, stated before the Commissioners that a saving of from £100,000 to £120,000 a year would be effected if the various railways were consolidated. The Commissioners inquired what were the real working expenses of the Irish railways at present, and found that they were on an average from 75 to 37 per cent; the Drogheda and Dublin was 40, and the Great Southern and Western was 43½. They thereupon took 42½ per cent, the mean between these two, and concluded that the Irish railways generally might be worked at that figure; and on pursuing the inquiry, they found the reduction would result in a saving of about £80,000, which, with the £260,000 already spoken of, would make a saving of £340,000, and with this the Government might commence to carry out any scheme they might determine upon for the reduction of the fares on the Irish railways, and the increasing the opportunities of using them. The next question was as to how the Government, after they had completed the purchase of the railways, should work them. The Belgian Government railways had been managed so satisfactorily that in 1885 it was probable that the whole of the capital would be re-paid, and that the State would be able to apply any revenue derived from them to the reduction of taxation. Nevertheless, we were aware that beside other objections a strong feeling prevailed in this country against any system of Government management; we therefore turned our attention to the view that had been put forward by some of the most able witnesses examined before the Royal Commission, among whom was Mr. Bidder, and came to the conclusion that it would be best to lease out the lines in accordance with the plan proposed by the late Lord Canning with regard to the Post Office contracts—namely, that the rent should be the interest of the debt contracted for the purchase, and that the company offering the largest reduction on rates and charges, and giving the greatest accommodation to the public, should be accepted as lessee; but persons of great authority said it would be impossible to induce companies to form themselves for the purpose of competing for the Irish railway system unless a lease of some length—say, from twenty to twenty-five years—were offered. To let a lease for so long was, of course, out of the question until whatever scheme was decided on had been tried; it was therefore decided that the best plan would be to work the system by a Commission appointed by both Houses of Parliament for a short time, and when the system was consolidated, and so brought into economical working order, no doubt there would be ample competition. The next question was the finishing and making of new lines. In our opinion, the Government ought to have nothing to do with either the one or the other. To do anything of the kind would lead to endless jobs; but the Government should have, as Mr. Drummond proposed it should have under his scheme, an absolute veto upon the construction of new lines. In cases where new lines were constructed, the representatives of the Government should be obliged to work them, provided those lines paid their working expenses, and, if there were any profits realized, those profits should be distributed in the way in which it was customary to do so under arrangement between different railway companies. Such were the principal recommendations made to the Crown, and nothing could have been fairer than the way in which the Government received them. It was, of course, impossible for the Government to take any decided steps in the matter without appointing a Commission to ascertain the condition and the exact value of the railways; he believed his noble Friend (Lord Naas) had stated that such a conclusion had been come to by the Government; his noble Friend felt as strongly as he how vitally important this matter was to Ireland. [Lord Naas: Hear, hear!] It touched every class in the community. In the hope that his noble Friend would be able to give some satisfactory answer to him, he asked the Question of which he had given Notice as to whether the Government intended to propose any measure for the consolidation of the Irish railway system?

Lord NAAS said, his right hon. Friend had not in the least exaggerated the great importance of this question to Ireland. There was, in fact, no question upon which all parties in that country were more thoroughly agreed than that something ought to be done with regard to the state of Irish railways, with a view to their being placed in a more satisfactory condition than at present; and he quite agreed with all his right hon. Friend had stated with regard to the great evils which had arisen on account of the want of consolidation of these railways; he would say also that the thanks of the country were due to his right hon. Friend for the trouble he had taken in the matter from the time when it was first mooted. The whole capital of the railways of Ireland was originally something like £27,000,000, but that was comparatively a small sum compared with that of England. Small, however, as that sum was, it was distributed over a number of lines, which were worked by separate Boards of Directors, and the consequence was that little or no attention was paid to the convenience of the public as to the mode in which they dealt with the traffic. That was always the case where there were many Boards of Directors, because whether or not they had separate interests, they always imagined they had, and looked with jealousy towards others, whether they were injurious to them or not. The first thing that strikes every one in considering this subject was the different managements and varieties of interest. They had, in dealing with this subject, to consider whether the anticipations that had been raised as to the advantages that must immediately occur from centralization would be altogether realized, or would lead to an immediate and extensive reduction of fares. A considerable reduction might, of course, be made; but it would be found impossible to realize the extravagant expectation which prevailed of a reduction of 30 or 35 per cent. Any alteration in the Irish railway system must be gradual to be effective; the reduction of fares must be a tentative process, because nothing would defeat the end in view so successfully as an endeavour to carry on the traffic at a loss on the working expenses. The subject must be dealt with in a business-like manner, and that, he believed, was in accordance with the views of his right hon. Friend. He was sure the House would not expect him to follow his right hon. Friend through all the details of his plan. That plan had been fairly considered; but with regard to the action of the Government, he was sure the House would be of opinion that it would be perfectly impossible for them, at the present late period of the Session, to invite Parliament to take into consideration a subject of such great importance. Indeed, if the House were now at the commencement of the Session, according to even the right hon. Gentleman himself, it would be impossible for the Government to propose a distinct scheme to Parliament without having more information on which to proceed than they now possessed. Before any steps were taken in the matter it would, he thought, be necessary that the Government should adopt some effective means to inquire into the accuracy of the statements which had been made in regard, not only to the financial position, the revenues, and the working expenses of the Irish railways, but also as to the position of the rolling stock and all the property belonging to the various lines. It was of the utmost consequence that a rigid inquiry should be instituted for the purpose of obtaining that information. He found that by the 5th section of the Act of 1844 it was provided that all railways should after a specified period make certain Returns as to their position and publish the accounts of their receipts and expenditure. Seventeen lines, extending over 952 miles in Ireland, were now liable to that provision; sixty-four miles of railway were not liable to it inasmuch as they were finished before the Act was passed, and there were 775 miles not liable as yet in consequence of the eighteen years prescribed by the Act not having expired since they were constructed. It was, under these circumstances, the intention of the Government to appoint, through the medium of the Treasury, in conformity with the provisions of the Act of 1844, certain competent persons to make the inquiries indicated by the 5th section. The Government also proposed, inasmuch as there was so large a proportion of the Irish lines at present outside the provisions of the Act, to lay before Parliament a short Bill which would enable the Commissioners appointed by the Treasury to exercise precisely the same powers in their case as the Act provided in the case of others. He intended to ask leave to-morrow to introduce this Bill. It would be a very short one; but he thought it would confer all the powers necessary in order to make the inquiry which he indicated. It would contain, perhaps, one additional power—namely, the power to summon all the witnesses before them whom they might deem it expedient to summon, and to examine them if they should think fit. Those Commissioners would, therefore, be empowered to examine into all financial matters connected with the railways in Ireland. There was, he might add, another Act which enabled the Board of Trade to inspect the works of a line. The provisions of that Act it was also proposed to extend to the present inquiry, so that the Commissioners would be enabled to investigate a very important branch of the subject, the exact state of the lines themselves, and to form a judgment as to the sums which it would be necessary to expend for the purpose of placing them in complete working order. If Parliament should see fit to agree to this proposal of the Government, he thought that by the commencement of next Session he should be in a position to lay before the House an accurate and full account of all the Irish railways, the exact value of the property and state of the lines, and, if Parliament should wish to take up the question either of purchasing or leasing them, the precise sum of money which would be required to carry out that object. The Government would, as far as possible, endeavour to engage in the inquiry the assistance of the ablest and most experienced men whom they could procure. It was an inquiry which was, in his opinion, absolutely necessary as a preliminary step, and he hoped the House would not think he was called upon to say anything further beyond the statement that the subject continued to engage the most anxious consideration of the Government. He could assure the House, both for himself and his Colleagues, that they were fully sensible of its enormous importance, and that they were desirous, as soon as they possessed the requisite information, to deal with it efficiently.

Mr. LANYON said, the plan which had been sketched in the House was one which met the approval of every class in Ireland. He was prepared to offer statistics to the House, if necessary, to confirm the views of the right hon. Member for Limerick; but after the statement of the noble Lord the Secretary for Ireland, he would only congratulate the Government on the step which they were about to take, and which he thought was a liberal instalment of that policy he expected from the present administration.

Mr. J. B. SMITH said, he had no objection to the introduction of the Bill to which the noble Lord had alluded; but must urge on the Government the necessity of great caution before pledging themselves to the purchase of Irish railways. There were English railways in distress as well as Irish, and it was but fitting that the one should be left to take the same means as the other to get over their difficulties.

Mr. HORSFALL, as one of the Members of the Royal Commission, protested against the course which the right hon. Gentleman had taken upon himself, in attacking that Commission.

Mr. MONSELL denied that he had made any attack on the Commission.

Mr. HORSFALL said, the right hon. Member had attacked the Report of the Commission in a most unwarrantable manner. The right hon. Gentleman ought to have had the common courtesy to have intimated to the Members that he intended to bring their Report under the consideration of the House; and when this was done in accordance with the usages of the House, he (Mr. Horsfall) would be fully prepared to defend that Report. The Royal Commission sat for nearly two years; but the right hon. Gentleman, although he attended the investigation for a portion only of two days, succeeded in getting his Report adopted as the Report of the dissentient portion of the Committee. He hoped the day was very far off when the Government should take charge of Irish railways. When they did so, they would confer on Ireland, not a boon, but the very reverse.

Mr. LEVESON-GOWER, although one of the Commissioners, did not rise to defend either them or their Report. He had no notice that the Report was to be attacked; and he would leave the defence in abler hands. Although he signed the Report, stating the opinion of the Commission was that the purchase of the Irish railways by the Government would be objectionable, he would be really glad if any scheme could be framed that would be beneficial to the people of Ireland; but he was afraid that what had been stated to-night would raise expectations which would never be realized. The more he considered the subject, the more he was convinced that the purchase of the Irish railways would be no advantage to the country. He understood his right hon. Friend's scheme to be, that these railways should be acquired by the State at a certain number of years' purchase upon the dividends now paying. Well, nothing could be more fallacious.

Mr. MONSELL said, he had distinctly stated that the principle upon which they were to be purchased should be their value.

Mr. LEVESON-GOWER: That was a very vague principle, and he was afraid that it would be very difficult of explanation. As to amalgamation, if it was likely to be so beneficial, why on earth did not the Irish shareholders adopt it as English shareholders did? All the evidence taken by the Royal Commission went to show that an immense advantage would arise from the general lowering of fares; but the noble Lord opposite stated that a lowering of fares was not likely to be carried out. For what purpose, then, was all that evidence taken, if it were not to be acted upon?

Mr. LAING said, that as it was important that the Legislature should arrive at some sound practical conclusion next Session, it might be convenient that those intimately acquainted with railways should offer a few suggestions on this occasion. It seemed to him that the chance of arriving at a sound conclusion on the subject depended, not merely on the Government collecting information during the Recess, but on their applying their minds to a consideration of the subject so as to tell Parliament at their next meeting that they were ready to propose a scheme for their adoption. The first thing was to dismiss from the mind all notion of analogy between Irish and English railways. If anything at all was to be done in the matter, it was not to be done on principles adapted to English railways. His own feeling was adverse to State interference on behalf of distressed railways. Whatever might be the result of our legislation with regard to railways in England, it was too late to go back and introduce the system adopted in France, or recommended in the Report of Lord Dalhousie. Railways in this country must, he believed, be left very much on the footing of private enterprize. Whether Ireland were in such an exceptional position that the assistance of Government could be advantageously given, without the risk of incurring any heavy loss to the Exchequer, was another question. During the Irish famine, and some years afterwards, things were done which were not justifiable according to the principles of political economy, and would not be justifiable in England. The recommendation of the Commission in favour of cheap fares seemed to be regarded as of very little value. That Commission was appointed to investigate a question raised by Mr. Galt, whether Government ought not to purchase railways generally; and the Commissioners, in reporting against such purchase, threw overboard the Irish question, and recommended the introduction of cheap fares. He (Mr. Laing) thought that great advantage would result in a country like Ireland from a lower railway tariff. It would not be worth while to run counter to the ordinary rules of political economy unless they did not a little thing but a great thing—unless they established a tariff approaching that of the cheapest railway tariff in Europe—namely, that of Belgium. If the Irish railways could be purchased by the State for £20,000,000, the money being obtained at 3½ per cent, £700,000 would be required for the annual interest; and if in this way Ireland could obtain a cheap tariff on railways, then, in his judgment, looking at the whole political and social circumstances of Ireland, it would be worth while to throw overboard the maxims of political economy, and take an exceptional view of Ireland. He would, therefore, suggest to the Government to consider carefully whether, if they did anything at all, they should go even farther than the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Limerick. That scheme was, that after the railways had been taken by the Government, and worked for a time by Commissioners, the future working should be put up to tender. He would suggest that this tendering should be for working the line at a tariff already fixed at a low rate. What the Government would have to guard against would be the making of too bad a bargain for the British taxpayers by buying insolvent railways at too high a rate. If the immediate loss did not go beyond such a sum in the first ten years as might reasonably be expected to be recouped in the next ten, then he thought the British public would not object. But he thought they might make a large reduction of tariff without any material risk of a heavy loss to the public. The net revenue was now £900,000. Well, if the tariff were made very low, the amount reduced would not be all loss; something would be got back by increased traffic. Suppose they lost one-third, there would be £600,000 left. But if there were thirty-five companies it was not an out-of-the-way expectation that there would, by amalgamation, be a saving effected of £2,000 a company, or £70,000 in all, and this would nearly make up the required £700,000 a year. It was clearly a question for inquiry, and he hoped the Government would give their best attention to it during the Recess, so that when Parliament met next year some scheme might be produced by which the Irish railways might be purchased at a fair price, with a prospect of their being worked at a low tariff. Very great political and social benefits would, he was sure, result from such a measure.

Sir FREDERICK HEYGATE said, he considered that the importance of this question was so great that it ought to be the subject of a rigid inquiry into the condition of the Irish railways, both as regarded the lines themselves and the rolling stock. Looking upon it as one of political expediency, they ought to consider whether it was not worth while to do more for the Irish railways than they did for the English? The House seemed quite to have forgotten what had been done in the case of the Indian railways. He believed that only 2 per cent of the holders of stock in those railways were natives; and it was by means of British capital, guaranteed by the revenues of the Government, that those railways had been constructed. The same, he understood, had been done to some extent in the case of the Canadian railways. Surely Ireland had quite as much claim upon the Parliament as India. He looked upon the question of purchasing the Irish railways by the Government with doubt and apprehension, because in the first place he was not an advocate for Government management generally, and secondly, he doubted whether they would be worked in such a manner as to be profitable to the country. He was rather inclined to think that if they purchased the lines and leased them, they would fall into the hands of some great English company who would work them more with a view to their own interests than to the interests of Ireland. Some preferable plan might be adopted by way of guaranteeing the capital advanced at a low rate of interest, coupled with the condition that the railways should run a Government train once a day as they did in England, and giving greater postal facilities. The adoption of some such scheme might lead to the consolidation of the lines in a manner which would be greatly to the benefit of the country. In any case, however, the question had now become an Imperial one; something must be done, and done efficiently, and he was not sorry that the question was to be left over for another year, because he was convinced that by that time the railways would be in such a condition that it would be impossible for the Government to remain passive. The difficulty they had to encounter in dealing with the Irish railways was, that they were dealing with a country in which, from political circumstances, capital was not forthcoming, because in all probability capital would be equally shy in England if circumstances were the same. There was also a declining population in Ireland, which was not the case in England. That the condition of the railways was attributable to a great extent to those causes was proved by the fact that in the neighbourhood of Belfast, where trade was active and the population not decreasing, the railways were prosperous, and the shareholders were by no means in favour of the proposition that the Government should purchase them. Indeed, for fifty miles round Belfast trade was active and the railways largely increasing. In conclusion, he would only say that he thought the Commissioners had fallen into an error in underrating the value of the mineral and coal traffic that might be developed on the Irish railways. In the part of the country where he lived, for instance, a large weaving establishment had been erected, involving the use of extensive machinery, worked by steam, and the coal had to be brought twenty or thirty miles by train to the place, and in this and many similar cases upon the price of the carriage depended whether the works could be profitably carried on or not. For his own part, he believed that the trade and prosperity of Ireland were capable of indefinite extension, and that nothing would more conduce to it than an improvement in her railway system.

MR. CHILDERS said, no subject could be more important than proper principles of legislation in reference to railways, but Parliament had not been successful in dealing with it. Rather more than twenty years ago the question as a whole had come under the consideration of Parliament under the auspices of the Government of Sir Robert Peel. Under the advice of the late Lord Dalhousie and of his hon. Friend the Member for Wick, a scheme had been devised which would have enabled a consistent line of policy on this question to be pursued, giving a department of Government a proper voice in the matter. The only sensible alternative was free trade in railways; due regard being had to the rights of landowners and to conditions of safety for the public; but neither course had been followed. They had allowed the legislation upon railways to be effected by Committees, at the instance of the companies themselves, acting under the advice of able lawyers, and there had been from year to year new lines sanctioned without the adoption of any uniform system, either as respected the principles on which permission to make new lines was granted, the financial arrangements, the tariff, or the nature of the securities. The consequence had been that in the present year they had witnessed a state of things which had probably never been paralleled in the history of England. It was of the utmost importance that on questions of this kind Parliament should be fully advised in the first instance, before it took any particular course. He thought Parliament should require very much fuller information upon the question before they decided to adopt a principle which was not in force in any other country to the extent proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. It would be a great misfortune for the owners of Irish railways were the present Government to hold out at present any promise that they would adopt the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, and therefore he had heard with satisfaction the cautious statement of the noble Lord, in which he merely pledged the Government to inquire further into the question. As they were aware, it was in the power of the Government, under the Act of 1844, to purchase all railways in England after the 21st year of their existence, and the same Act provided that three years previously the Government should be furnished by each company with a detailed account of its capital and income, its receipts and expenditure, distinguishing between the main line and branches. Several of the railways came under the provisions of the Act five or six years ago, but they had never made any such Returns, and when he was at the Treasury last year he made some inquiry as to the reason of the omission. The answer he received was, that as the Railway Commission was then sitting, it would be improper for the

Treasury to interfere. He considered that as Parliament had laid down the principle, it was the duty of the Treasury, in conjunction with the Board of Trade, to ascertain whether under the present system of Private Bill legislation it was possible for the railway companies to comply with that provision, and if not, they ought to consider whether it was worth while to retain such enactment on the statute book? He hoped, therefore, that the Government would extend any inquiry made into the condition of the Irish railways to the English lines also. While addressing the House upon this subject, he wished to point out what he regarded as being the chief reason for the failure of the Irish railway system. It might be stated as an axiom in railway finance that no lines pay well which did not run between great centres of industry—through large mining or manufacturing districts, or between populous inland towns and the sea. The financial position of English railways which did not fulfil those conditions was in almost every case unsatisfactory, and it would be found impossible, by any change of system, to make the Irish railways which ran through extensive agricultural districts profitable undertakings. Ireland was in the condition of an almost exclusively agricultural country, and no just comparison could be drawn between it and Belgium, which was comparatively one of the richest countries in the world, teeming with population engaged in manufactures. The truth was that the present unsatisfactory condition of the Irish railways was not solely owing to mismanagement, or the subdivision of management, but also to the fact that a larger mileage of expensively built railways had been laid down than an agricultural country could bear — there not being sufficient traffic to produce interest upon the capital that had been expended. He had introduced this subject for the purpose of giving the Government an additional inducement to fully inquire into the whole question before they committed the country to any definite course upon this important question.

MR. M'LAREN said, that the observations made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) seemed to him of rather a startling character, since he began by laying down sound principles, and saying that any Bill brought before the House should have reference to the United Kingdom generally, and not to Ireland merely, but ended by saying that all our notions of political economy should be thrown to the winds for the sake of Ireland. With regard to the proposal to reduce the railway fares in that country 30 or 35 per cent, which it was said would assimilate them to those of Belgium, anyone who had attended to the operation of rates for railway fares must see that it was utterly fallacious. He (Mr. M'Laren) had had a good deal of experience in these matters, and, as a Director, had attended to the traffic for a number of years on a line of railway which passed through several important districts—some of them populous, and others thinly peopled. The result of his observations was to convince him that wherever a railway passed through a thickly-peopled country such as Belgium you might reduce the fares to almost any extent, and increase the traffic proportionably, thus making up a great part of the loss, if not the whole. The reason was that parties would go short distances in a populous country to do their business themselves, instead of writing or employing an agent to do it for them. In districts containing many towns the traffic might thus be increased indefinitely, and an instance might be found in the line between Newcastle and Shields, where, though the fares were fabulously low, the railway paid more per mile than other parts of the line where the fares were three times as high. From Glasgow to Greenock also the fares were very low, yet the line paid a higher rate per mile than any other in the district. But to apply this principle to thinly-peopled districts, as in Ireland, was most absurd, because there the people would not travel, having no business or adequate motive. It was not a reduction of 2*s.* 6*d.* or 7*s.* 6*d.* on a journey of 100 miles which would induce any one to undertake such a journey; but if you could reduce the fares to 1*s.* or 6*d.* for a journey of a few miles in thickly-peopled districts, many would then have no scruple in travelling ten times a week if they found occasion. The same reasoning applied to the goods traffic. The locomotive conveyed 200 tons of goods, on an average, at a cost of 1*s.* per mile. It was evident that with a load of 200 tons it could convey them very cheaply; but suppose that in Ireland not more than 100 tons—or more probably 50 tons—of goods could be obtained to carry, the expense per ton must be proportionably greater, because the total cost for locomotive power would be as great for the small load as for the full load. It would, therefore, be of no avail to reduce fares by 30 per cent. If the people of Ireland wished to derive the utmost possible advantage from the railways that had been constructed, the plain system was to unite them by Act of Parliament, and to let the Commissioners appointed to manage them divide the net profits of the united lines according to the average earnings of the three previous years. That principle of amalgamating a system of important railways had been adopted many years ago with the lines centreing at York and Newcastle, and it was the right principle to adopt in Ireland. Then where reduced rates were found advisable, as the result of experience, the people of Ireland would derive the benefit; but he objected most decidedly to the railway shareholders of Ireland coming and putting their hands into the national purse, and claiming assistance which would not be conceded to those of England and Scotland. The right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Motion said that something should be done for Ireland, because, as compared with England, it was a small country, but Scotland was still smaller. There had lately been two distressed Scotch railways before Parliament—the North British and the North of Scotland, and if the distressed railways of Ireland were to be assisted, why should not these two, which had a capital amounting to two-thirds of that of all the Irish railways? Then there were the London, Chatham, and Dover and the Great Eastern Railways, of which the united capital was greater than that of all the Irish railways; and why should they not be assisted on the same principle? He objected to this kind of sectional legislation, holding that justice ought to be done to Ireland in matters of far greater importance than cobbling up bankrupt railways. This was a scheme introduced to take away the attention of the people of Ireland, who demanded justice in the questions of the Land tenure and the Established Church. Because the House refused or hesitated to do justice in these matters, it was now proposed to treat the people of Ireland like children, offering them sweetmeats to still their crying for other griefs.

Mr. HENLEY observed. that the hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) had stated that the general railway system of the United Kingdom had been a complete failure. Now, he took the liberty of protesting against that statement. [Mr. Childers: I said financially.] If they had been a failure, they had, on the other hand, conferred an enormous benefit on the country. If the development of our roads and canals for the last hundred years had been as financially disastrous to the persons who undertook them as the railway system had been, still the enormous gain to the community had far over-balanced any possible loss in that direction; and where parties, for the sake of their own private gain, laid out their own money, or induced others to spend money for their own private gain, he did not think the country ought to be called upon to come in and stop the gap. He was glad to hear that his noble Friend was prepared to make an inquiry into the subject, but should be sorry to see the Government take these matters into their own hands. It would be the greatest curse to the country that could happen, whether it was done in Ireland or in England.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down said that it would be a great mistake on the part of the Government to take into its hands the business of promoting the formation of railways, instead of leaving it to private enterprize. Now, that is a general principle, and, like all general principles—even the soundest—ought not to be pushed too rigidly and too universally, regardless of the peculiar circumstances of particular countries. If we look to the case of India, there are few among us who would think it has been unwise on the part of the Government to run very considerable pecuniary risks in order to promote railways in that country. Again, in some countries of Europe it is very likely that the intervention of Government has been perfectly justifiable. Even in Belgium, which has been mentioned this evening as being one of the richest countries in the world, and one in which the most signal successes have been achieved in regard to railways, I believe the interference of Government was of a most important and vital character. It is very difficult indeed to deal with general principles in reference to this subject; but, with respect to Ireland, I think it perfectly right that the formation of railways should be left to private enterprize. As to the question before us, we are not called upon to pledge ourselves to anything; but still I think it is desirable that some ideas which tend to encumber the consideration of it should be put aside. In the first place, it is to be assumed that we are considering this as a question of a principle which is applicable to Ireland and not to England. Now, with respect to Ireland, we have not, up to the present moment, pursued the same rule as in England, because we had become creditors of the Irish railways to a very large extent, having made loans to them at a low rate of interest. The mere ground of the actual embarrassment of Irish railway shareholders is no ground for the interference of Parliament; it is not for the Government to relieve their embarrassments more than those of any other distressed class. But then, again, I think it should be understood that under no circumstances should a question of this kind be entertained if it was likely to end in the management of railways by Government. I do not think there are any questions of expediency or policy which should be allowed to influence this House to permit Government interference in the Irish railways to end in their management of them. If Government is to become the proprietors of these railways, I apprehend, independently of the high authority of the hon. Member for Wick — and it is a high authority upon these matters—that it is evident there would be no difficulty whatever in providing for the management and conduct of them by independent parties. In my own opinion, we require very powerful considerations to justify even as much as is now about to be done, because we are about to call for information respecting Irish railways, not merely upon the general ground that railways are a matter of public interest, and the more information we have about public interests the better, but likewise there are circumstances and features of speciality in the case of the Irish railways as to make it desirable to examine their case more minutely, and to convey to certain parties greater powers to conduct that examination than we could give in the case of the English railways. When the Government propose their Bill I shall give my assent to that Bill, and we shall merely be affirming, to a certain extent, the existence of special circumstances in connection with the Irish railways which may hereafter form the foundation for special legislation. I think the effect of that inquiry will be, not to decide, but to raise for the decision of Parliament a question of great importance—namely, the question whether, upon grounds not connected with railway interest as such, but upon Imperial grounds connected with the general condition of Ireland and its relations to this country, it may be worth our while to depart, in a particular instance, from the ordinary economical rules upon which we act with respect to the interference of Government, and to make an experiment which, besides being a departure from those ordinary rules, may involve a certain amount of pecuniary risk to the Exchequer. I wish to convey my own concurrence in the observations of the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing). He said: "Do not contemplate this inquiry at all, and do not entertain any question of this special character, if the experiment you mean to make is to be small." No small experiment can justify a departure of that kind. If we were to embark in this matter—upon which I give no opinion at present—it must be with a view to great and important results. My hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) has pointed out the difference between applying the principle of low fares in the hope of augmentation of traffic in thinly-populated districts, and applying the same principle with the same hope in thickly-peopled mining districts, and I trust the noble Lord will supply us with all the light upon the subject that he can possibly obtain. The question is as to whether, by a large reduction of fares, partly upon passengers, and much more upon goods of all descriptions, it is likely to stimulate, to a great extent, the industries of Ireland. If it cannot, the case at once falls through. If the evidence, however, lead to the conclusion that it is highly probable such stimulus would be given, I think an important question will come before the House as to whether it is wise to do in Ireland, under those circumstances, what, undoubtedly, none of us would dream of doing in England or Scotland? As regards the proposition of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Monsell), it is not so entirely novel as might be supposed, even if that proposition be, as I am inclined to think it would prove to be, one involving a risk to the Exchequer. We have for years, for generations, been endeavouring by the application of public money in forms not recognized in Great Britain, and which have been admitted only to a certain extent in Scotland, to stimulate Irish industry; but it has been by drifts, and it has necessarily been done with partiality. There has also been great inequality in the application, and very little success has followed. What has been done has had the effect of creating complicated arrangements and relations between particular places in Ireland and the Treasury, leading to a constant desire on the part of the inhabitants to obtain better terms, while on their part the Treasury have endeavoured to force upon those places a continuance of the terms then existing. A great deal of public money has been spent, and I must say spent in an unsatisfactory manner, for the development of traffic and industry in Ireland, without producing in the main that result. In fact, in many cases nothing but local dissatisfaction has been produced. Many of these transactions were necessarily small, and in a great degree secret, and not observed throughout their whole course by the public; therefore they did not fulfil one of the conditions which we deem necessary for a sound administration of the public funds. With respect to the Irish railways, at any rate, none of these objections apply. My right hon. Friend (Mr. Monsell) disclaims a demand for public aid; but I agree with the hon. Member for Wick that the public Exchequer should run some risk, and, if that risk should be run, I think a favourable comparison might be drawn between that mode of running risk and the mode which has hitherto been adopted, because whatever is to be done in this matter will be done in the face of day as an act of Imperial policy, and will be appreciated as such. It would not be done for the benefit of one class of the community of Ireland more than another—and the Government and Parliament would be responsible, and they would only agree to the measure at all after due and careful deliberation. I know of no way in which a benefit could be conferred upon an entire community better than by cheapening the means of railway communication. We must not rush, however, into any conclusion upon this subject without great consideration; but I think there are considerations of sufficient importance to warrant the preliminary steps which the Government propose to take, and I have only again to express a hope that the thinly-populated state of the country will be fully borne in mind by all who deal with the subject.

Mr. WHALLEY called the attention of the House to the proceedings of a Parliamentary Committee on the subject of Railways in 1863, and that Committee anticipated very distinctly that state of railway property which they had had to contemplate with so much regret during the last year or two. The course of legislation in this country with regard to railways involved greater difficulties and greater expense and risk in railway construction than was found in any other country in the world. It was established before that Committee, that in the construction of railways in Wales—a country no more favourably circumstanced in that particular respect than Ireland—out of a sum of £3,000,000, no less than half had been lost or needlessly spent through the risk and uncertainty attending the administration of railway property by Committees of that House, instead of there being some permanent department to administer it on certain fixed rules by which capitalists and others would know how to proceed. The monopolizing tendencies of the large railway companies had also proved a great difficulty in the way of developing the resources of certain districts by the construction of new lines. The system of private Bill legislation was the cause of great disaster and injury to railway property and a great hindrance to future enterprize in that direction, and it was sustained mainly by the influence of the great railway companies in order to increase the difficulty of constructing new lines by other persons. The subject was brought under the notice of Lord Palmerston, when he was at the head of the Government; but, after the full consideration of the capability of the Government to check the influence of the great railway companies and to deprive them of the benefit which they derived from the enormous expense, and risk, and uncertainty created by the system of Private Bill legislation, it was determined by the Government of the day that they were not strong enough to contend with that influence. It was only by a majority of 1 in the Committee which he had referred to that the business of Private Bill legislation was retained in that House; but it was by a majority of more than 1 that a Resolution was agreed to, at one time by that Committee, declaring that competition should not be regarded as a ground of objection when raised by great companies as against new railways. That Resolution, however, was afterwards rescinded — a circumstance altogether without precedent, he believed, in the history of Select Committees of that nature. As it was, the great companies, by means of Private Bill Committees, were able to subject other companies to a process of litigation which was, without exception, in the history of any country, the most costly, uncertain, and unsatisfactory of any judicial tribunal ever devised for any purpose whatever.

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN CATTLE INTO LIVERPOOL.—RESOLUTION.

MR. GRAVES rose to call the attention of the House to the restrictions which are placed on the importation of foreign cattle into Liverpool. He said, the present Orders in force for regulating the importation of cattle into Liverpool confined the imports to a single dock, and in the immediate vicinity of that dock, in an area of some two, three, or four acres, the cattle were obliged to be slaughtered on their landing. No animal could leave that space alive, and the consequence was that the trade were put to considerable expense by having to keep up two establishments for slaughtering. Liverpool had a population of 500,000, and it imported a very considerable number of foreign cattle. Some 1,500 head of cattle of one kind or another were conveyed daily to Liverpool, and it was necessary that every facility of egress and ingress should be given for passing that large number out of the town inland. The mere stoppage for twelve or twenty-four hours of that regular flow of cattle was attended with consequences prejudicial to the health of the town. Last year, when in consequence of the cattle disease it became necessary to put a complete stoppage upon any movement of cattle, the death-rate of Liverpool immediately increased, and the Government wisely relaxed those restrictions for the supply of the great manufacturing districts of Lancashire ; still the evil continued in its application to foreign cattle in a modified form. Now, he strongly maintained that, so long as a single instance of the disease lingered in any part of the country, the wisest policy was to lay down the most stringent precautions with a view to its extinction, and it was only because of the peculiar character of the cattle which were imported into Liverpool that he deemed it to be his duty to bring the subject under the notice of the House. The entire importation of foreign cattle into Liverpool last year, with the exception of about twenty beasts from other places, came from Spain and Portugal, and in those countries the cattle disease was unknown. The evidence given before the Committee which sat last year on Trade in Animals was so conclusive upon that point that the Committee inserted a special clause in their Report confirming the freedom from the disease which was enjoyed by Spain, and saying that there seemed to be no reason for the quarantine of cattle exported from that country. It should be remembered that the tendency of checking importations was to enhance the price of food ; and that in the great manufacturing districts of the North, which were so largely dependent upon the cattle trade of Liverpool, it was important to consider whether the restrictions employed were such as public interest demanded. He thought in this case, looking at the character of the cattle, the countries from which they were obtained, their freedom from disease, and the question of public policy and interest, it would be better if these restrictions were, if not entirely removed, at least modified. On these grounds, he ventured to make the Motion of which he had given notice. He had not extended it to cattle from any other countries than Spain and Portugal, because he was unwilling to introduce the possibility of danger; but if, on international grounds, there should be any objection to singling out the two countries he had named, then he would ask to extend the operation of the Motion to all countries, seeing that, as a fact, the foreign cattle trade of Liverpool was really confined to Spain and Portugal.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "Cattle arriving from Spain and Portugal may be removed by Rail from Liverpool to Manchester and Salford, under somewhat similar regulations to those in force at Harwich and Southampton for conveyance of Foreign Cattle to London,"—(*Mr. Graves,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. BAZLEY supported the Motion, as his sympathies were entirely in harmony on this point with those of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves). Manchester and Liverpool, he believed, were the centres for distributing animal food to as large a population as that which derived its supplies from London, but Manchester and Liverpool were denied those privileges in connection with the slaughtering of cattle which London enjoyed. As long as that difference remained, it was reasonable to suppose either that there was a want of information on the subject on the part of the Executive, or a direct intention to give to London a favour which was withheld from the North. The price of animal food in the North was so high that it was seriously injurious to the welfare of the people, and that price was very much enhanced by the restrictive importation. He complained of the difference which existed in the treatment of London and of the North. There ought to be one common and equal law on the point applicable to the whole of the kingdom. He hoped the Government would be able to accept the Motion of his hon. Friend, or at all events to do something which should remedy the existing state of things.

MR. COWEN agreed in the desirability of having one rule which should apply to all parts of the kingdom; but it was important, while the cattle disease was still raging in other parts of the world, that all cattle imported to this country should be slaughtered at the port to which it was brought. At Newcastle all cattle had to be slaughtered on the spot, and if there was a relaxation in one place it ought to extend to others. No doubt it was very desirable to do away with the existing restrictions altogether; but so long as the cattle disease continued in existence, the only safe course was to kill all cattle at the port of debarkation.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, he entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Newcastle, that the restrictions which the Government had been compelled to impose had been a very great burden upon the country, and had tended to raise the price of meat. But though there was the evil of that burden on the one hand, there was a still greater evil on the other—namely, the danger test. By removing the restrictions they might again let loose the cattle plague in this country. The restrictions were an evil, but the cattle plague was a still greater evil, and the Government had to choose between the two and take the least. The Government, he thought, ought not to run the risk of re-introducing the cattle plague. The hon. Member for Liverpool had, he admitted, made out a good *primâ facie* case, and he wished he could at once say he was in a position to meet his view of the matter. He would assume that the foreign cattle imported into Liverpool were chiefly Spanish; but he would remind the hon. Member that there was an international difficulty in this case, and that in consequence of the Favoured Nation Clause, the Sovereign of this country could not extend any favourable provision to one country which she did not extend to others; she could not say, "Let Spanish cattle come in, but let cattle from other nations be excluded." The hon. Member for Liverpool, recognizing the international difficulty in the case, had suggested that the terms of his Motion should be made to extend to cattle imported from all countries abroad. But they were bound to keep this great object in view—that so long as the cattle plague existed abroad, they should not allow the foreign cattle which came into England to mix with English cattle unless both were about to be slaughtered. That was the fundamental principle which guided the Privy Council. With regard to the course pursued at Harwich and Southampton, it should be remembered that at those places no market for home cattle was permitted, so that the foreign cattle could not possibly mix with English beasts. At Liverpool, there was a large home market and a great flow of cattle from Ireland; and if the restrictions were removed, what was to prevent Irish and foreign cattle from coming into contact with each other, or even from being conveyed to other places in the same train? If that were to happen, the seeds of the disease might easily be sown throughout the country again. With regard to the desire which Manchester had expressed to be placed in the same position as London, he would ask, was Manchester prepared to go to the expense to which London submitted, of having a cordon of police constantly drawn round the town to prevent the passage of any cattle outside the limits of the local authority? London was a special case. If cattle were slaughtered at the ports, the offal would not be sent up to London, and the poor would be deprived of a great portion of the food. Only the most expensive meat would be sent to London; for that would leave a greater margin of profit after paying the expenses. The East End would, therefore, have to buy more expensive meat. The sense of the House ought to be taken substantively on that important question before he could assent to such a Motion as this.

He could only assure his hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool that every restriction which the Government could safely remove they would remove, and they would endeavour to make those which prudence compelled them to maintain as light as possible, not only for Liverpool, but for all other places also. He only wished that the restriction which the hon. Gentleman complained of could be removed at once.

Mr. DODSON said, he was glad to hear the noble Lord express so earnestly his wish to remove every restriction which could safely and reasonably be removed. He wished, however, to remind the House that the price of food to the consumer was enhanced, not only by restrictions on the importation and removal of foreign cattle, but also by every restriction and impediment placed in the way of trade in our own cattle. Restrictions had been imposed both on foreign and home cattle; and if it was in the interest of the consumer to relax the one where it could be done with safety, it was also in the interest of the consumer to relax the other where it could be safely done. It seemed to him that relaxations could be given to our own traders at home with less danger than to foreign importers; for they were fairly entitled to assume that the cattle plague was introduced here from abroad, and the danger of its breaking out again, arose from the chance of its being re-introduced from abroad. Happily, the cattle plague had now very much abated, and he hoped the noble Lord and the Committee of the Privy Council would take it seriously into their consideration whether, both in the interests of the producer and the consumer, the time had not arrived when some considerable relaxation should be made in the restrictions on cattle at home. By the operation of the present system an advantage was given to foreigners over the home breeders of cattle. Foreign cattle were brought to Harwich and other ports, and from thence were brought directly up to the London market, whereas the home grazier was obliged, among other things, to run, perhaps, from one end of his county to another before he could obtain a license from a magistrate to remove his cattle from home.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: We have removed this restriction; any local authority can now appoint persons to grant licenses.

Mr. DODSON said, he was glad to hear that, and hoped that would be a step to still further relaxation. He wished to call the attention of the noble Lord to another matter. There were many districts of the country which were entirely free from the cattle plague—some districts had been free for more than a year—and he wished to know whether it was not possible to allow the free circulation of cattle within those districts. In Scotland cattle were allowed to be moved into England, but a cordon was drawn to prevent them passing from a foul to a clean district. He thought something of the same kind might be done in groups of counties in England.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he hoped, as soon as the Bill now before the House was passed, to be able to remove a great number of those restrictions.

Mr. GRAVES said, that after the satisfactory explanation which the noble Lord had given he would withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

NATIONAL ART COLLECTIONS.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Mr. COWPER, in drawing the attention of the House to this subject, said, the pressure of political questions during recent years had prevented due attention being paid to the proper exhibition of the national collections of art. It seemed to him that the present state of affairs in that respect presented a favourable opportunity for the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the best mode of classifying our art collections, which, if it were composed of gentlemen of judgment and experience, and represented our various art institutions, might prepare the way for future legislation, and provide materials which would enable the Government in the course of the ensuing Session to propose such measures as were requisite to insure an improved exhibition of those collections. The practical utility of these magnificent collections depended on an intelligible arrangement, and much of the enjoyment and pleasure to be derived from every collection, whether of science or art, depended, in a great degree, upon the logical order and the method in which the objects were exhibited. Without the systematic arrangement which led the observer through a connected series, the museum would fail in giving useful information, and would become a show to excite surprise and wonder. Every collection that increased must be re-arranged from time to time, and they ought to determine soon what was to be placed in the new buildings for pictures and other objects of art. Until within fifty years ago the British Museum was the only receptacle we possessed for collections belonging to the State, but since the National Gallery and the South Kensington Museum had been established, a sound system of classification had been adopted between the three Institutions. No other country in Europe had attempted to combine in one collection matters so heterogeneous as those in the British Museum, such as Antiquities and Statuary, with Natural History and Books, and he should suggest that in our future arrangements we ought to make as systematic a division as possible between our different museums. He wished to premise that the Motion he was about to make would only relate to the art collections. The collection in the British Museum illustrated the history of civilization among the Assyrians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans; and the South Kensington Museum, taking up the series, led us from the earliest ages of Christendom down to the present time, but contained no paintings, which were collected in the National Gallery. The only original drawings included in the National Gallery Collection were those by Turner, and it would be advisable to transfer to the National Gallery the valuable series of drawings by ancient masters which was now at the British Museum. As a mere matter of classification it was clear that those drawings should be contiguous to the paintings of the same epoch; so that when any person wished to study the picture by Perugino they might be enabled to pass from the finished picture to the original sketch from which it was painted. The study of these drawings was in his opinion as important to artists as that of the finished paintings, because they showed how the first conception of a subject by a great mind was gradually worked out into detail, while it was not improbable that the flashes of genius often shown in the first conception of a subject would infuse more light and life into the mind of the student than would the finished picture hanging on the walls of the National Gallery. These original drawings were now exhibited at the British Museum in a room which was much too small for their proper exhibition, and he hoped that a proper place would be provided for their reception in the new National Gallery. The subject was fully considered by the Committee of the House of Commons in 1860, when it was shown that no serious objection to this proposal would be offered on the part of the Trustees of the British Museum, or of any other persons who were interested in the matter. He should further suggest that the magnificent cartoons of Raphael, which were the most interesting original drawings in the world, should also be taken to the National Gallery. For a long time past they had been placed in a room utterly unworthy of them, and it was now time that proper honour should be paid them. The Hampton Court Collection of drawings, which included the Andrea Montegna drawing of the Triumph of Julius Cæsar, he should also wish to see removed to the National Gallery. He thought it important to call attention to this subject at the present moment, because in all probability next Session the First Commissioner of Works would propose a Vote for the erection of a new National Gallery, and it was necessary that the Government should first know what pictures would be exhibited in the new building. The designs which had been exhibited in the earlier part of the year were not the final plans for the new gallery; they were merely intended to assist in the solution of the problem how to erect a building well adapted for the exhibition of pictures and fitted to occupy that prominent site. Coming now to the arrangements of the new gallery, he hoped the Trustees would not think it their duty to exhibit all the pictures they possessed of the English school; for he thought it would be unfortunate if our national art should be represented by any but works of great merit. There was another collection which he thought should be transferred to the gallery. He meant those historical portraits which were at present in the Ornithological Gallery of the Museum, where they were quite out of place, and were not at all well seen. The National Portrait Gallery should be placed in the new building, but continue under a separate administration; for the principle upon which pictures were selected for it was entirely different from that which was acted upon by the trustees of the National Gallery. The portraits ought to be selected not for their merit as works of art, but only for the correctness with which they represented persons whom it was desirable on historical grounds to have remembered. With ample space it would be desirable where oil paintings could not be procured to have portraiture in prints—at all events, until an opportunity occurred of purchasing the pictures themselves. There was another museum which he had mentioned in his Motion—the Indian. That was one to which he thought more attention should be paid than it had yet received. At present it was a very interesting and valuable collection, illustrating the arts and manufactures of our Eastern possessions; and if it were extended so as to include Oriental art generally, it would become a very valuable source of instruction, particularly in its illustrations of the harmony of colour. The museum of Patents and Mechanical Inventions might be rendered a source of instruction, suggestion and amusement to mechanics. It should be extended in its purposes and objects, and it might be made exceedingly useful to inventors. The Museums in Edinburgh and Dublin had a relationship with that at South Kensington; and better arrangements should be made as to the objects which were to be exhibited in them. It would be necessary to obtain legislative sanction before the Trustees of the British Museum could surrender the objects which he proposed should be transferred from their keeping; but he apprehended there would be no difficulty about the matter; for there could be no doubt that the intentions of the donors would be carried out in the spirit, if not in the letter, if the objects of art to which he had referred were removed to the National Gallery.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words " an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions for the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider and report what portions of the National collections of Fine Art ought to be exhibited in the New National Gallery in Trafalgar Square; what provision ought to be made for the exhibition of the portraits belonging to the National Portrait Gallery; and what division ought to be adopted between the classes of objects to be hereafter exhibited in the following institutions :—The National Gallery, the British Museum, the South Kensington Museum, the Museum of Patents and Mechanical Inventions, the India Museum, the Edinburgh Museum of Science and Art, and the Museum of Irish Industry,"—(*Mr. William Cowper,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, in seconding the Motion, thanked the right hon. Gentleman for having introduced this subject to the notice of the House. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had stated the case of the National Portrait Gallery, in which he (Mr. Beresford Hope) felt personally interested, very fairly; it was not a collection of pictures as such, but of likenesses, and it ought to admit all methods of portraiture. No doubt, the House was rather scared at the very idea of a Royal Commission on the matter of our art collections. They, perhaps, were afraid it would be of a very permanent character—

"————Sedet eternumque sedebit"

one after another—he could not count how many. He confessed he was somewhat afraid of that suggestion himself. But now that they were, as it were, beginning a new era—now, as they were told, that they were approaching towards a state of beatific excellence, which was to be brought about through the means of a great measure, that was somewhere else that evening—he thought that they might devote a short time to the consideration of the question of the best disposition for the future of our artistic and scientific collections. He would chiefly confine what he had to say to the British and South Kensington Museums. The only allegation that had ever been brought against the British Museum was that of being heterogeneous. What did that imputation mean? Why, it could only mean when so applied that the British Museum was very large, ample, and complete. It was a collection of works of art and archæology of all ages and of scientific objects, with the addition of a library. It was a great magazine of human knowledge in every branch, and was under the management of an independent board. What was the harm of that constitution? What, he repeated, was the grievance of the British Museum being heterogeneous? There were two alleged grievances. One was that the Board of Trustees was not sufficiently varied in its composition to represent well the different objects of the institution. The other was that the building was not huge enough, and the area in which it stood was not large enough. Well, enlarge the area, erect new buildings, but place them under the Trustees, and as near as may be to the old central building in Great Russell Street. If they did not like that, place them elsewhere, under the same administration—a direct precedent for such an arrangement had recently been created; for within a quarter of a mile of the House, in a flat in Victoria Street, at that moment was to be found a branch of the British Museum—namely, a curious collection of palæontological remains known as the Christy Collection, bequeathed by a generous collector to the British Museum, and still remaining in the lodgings of the original proprietor. The relation of the greatest and most ancient of our public museums to other bodies of the same kind involved considerations too important to be slurred over in a hasty conversation. The British Museum had been subjected the last few years to an unnecessary and uncalled-for rivalry, in the creation of the independent national museum at South Kensington, which professed to monopolize the post-Christian schools of art. He would not now allude to the old stock South Kensington grievance, which sometimes amused, and more often bored the House. He had not one word to say against, and much to urge in favour of, the accumulation in itself. It was a magnificent collection in the mediæval and renaissance departments of art; and, he might say, that some years ago, before it had reached its present excellence, it had to himself been pronounced by that high authority on mediæval art, Count de Montalembert, to be unrivalled in Europe, and superior to the museum of the Hotel de Cluny; but, apart from what it contained, the institution was faulty in its organization, for, after all, the museum was a sort of little pet lamb in the hands of each varying President and Vice President of the Committee of Council upon Education—a plaything to be dealt with by successive administrations. It was destitute of the stability, and the method by which it might be distinguished, if it were united to the parent body under the solid, well-organized management of the Trustees of the British Museum. The two museums ought to be amalgamated. It was said against that that there was a clear and well-defined difference between them. The British Museum, we were told, contained specimens of art anterior to the Christian era, and South Kensington specimens of art after that era. He protested against the severance of these great periods of art, as tending to discourage the philosophic study of the world's progress; because if they wished to appreciate art, as students of history, they ought to see the productions of all ages and times as much as possible in one repository. That might be very easily and simply attained by the South Kensington Museum being handed over with all its liabilities to the British Museum. Then, of course, the renaissance and mediæval collection there would be amalgamated with that at the British Museum, while, as a matter of course, the Board of Trustees would be enlarged by the addition of representatives of those schools. If we desired to study art, so as to embrace as far as possible the history of all ages, it was of the utmost importance that we should have the materials for that study laid side by side in one grand panorama, and that we should get rid of the pedantry which led to our having one epoch illustrated at South Kensington, and another at the British Museum. He, for himself, objected to having a broad line drawn between the progress of the human race before the great revelation of Christianity and since that event. To draw such a line was an injury at once to Christianity and to Paganism. Unspeakable as were the benefits of the revelation of salvation—immeasurably superior as was the condition of the world after, as compared with what it was before, the Christian era—still it was the same, and not another human race that was thus purified. Christian art was built on that of previous ages; and therefore, in order to understand the very fact of Christianity, it was requisite to connect—not separate—the two. Such a separation would be eminently unphilosophical; and yet it was the principle which governed the distinct organization of South Kensington, and forbad our whole public art stores to form, as it were, one grand focus of the history and advancement of civilization and art from the year 1 in the history of the world to the year 1867 of the Christian Era. Such an amalgamation would go far to allay and soften the prejudices which art disputants of various schools entertained, and to put an end to the bitter disputes and controversies which had reigned between mediævalists, gothicists, and the admirers of other art "isms" by placing all forms and developments of art on the one broad grand basis of truth and beauty, visible in one universal collection. Any Minister, accordingly, who could bring representative art into one institution would confer a most important service, not only on the country, but on mankind at large. Of course, he did not mean to dismantle the new building down at Brompton, or transfer its contents to Great Russell Street. There it was, and the precedent of the Christy Collection justified the British Museum in having branch establishments. On the contrary, he would bring down to South Kensington those objects of post-Christian art which were now on exhibition at the old institution.

But here another aspect of the question came into view. The Kensington Museum depended on its art schools; and its collection of antiquities was intermingled with the study museum of casts and copies and models. In order to effect a real reformation, the two must be divided, for a great distinction was to be drawn between things which were only intended to be exhibited as art specimens, and things which were intended to be copied and to form the basis of art education. The art schools at South Kensington need not be meddled with; but left where they were, and as they were. Then the Kensington Collection, building and all, might be handed over to the British Museum. Nothing was more fallacious than the idea that study museums and art museums ought to be, or would ever advantageously be, part of the same institution. The artistic collections he would place under the British Museum, and the teaching schools he would retain as at present, unless the Royal Academy could be made strong and competent enough, as he thought it might be, to take the burden on itself, under the general control of that Minister of Art of whom he proposed shortly to speak. There was no objection to those portions of the collection at South Kensington deposited there on loan being received on the same terms by the British Museum; in fact, that principle was already recognized there, for the famous Portland Vase was on deposit, and not the property of the nation. He could give an instance from his own experience of the working of that incongruity. He had taken part some years since in the creation of a large and valuable collection of architectural casts for the use of architects and art-workmen. Its possessors deposited it on loan at Brompton, and year after year urged the authorities there to take it up as the nucleus of a study architectural museum on a national scale. But the Exhibition feeling was too strong in their minds, and, while desirous of a collection of casts, they wished to confine it to large objects, like the Pisan Pulpit, the Compostella Doorway, and Gray's Tomb, which the million who visited South Kensington would notice and admire. This was a very good thing in its way; but it was not all that was wanted for the practical student who had to learn the details which he himself was called on to carry out. The upshot was that after a time he and his friends, finding it impossible to bring South Kensington to their views, had been driven to make a home for themselves on their own resources.

To give effect to the desired change there must be a reform of the official department. There must be a Minister of Art responsible to the nation, strong enough to deal with the whole question of national art. At present they had only one Minister and two half-Ministers of Art—namely, the First Commissioner of Works and the President and Vice President of the Committee of Council, if, indeed, either of the latter was more than half of a semi-Minister. The Lord President ought to be returned to the department of general education, while the Vice President should sink into a Parliamentary Secretary. Then the art education of the country would be handed over to another Minister, the recent date of whose office, even on its present basis, had now almost been forgotten. Till 1832 the Board of Works had a permanent head, and, as might be supposed, jointly vegetated under the influence of clique and prejudice. At that date its architectural duties were transferred to an already existing official, who changed with the Ministry of the day, although his duty was merely that of land steward of the hereditary estates of the Crown — the First Commissioner of Woods and Forests. Then, again, he believed during Earl Russell's first Ministry, the original duties of the office were placed in the hands of permanent administrators, and the First Commissioner became the Minister of national architecture. Let him now be bidden to add to that the cognate duties of the Department of Science and Art with, as his permanent councils of advice to support and to instruct him, a strengthened and enlarged British Museum, a strengthened and enlarged Royal Academy, and a vigorous Institute of Architects. The present combination of art teaching and of primary education, under the same department of the State, had produced a great deal of perplexity and official paralysis, and placed this country at a thorough disadvantage compared with France and other Continental realms. Until they separated their art collections from art teaching, and primary education from both, England, with all her good intentions, never could take her proper place amongst the artistic nations of the world. If the Ministry of Art and Architecture were placed on its proper footing of dignity and emolument, good men could be got for the superintendence of that department as well as for others, because young men who were ambitious would read up for it as they did now for the Treasury, the Colonies, or the Foreign Department. Let the noble Lord the First Commissioner of Works take the matter in hand in the Recess, and carry out the reforms which he had suggested, and then he would be deserving of a statue by the side of Canning.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, that the right hon. Gentleman who brought forward the present subject had made so clear a statement with regard to all the collections, excepting that of the Patent Museum, embraced within the terms of his Motion, that it was plain there could not be that absolute necessity for the further inquiry indicated by the Motion, and he thought, therefore, that it would be the duty of the Government to decide on their own responsibility each point as it arose. It would be strange if it were otherwise, for during the last few years there had been no less than eleven Commissions or Committees investigating every one of these subjects. There had been five on the British Museum, three on the National Gallery; in 1860 there had been a Committee on South Kensington Museum, and in 1864 a Committee on the Patent Office and a Committee on the Irish Museum. There was a Committee in 1860 with respect to the drawings of the Old Masters in the British Museum; and that Committee clearly indicated their opinion that those drawings had better be transferred to any building which might be erected for the purposes of a National Gallery. He believed that such was also the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, and he did not suppose that anyone would be disposed to question the soundness of that view. With respect to the general question of the separation of the collections in the British Museum, it was only the other night that the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that early next Session the Government would be prepared to come

forward with a distinct proposal on that subject, and he could not but think that the appointment of a Commission now would only tend to embarrass the action of his right hon. Friend in that respect. The question of the Irish Museum had been completely settled by the department acting upon the recommendation of the Committee of 1864, as would appear from the 14th Report of the Science and Art Department just circulated, while so far as respected the National Portrait Gallery, Lord Stanhope had shown conclusively that it ought not to be placed with the general collection of pictures in the National Gallery; that its purpose would be destroyed if such a course were adopted, and therefore that it ought to have a home of its own, though probably under the same roof as the National Gallery. The Indian Museum was of course under the control of the Secretary of State and Council for India, and he had no doubt that ample accommodation had been provided in the new India Offices for the accommodation of that valuable and interesting collection. In conclusion, he reminded the right hon. Gentleman that when he was himself in office, two years ago, and a discussion arose in the House on a cognate question—namely, the relation between the Royal Academy and the National Gallery, in defending the Government against the attacks made against it, he pointed out the uselessness of moving for Commissions on subjects on which the House already possessed the amplest information, and the conclusions of which were precisely those of the Government. Having had already eleven Commissions on the various branches there was no necessity whatever for having one which was to range over the vast extent of the whole subject. The Commissions which had sat had furnished the Government with much interesting information on the various details of the question, and on that information it would act as occasion arose.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SUMMARY CONVICTIONS—MINUTES OF EVIDENCE—THE WHORTLEBERRY CASE.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR said, he desired to bring under the notice of the House a case which had excited a great deal of interest and indignation in the district in which it occurred, and which had given rise to a large correspondence in the local papers under the head of "The Whortleberry Case." The facts were simply these: On Sunday afternoon, the 16th of June, a party of young persons, consisting of three young men and three young women, mostly between the ages of fifteen and eighteen, were wandering through a wood, upon a public path, the openness of which had not been contested for seventy years. They deviated a little from that path, and trespassed upon the wood (which had no fence to part it from the path), for the purpose of gathering whortleberries. It was said by the party themselves that the trespass could not have been long because they had only gathered a few of the berries, which were in great profusion; but it is only right to say it is said three of the male persons were seen in the wood three hours before by the servant of the proprietors of the wood. It was not for him (Mr. Taylor) to decide which is the correct statement, and it did not materially affect the issue. Next day the proprietor took out a summons for "unlawfully damaging the underwood;" they were taken before a magistrate, who lived three miles off (Colonel Peard), and were condemned by him to three weeks' imprisonment with hard labour, and walked off nine miles to gaol. Now, with regard to the character of these people, as regarded the legal question and the facts of the case it could have no importance; yet with regard to the moral view of the case, and the probabilities of it, it was of the greatest importance. Now, he had received a most remarkable and exceptionally good account of the previous character of every one of these persons. Now, it was upon the bare facts, as he had narrated them, that he ventured to ask a question a few evenings ago, which was answered by the hon. Member for West Cornwall (Mr. Kendall). That hon. Gentleman in the first place said, in a somewhat scornful way, that "the case had nothing at all to do with whortleberries;" but that is just as you regard it. If we look only to the wishes, interests, and motives of the prosecutors no doubt they care nothing for whortleberries; but if we condescend to take the motives and desires of the prisoners into consideration, as he presumed it was the business of those who were to deal justly between parties to do, then it became a whortleberry case, pure and simple; because the trespassers had no other motives than to get these berries; nor were they alone in this, for the three male delinquents state in a letter to the local paper that as they and some other lads were walking towards St. Blazey on that afternoon at three o'clock, Sir Colman Rashleigh's servant said to them, "Come on, we are going to have a buster of 'urts'; when, he adds, "they all went into the wood except us." The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Kendall) then proceeded to say that—

> "A portion, he might add, of Sir Colman Rashleigh's income was derived from letting part of a large coppice wood every year. The bark of the trees and the young oak shoots in the wood were, it appeared, seriously damaged by trespassers."

And he added—

> "One of the parties who had rented the coppice wood had informed Sir Colman Rashleigh that there was no use in taking it—so great was the damage done by persons trespassing upon it."

Now, he must really give the hon. Member credit for possessing that quality which was said to distinguish the late Sir Robert Peel—that of cleverly dressing up a case for the House. Would the House believe that this serious inroad into the income of Sir Colman Rashleigh referred to a wood, of which he was informed the total rateable value was only £25 per annum? But the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Kendall) depended still more upon the letter written to him by the convicting magistrate; therefore, they were not left in doubt upon the case. The convicting magistrate said—

> "Parties have constantly been brought before our bench for trespass and damage in Prideaux and Tregrehan woods; we have generally fined the parties so brought before us, hoping that leniency would have the desired effect."

Again—

> "When the parties were brought before me they all pleaded guilty, and I sent them to Bodmin for three weeks, in hope that this punishment may have the effect of stopping others, which fining has not done."

We have all heard of the address of the Judge to the man who had been condemned for horse-stealing. The Judge said—

> "I do not condemn you for stealing a horse, but in order that other men may not steal horses;"

but this magistrate went much beyond this dictum; he said—

> "You are not to be punished because you have committed a crime which deserves this punishment; but you are punished because other persons have, as we believe, committed it, and because we have not been able to get hold of them."

The letter then goes on to say—

> "A day or two before these persons were found the keeper met a party, who, on being spoken to, defied him in most violent language. He did not know the parties, so could not apply for summonses. A day or two afterwards Battie fell in with this party."

Now, was it possible for any one to have written a more self-condemnatory letter than this? They had first the clear statement that the magistrates were, beforehand, determined to punish with imprisonment anyone whom they might find in the woods, whether guilty of trespass or not. And secondly, they had the acknowledgment that the keeper, in his turn, had been bottling up his wrath at being "defied in most violent language" by certain unknown parties, and had thus wreaked his vengeance upon the first "parties" he could catch; who, unfortunately for him, and for them, so far as it is unfortunate to suffer innocently, happened to be these six poor people who had never been charged before with any offence whatever. Now there were two legal points which arose in this case—not technically legal but, in a common sense point of view, legal. With regard to the first of these points, in the first place these people were sentenced in a private room in the house of the committing magistrate, and a friend of one of the prisoners was refused admission to that room. If that were so and an absolute refusal was given, as he believed it was, it was most illegal. But beyond this he ventured to assert that it was not enough for justice that the doors should not have been closed against them. It should have been explained to these peasants and their friends, trembling before the awful presence of the squire's dignity, that his justice-room was not for this occasion a private sanctum, to enter which without permission was but to commit a new trespass. To all intents and purposes this was a private interview, and neither magistrates nor prisoners had any legal adviser present. Upon this point the 11 & 12 *Vict.* c. 43, s. 12, enacts that—

> "The room or place in which such justice or parties shall sit to hear and try any such complaint or information, shall be deemed an open and public Court, to which the public, generally, may have access, so far as the same can conveniently contain them."

Mr. Justice Bayly, in Daubney, *v.* Cooper, 10, Barnewell and Creswell, 240, says—

> "The ground upon which our present opinion is formed is that the magistrate was proceeding upon a summary conviction, and therefore exercising a judicial authority. He was, as it were, a Court of Justice for that purpose, and we are all of opinion that it is one of the essential qualities of a Court of Justice that its proceedings should be public, and that all parties who may be desirous of hearing what is going on, if there be room in the place for that purpose, provided they do not interrupt the proceedings, and provided there is no specific reason why they should be removed, have a right to be present for the purpose of hearing what is going on."

He (Mr. Taylor) therefore ventured to state, as the first legal point, that he doubted very much whether any punishment, awarded in that private and secret way, could bear the gaze of legal investigation. Now, according to the letter of the committing magistrate, which was read by the hon. Gentleman opposite, this conviction took place under the 24 & 25 *Vict.* c. 97. It did not state the section; but he presumed it was the 22nd, the words of which were, in stating the offence—

> "Unlawfully and maliciously cut, break, bark, root up, or otherwise destroy, or damage, the whole or any part of any tree, sapling, or shrub, or any underwood, the damage amounting to one shilling."

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that in the letter forwarded to him the sections were stated as the 52nd and 53rd.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR: I believe those sections are pretty similar to the 22nd. The words of the committing magistrate are that the sentence was for "trespassing and destroying underwood." Now, with regard to trespassing, there was no power of summary punishment at all. There was no case in which a mere trespass can be punished except by action. Therefore, that part fell through altogether; and as to the damage, no damage was done, he was informed, upon the authority of a gentleman residing in the neighbourhood. They had, therefore, a conviction for trespass which was not legal, and for damage which was never committed. Well, how was a conviction to be got against these people? It seemed that the magistrates had resolved that any person found wandering in this wood should be sent to prison, and the only way in which that could be done was to obtain a confession of guilt with respect to the trespass which they could not punish, and transfer that to a wilful damage of the underwood which they could punish, but could not prove. See how this was managed. According to a statement signed by the whole of the accused, the following was what took place:—

> "Colonel Peard read the summons aloud to us and said, 'What do you say to that?' Joseph Coppin replied, 'I was there, sir,' and before I had time to say I was not damaging the underwood he asked the rest. George Bennett and all of us said 'guilty,' meaning of being in the wood. We were about to say that we were not damaging the underwood when Colonel Peard said—'We

need not enter any further into the case, you are already sentenced to the House of Correction for three weeks with hard labour. Take them away.' Master Rashleigh was standing close to Colonel Peard's chair, with his elbow resting upon it. We are sure that we did no damage, and think that we have been very hardly used."

Now, with respect to this plea of guilty, everyone that had been accustomed to attend Courts of Justice, or who read accounts of those Courts, knew how nobly, even occasionally how pedantically, Judges sitting in authority warn prisoners against pleading guilty without the clearest understanding. They insisted upon making the prisoners know fully what they were about, and sometimes even when the prisoner insisted upon pleading guilty they almost imply "Will you not take your chance of being fairly hunted down?" Now, he thought he should carry the House with him when he said, under these circumstances, that when these young people went into that dining-room of Colonel Peard's they did not go into a Court of Justice: they did not go into a place where their case was to be fairly investigated, and where their punishment, if punishment were necessary, would be mercifully administered; but they went into a trap out of which they were only to issue with the burden of a fore-determined punishment upon them. A great deal had been said about setting class against class. This was simply a punishment inflicted because of class. Every man in this House knew that if these young people had been members of the squirearchy, or of the tradesman rank of society, there was no justice in the United Kingdom who would have dared to inflict this punishment upon them. It was, he knew, vain to say, "Do not tell us how kind and good these people are!" They all knew that when any case of peculiar injustice was brought to light, the perpetrator was sure to be described as of a judicial mind, perhaps even of an "hereditary judicial mind" —whatever that might mean. In like manner if there was a case of peculiar cruelty and hardship, the man who committed the act was certain to be described, *ad nauseam*, as a person overflowing with the milk of human kindness. But in this case he accepted it as a fact, and believed it to be true, that the proprietor of this wood was a man who was exceptionally kind and tender-hearted and of a generous nature. But that made the case ten-fold worse, and more dangerous. If this was the way the peasantry were treated by persons who were exceptionally kind-hearted and generous, what was to become of them in those cases—and there would be such even amongst the landed gentry—where they were men of hard, stern, and revengeful natures? This was the case he had to present, and he ventured to ask what had been done in the matter? The Home Secretary heard his Question a few nights ago; he heard the statement of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Kendall), and he heard the excusatory letter of Colonel Peard; and he must have known better than any man in this House how utterly futile, fallacious, and weak was the defence made against such a charge. What had he done? Had he done that poorest and smallest justice that was now possible to be done to these poor gaol birds? Had he sent them a certificate of illegal conviction? In bringing this case before the House he had to consider what practical form he should give to it, and he came to the conclusion that it would be useless to move for Papers, since it was quite manifest that there were, and could be, none worth producing; and he knew it was very unlikely that he could carry a Motion in the present House for the removal of the committing magistrate. He was, moreover, much more desirous to gain, if possible, some security to the people for the future, rather than attempt to legislate and punish for what was past. He therefore had ventured to ask the House to pass a Resolution which it appeared to him no party could object to. The Resolution was—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, in all cases of summary convictions before justices of the peace, it is desirable that Minutes of the Evidence on which the conviction was founded should be recorded, and preserved for future reference in case of need."

He would trouble the House with but two observations in support of this Resolution. He thought it eminently desirable there should be a unity of action all through the country. On a late occasion there were hon. Gentlemen who expressed their astonishment to hear that full notes of evidence were not taken in all such cases; while others seemed to express equal astonishment that such notes should be supposed to be taken in any case. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) made some observation, and he understood him to say that, in his experience, certain notes were taken by the clerk, but that the notes which the clerk took were not necessarily related to the proceedings of the magistrate. Those notes were not read, he said, afterwards to the magistrates, and might not therefore convey either the moral or legal ground upon which the decision was given. Now this was a diversity of action which should be remedied. It was also highly desirable that the people of this country, who were subject to summary jurisdictions, should not only be justly dealt with, but that they should believe that they were justly dealt with. There was a general impression that practical justice was not dealt out in many cases by the unpaid magistracy of the country to the peasantry. It was extremely desirable, in the interests of the people, that a record of the evidence in all these proceedings should be taken, to render possible subsequent appeal; but it was, he thought, quite as important for the magistrate himself, unaccustomed as he may be to legal questions or to the careful weighing of evidence, that he should, as it were, have to act upon some recognized basis, and should feel that his decision must be in accordance with written documents, which must be sufficient not only for his own mind, but it may be for the authorities who may have to revise the decision which he may come to. He therefore begged to move the Resolution of which he had given notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, in all cases of summary convictions before justices of the peace it is desirable that Minutes of the Evidence on which the conviction was founded should be recorded and preserved for future reference in case of need,"—(*Mr. Taylor,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. KENDALL said, that he fully agreed with the Resolution, but he disagreed very much from the statement with which the hon. Gentleman had introduced it. The whole question really was this—whether a man had the right to deal with his own property and protect it as he liked? He would lay before the House a plain honest statement of the facts of the case. Sir Colman Rashleigh had a considerable property, near St. Blazey, in the mining district. Many landowners, he must observe, refused to grant setts for mines on account of the troublesome character of the miners; but for his own part he had always acted on the opinion that they were susceptible of judicious management. He would also observe, before coming to the main facts of the case, that what the hon. Gentleman opposite had said about Mr. Northey was altogether out of place, for Mr. Northey was a commercial traveller living twenty miles off, who did not see the place where the trespass was committed for weeks afterwards; and how then could he pretend accurately to inform the hon. Gentleman what amount of damage had been done? Now, Sir Colman Rashleigh had suffered a great deal from depredations upon his property, and he might observe that every year a certain portion of an oak coppice wood was cut down and sold, and great damage was done by persons trespassing, for by walking upon the young shoots they destroyed them. Again and again offenders had been warned, again and again they had been brought up and fined, and last year the magistrates said, "We find it is of no use in the world to fine you, for you combine together among yourselves and pay it off, and we are, therefore, resolved that if this occurs again we will imprison you." Notices, warning trespassers off, were actually put up at different points in the very place where this trespass was committed; and when Sir Colman Rashleigh's son was informed by a boy that six persons were trespassing in that place, he went there and determined that the persons should be apprehended. Now, he had lived in that neighbourhood forty years, he knew the people, and he never broke his word with them. Whenever he told them that they would be imprisoned the next time they were brought before him, he never failed. They knew he never did, and it was only by being very firm, and never getting angry, that they were to be managed. It was a great mistake to suppose that the population in Cornwall were poor-spirited or down-trodden. A more independent set of men, or more able to assert their own rights, nowhere existed. Well, Sir Colman Rashleigh's eldest son, when he came across the trespassers, had their names, and laid informations against them at the next Petty Sessions, and on Wednesday the case was heard in the private dwelling of the magistrate and they were convicted. This was the simple story; and, while he regretted that the case should have been heard in private, he would ask any one whether, after the repeated warnings and the threats that the next case of the sort would be punished with imprisonment, the magistrate could have taken any other course? He must protest against country gentlemen being held up in this manner to the indignation of the public.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, this was not, as the last speaker supposed, a question as to whether a man's property was his own or not. The question was, whether six persons had had justice administered to them or not? He wished to point out that Sir Colman Rashleigh had not been attacked in that House or out of it in consequence of this affair. The complaint was made against the magistrate, and it was twofold, as to the mode in which the investigation was conducted, and as to the punishment awarded. For his part he thought that a more monstrous case had never been brought before the House. The offence of which they had been found guilty was described in the statute as that of wilfully and maliciously damaging underwood. But the offence alleged in the summons was simply for damaging underwood. The prisoners alleged that the summons had been read out to them by the magistrate, and they were asked what they had to say to it; they answered that they were there, meaning that they were trespassing in the wood; but they never intended to plead guilty to a malicious injury to property. If the words of the statute "malicious and wilful damage" had been read to the prisoners, he was sure they would not have pleaded guilty. He could not help thinking that if the conviction was in the same words as the summons it was void, as the very gist of the offence was contained in the words "wilful and malicious." It was never intended that the punishment inflicted should be applied to cases of mere trespass with nominal damage. No doubt the magistrate had not committed this wrong intentionally; but it showed that he was so grossly ignorant of the law that he did not know how to conduct his business. The proceedings from the commencement were irregular; such a case should never have been decided in a magistrate's private room; it should have been heard at Petty Sessions, where the magistrates' clerk could have been appealed to for advice. It was quite incredible that three weeks' imprisonment with hard labour should have been awarded as a punishment for such a trifling offence. He trusted inquiry would be made, for as the facts stood at present he thought the only course would be to dismiss the magistrate from the Commission of the Peace.

Mr. HENLEY said, he thought the House was much obliged to the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor) for filling the office which used to be so ably undertaken by Mr. Duncombe, the late Member for Finsbury, who, in dull times, used to trot out novel subjects to relieve the tedium of the hour; but he trusted the hon. Member would in future bring forward cases which would hold water better than the present. The hon. and learned Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) seemed to think the charge did not come within the statute; if that were so, as he was an hon. and learned Member, it would have been more to the purpose, and much more satisfactory to the persons most interested, if he had put in that plea in a higher court, instead of assisting at one brief conversation on the subject. With regard to the subject of depositions, he noticed that the people in this instance pleaded guilty, so there was an end of all evidence; and, in his opinion, it was most unadvisable to add to the expenses of such trifling proceedings by insisting on the taking of depositions, because it often happened that even without this expense it was most difficult to keep the people from going to prison, simply because they were unable to pay the expenses and the small fine. He agreed in one remark that had been made, and that was that justice should not only be done, but that people should think it was done. About ten years ago, magistrates were empowered to make summary convictions in cases of petty larceny, and the question put to the offenders was, whether they would like the case to be decided at once or preferred going before a jury. In all the cases which had come before him he had never found one in which the party preferred to go before a jury; and he thought, whatever grievance-mongers might say, that was the best proof that the parties believed justice would be done by the magistrate. He should be extremely sorry when people were brought up for small offences to saddle them with the cost of the depositions, which, in many cases, would more than double the costs which must be paid.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, the hon. Member for Leicester had called upon him to answer certain questions, and had imposed upon him a duty which, if he were to discharge, would be more illegal than anything that was charged against the magistrate. The hon. Member had asked him to issue a certificate declaring that the decision complained of was illegal; but if, as the hon. and learned Member for Reading had said, the proceedings were wrong *ab initio*, he would, by acceding to the request of the hon. Member for Leicester, be guilty of usurping the position of the Court of Queen's Bench. With respect to the case itself it never was brought before the Home Office, except on the Question put by the hon. Member. There was no Petition — no memorial—no complaint of the conviction. When the case was first mentioned the imprisonment had expired, and no question was put to him as to whether the men were properly imprisoned or not. When the question was afterwards repeated, he (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) wrote to the magistrate, asking if he wished to offer any explanation. The magistrate, in reply, explained what he had done, and so far as the statute was concerned his proceeding was regular. At all events, nothing was done contrary to the terms of the statute. The hon. and learned Member for Reading had said that the case should have gone to the Petty Sessions, but the terms of the Act were "upon conviction before a justice of the peace." There was no occasion to take the defendants before the Petty Sessions, and the only question was whether the justice called upon to hear the case should have heard it in the Petty Sessions court or in his own house.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he did not say the magistrate was bound to hear the case in Petty Sessions as a matter of law, but only that he ought to have done so.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he had understood the hon. and learned Gentleman to speak as a lawyer. When the hon. and learned Gentleman called upon the Government to dismiss a magistrate, he should have thought it would have been not for an error of judgment, but for having acted illegally, which he did not understand to have been the case in this instance. The magistrate, in the letter which he had received from him, stated that when the six defendants were brought before him he read over to each the charges made against them *seriatim*, and then put the question—"You have heard the charge against you: what do you say—are you guilty or not guilty?" The letter went on to say that each defendant pleaded guilty, and the magistrate then sentenced them severally to twenty-one days' imprisonment, with hard labour, in the House of Correction at Bodmin, under the 24 & 25 *Vict.*, c. 97, ss. 52 and 53. The 53rd section of that Act was to meet cases for which no other punishment had been provided, punishment having been provided in other cases where the damage amounted to 1*s*. Colonel Peard added that persons were continually brought before the bench on which he acted for damaging the plantations in the neighbourhood; that they had over and over again tried to put a stop to such a state of things by inflicting a fine; that, upon the last occasion when offenders were brought before them, they gave notice that, as their leniency had proved ineffectual, those persons would be sentenced to be imprisoned the next time they were brought up. The injury, Colonel Peard went on to say, done to the plantations was very serious, and the magistrates saw no other way of putting a stop to it. He also said that if a heavy fine had been inflicted the hardship would be very great on some families, especially when the present distress in the mining districts was taken into account, and that notice against trespassers had for some time been placed in the wood by Sir Colman Rashleigh's order. Such was the statement of the magistrate, and as to Sir Colman Rashleigh, who was not in Cornwall at the time, there were no materials at the Home Office for instituting, in reference to him, such an inquiry as the hon. Member for Leicester had suggested. He (Mr. Gathorne Hardy) quite admitted that when a magistrate heard cases in his drawing-room, as in the present instance, the room should be open, so that any one who wished might have an opportunity of listening to the proceedings. It was, however, a perfectly novel statement to him that there was any impediment thrown in the way of any one entering the room in the cause under discussion. Such did not appear to be the fact from the letter of Colonel Peard, and he could not under all these circumstances inquire into the conduct of Sir Colman Rashleigh. He had no materials, in fact, on which to base such an inquiry, nor was it his duty to inquire into the conduct of the magistrate, but that of the Lord Chancellor, who, if he had acted improperly, had it in his power to dismiss him. If cases in which an excessive punishment had been inflicted, or in which the reversal of a sentence was called for, were brought before him, then it would be his duty to investigate the matter. Nothing of that kind, however, had come under his notice in the present instance, and he had no statement to make with respect to it to the House on the part of the Home Office. The magistrate had acted within the law, and it was no part of his duty to interfere in the matter.

Sir ROBERT COLLIER said, he did not think any blame could, under the circumstances, attach itself to his right hon. Friend who had just spoken. As to Sir Colman Rashleigh and Colonel Peard, with whom he had the pleasure of being acquainted, he felt assured that the one was incapable of acting harshly towards the poor, and that the other would not be guilty of any malversation of his office as a magistrate. The impression, however, which had been left on his mind by the statements which had been made on both sides was that considerable want of caution had been exhibited by the latter. Before taking the plea of guilty he ought to have explained clearly to the prisoners what the nature of the offence was with which they were charged, and that they were not merely accused of having been unlawfully in the wood, but of having committed wilful and intentional damage. From the statement which had been made by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Reading, it would appear that they had pleaded guilty under a misapprehension, and it would seem, from Colonel Peard's letters, that he at once took the plea of guilty, and, without another word, sentenced them to three weeks' imprisonment. Now, no Judge would, he ventured to think, have acted in that way, and very few magistrates. He was also of opinion that the sentence was, under the circumstances, excessive; and he could not help thinking that the prisoners did not mean to commit the offence with which they were charged. He would only add that he regarded it as extremely unjust to his hon. Friend the Member for Leicester to be called a grievance-monger because he brought the case under the notice of the House. In his opinion, he deserved the thanks of the House for having drawn its attention to what he believed was an exceptional case in the administration of justice.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY hoped the hon. Member for Leicester would not press his Motion to a division. He did not believe it would lead to any advantage.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES:

Supply *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

£507,428, to complete the sum for Post Office Packet Service; no part of which sum is to be applicable or applied in or towards making any payment in respect of any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863, to Mr. Joseph George Churchward, or to any person claiming through or under him by virtue of a certain Contract bearing date the 26th day of April 1859, made between the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Admiralty (for and on behalf of Her Majesty) of the first part, and the said Joseph George Churchward of the second part, or in or towards the satisfaction of any claim whatsoever of the said Joseph George Churchward, by virtue of that Contract, so far as relates to any period subsequent to the 20th day of June 1863.

Mr. CRAWFORD*: I avail myself of the present opportunity for the purpose of inviting the House to consider that portion of the Report of the Select Committee of last year on "East India Communications" which has reference to the Postal Service between this country and India, China, Australia, and the East generally. It is not my intention in any way to deal with that part of the Report which refers to Telegraphic Communication with the East. In proposing to offer some criticisms on the manner in which Her Majesty's Government have proceeded and are now proceeding to carry out the recommendations of that Committee, I wish to assure my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury that I do so in no fault-finding, captious, or party spirit, but solely with the hope that I may be permitted to co-operate, to a certain extent, in placing this important service, as it respects the commerce of the country, upon a satisfactory footing. It will be in the recollection of many Gentlemen now present that early in the last Session I drew the attention of the House to the condition of our communications with the East, with especial reference to the fact that great changes had taken place in India, and in particular that railways were in course of construction or completion there which would very much alter the arrangements of the Postal service with that country. I submitted all these matters to the House at the time. I called attention to the vast interests which were concerned in the trade between this country and India, and to the social and political relations of the two countries. I pointed out the imperfections of the system of communication, and I also stated, from my own point of view, what I conceived would be the proper method by which our communications should be put on a better and more satisfactory footing. The Motion I then made was agreed to, and a Committee was appointed to inquire into the subject. I should like to direct attention, for one moment, to the constitution of that Committee. It was, I think I may venture to say, in every sense of the word, a "Select" Committee. It was a Committee selected for the purpose of considering a particular question; and it was selected entirely on the grounds of the fitness of the Gentlemen placed on that Committee to undertake the duties assigned to it. In the first place, the interests of the Government of the country, or, I should say, of the Exchequer, were represented, and, I need hardly say, efficiently represented, by my hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers), then Secretary to the Treasury. The India Office was represented by my hon. Friend the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld), and both these Gentlemen were constant in their attendance on the Committee, and took as much interest in all that occurred as any Gentleman present. Commerce was represented by my hon. Friend the Member for South Lancashire, formerly Member for Liverpool (Mr. C. Turner); also by my hon. Friend the Member for Southampton (Mr. Moffatt). My hon. Friend the Member for Frome (Sir Henry Rawlinson) represented generally the interests of the East, of which he is particularly cognizant. The science of telegraphy was represented by the hon. Member for Greenwich (Sir Charles Bright); steam navigation by the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Laird); and almost every interest may be said to have been represented by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton). In point of fact, there was no particular interest affected by the inquiry which had not its representative and advocate in the Committee. I may say also, in passing, that the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Packet Company, whose proceedings under their contract were to be called in question, were represented by my hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Weguelin), who is intimately connected with that Company. The Committee sat for a great number of days. It examined a vast number of witnesses, and the whole question underwent a thorough investigation. The arrangements of the Peninsular and Oriental Company, the manner in which they had performed their service, and the cost to the country of that service, were all fully gone into; and the result was that the Committee, after considerable examination of the subject, came to certain conclusions, which they embodied in a Report, and that Report was accepted by them without any question whatever, passing the ordeal of the Committee without Amendments, except a few of a merely verbal character. I mention this in order to show that the question had been so thoroughly investigated, and was so well understood by those who considered it, that when the Report was settled, no question of doubt arose upon any point connected with the postal service.

In their Report the Committee, in the first instance, drew the attention of the House to the vastness of the trade between this country and the East. I need not occupy the time of the Committee by referring to the figures which are given in the Report. The magnitude of the trade is evidenced by the value of the goods which are imported by and exported from this country and the countries referred to in the body of the Report. The tonnage also was given, and other facts stated which justified the Committee in the conclusion they formed that upwards of 25 per cent of the whole of the external commerce of the United Kingdom was transacted with the several countries enumerated in the Report. The Committee then went on to describe the manner in which the postal communications were carried out, and pointed out its imperfections at length. They also discussed various methods which had been propounded for the purpose of improving those communications, and wound up their Report by making certain recommendations. I may say that there is in the Report a paragraph in which it is stated that in the opinion of the Committee, as regards the

Peninsular and Oriental Company, who possess a fleet of fifty-seven steam vessels, of the aggregate tonnage of 84,176 tons, and of nearly 20,000 horse-power—

> "The services of that company, under the several contracts to which reference has been made, have been well performed,"

and the Assistant Secretary of the Post Office stated—

> "That no mail that was entrusted to this company for conveyance was ever lost."

That, I believe, can hardly be said of any other postal service in this country. The recommendations which the Committee made to the House are recorded under seven heads. They point out the changes which had taken place in the internal communications of India, consequent upon the introduction of railways; and they say that the time had arrived when, in their opinion, tenders should be invited for the establishment of a weekly service with India, that that weekly service should be directed to Bombay alone, and that the other communications then existing with Madras and Calcutta should, as far as regards India, be entirely superseded and laid on one side; the fact being that Bombay is now on the point of being connected by means of railways with all parts of India; consequently, letters conveyed to Bombay will necessarily reach any place in the interior of India, to which they are addressed, quicker by way of Bombay than by any other route. They next suggest, with reference to the extreme importance of maintaining our communications with India upon a satisfactory basis—

> "That such service should be on the footing of an express service,"

and that it should be—

> "Entirely unconnected, to the eastward of Suez, with any other mail services"

whatever; the reason being that where different branch lines of steam communication have to be worked together, great delay must sometimes take place from the non-arrival or late arrival of vessels, independently of the delay that is necessarily attendant upon the trans-shipment of passengers and merchandize. Wherever postal communication has been extended, there commerce has invariably been attracted; in fact, the conveyance of the mails has proved a most efficient agency for increasing our trade in all parts of the world. The then Committee describe what, in their opinion, should be the speed at which these mails should be carried. They suggest that—

> "The time-table should be based on a prescribed speed of not less than eleven nautical miles per hour on the voyage between Marseilles and Alexandria, and ten miles per hour between Suez and Bombay."

There are various other recommendations in the Report, and among them is one which will probably form the principal subject of comment this evening, which is—

> "That Her Majesty's Government should take into their early consideration the arrangements to be made, in consequence of the proposed separation of the Indian service, for maintaining a fortnightly or half-monthly service to China, and a monthly or four-weekly service to Australia, having regard to any facilities which may be afforded by the monthly service to China, now performed by the Messageries Impériales from Marseilles."

The Report was presented at the end of the Session of Parliament. It had been concurred in entirely by my hon. Friends, who, in the Committee, represented the Departments of the Government which were concerned; and at the time it was drafted it was reasonable to suppose that they would have been the persons to be entrusted with the carrying out of the recommendations of the Committee, and we had every right and reason also to suppose that, as they had been parties to the recommendations, if the execution of them had been left in their hands, we should have seen them fulfilled to the letter. The conduct of this and of other matters, however, fell into different hands. When the present Government came into office they lost no time in taking the matter into consideration, and on the 4th of September a Treasury Minute was recorded in which the Report of the Select Committee was reviewed, and the opinion of the Government generally in reference to the whole question was set forth at full length. In this Minute, "My Lords," state, in the first instance, the nature of the existing service, and then they pass on to a question to which I desire to draw attention, because it is a subject of great importance. I refer to the question of cost. Now the question of the cost of maintaining this communication had been a vexed question between the public and the Treasury, and between the Post Office and the India Office; and the departmental controversy as carried on was of a very peculiar character. It was, in fact, a sort of triangular duel. The Post Office was on one side, the Treasury was on another, and the India Office on the third side, all engaged in trying how they could shift from one another the burden of what was considered to be the loss sustained by the public in the maintenance of these communications. Now, in offering a criticism on that part of the Minute of the Treasury which has reference to this subject, I wish to refer to the evidence which was given before the Committee by a gentleman who represented the Post Office. I have often heard the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) speak in the highest terms of the public servants of the Government and the country, and I have heard the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer do the same. No doubt whatever has been said by them on this point was spoken with a full knowledge of its truth. At all events, my experience justifies me in saying so; and I should say that of all persons Mr. Frederick Hill, of the Post Office, is the last man of whom we should speak as being deficient in zeal, ability, or intelligence. Mr. Frederick Hill has practical opinions of his own on this subject, which he has always expressed, and which he enforced with great vigour before the Committee. His object was to show that there was what he termed a "loss" on this Contract Service; that is to say, that its whole cost exceeded the estimated receipts for postage by a certain amount, and he held that that was a "loss" to which the country should not be put, and that it ought to be recouped in some form to the department. The controversy between the departments of the Government, therefore, was as to whose shoulders this loss should fall upon. An attempt was made—at least it was proposed to charge an additional sum in the way of postage; but that was strenuously objected to by Sir Charles Wood, who was then at the India Office. It was also proposed that India should be called upon to bear the "loss;" but to that, too, Sir Charles Wood stoutly objected. The public, likewise, protested against being called upon to pay a larger amount of postage, and as a result, in reality it was the only practical issue, the public were likely to be the sufferers in the long run, as appeared to be the intention of the Treasury at the time, for they were to be called upon to pay an additional 50 per cent in postage. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer told us the other day that the Government were occupied in arranging the terms of a Postal Convention with the United States of America, and the expectation of a reduced rate of postage being established between the two countries was made matter of congratulation. But it appears that, at the very time that this great boon was to be conferred on persons engaged in trade, or having occasion to correspond, with the United States, it was actually the intention of the Government to subject those who are engaged in the Eastern trade to a considerable advance in postage. It is a question which well deserves the consideration of this Committee whether the residuum or difference between the cost of the service, and the amount received for postage, is a matter to be viewed in the light in which it was treated by Mr. Frederick Hill. I, for one, hold that there are considerations to be taken into account in this matter which are wholly apart from the question of the profit and loss arising upon the accounts of the Post Office. The difference, as I will explain to the Committee, is not considerable; but whatever it is, that difference represents the whole cost to this country of the means, by which not only the commercial, but the social and political connection, between this country and its Eastern possessions and dependencies and the Eastern world is kept up. Sir Charles Wood, at that time, took a view which, I think, will commend itself to the judgment of the Committee. In a letter which he addressed to the Secretary of the Post Office in October, 1865, he said—

> "Sir Charles Wood, however, cannot regard the question as one merely affecting the charge on the Imperial revenues. It has been the perception of the bearing of increased postal communication on the wealth and progress of the country that has induced Statesmen of late years to consent to fiscal sacrifices for the purpose of obtaining it.
>
> "There can be no doubt that increased postal communication with India implies increasing relations with that country, increased commerce, increased investment of English capital, increased settlement of energetic middle-class Englishmen; and, from all of these sources, the wealth and prosperity of England are probably more greatly increased than that of India; and at the present day there are classes in India, not private soldiers, to whom the increase of the rate of postage between the two countries would be not only a hardship, but a positive hindrance to their progress."

I apprehend that there are few persons who do not concur with Sir Charles Wood in that view, and who do not think that it would be a great calamity, if all communication between the two countries were to be subjected to the burden of an increase of not less than 50 per cent in the expense of carrying on our postal communications. The question is what is the whole sum to which I have been referring? In the Treasury Minute the entire cost of carrying out the communication between this country and the East is set down in the gross at £349,625, to which certain additions are made that I need not enumerate in detail, and from which a deduction of about £236,000 for the estimated amount of postage is made. There then remains a sum, stated in the Minute to be £160,000, of which it may be roughly calculated that one half is borne by India and the different colonies concerned, and the other half by the mother country. It was the endeavour of the Committee to separate as much as possible the cost of carrying on our communications with India from the cost of maintaining our communications with China, Australia, and other parts of the East, and for that purpose they obtained from Mr. Hill a Return showing what was, in the estimation of the Post Office at that time, the exact cost of the India service, as distinguished from the China service; and the result was this. The account is in the blue book, and bears the signature of the Receiver and Accountant General of the Post Office. The last paragraph of the Memorandum is in these words—

> "Thus it appears that the present loss on the India service is about £48,000 per annum, and that the loss on the China service is about £34,000, making a total loss of rather more than £82,000."

Now, in the Treasury Minute, the whole sum is set down at £160,000, so that the difference between the two must be borne by the Australian and other Colonies with which communication is kept up. Separating the India service from the others it appears then that, in the very worst view as regards the result, the deficiency does not amount to more than £48,000. A competent witness, however, contended before the Committee that that was not a fair Return, because it was made up of a mileage rate applicable to the combined services of India and China, whereas a portion of the India service is carried on at a considerably reduced rate, and that that reduced rate did not belong to the China service at all. Therefore, the average was not fairly stated, and the probability is that the whole loss on the India service does not exceed £30,000. That sum of £30,000 then is the amount for which the communications are to be scrimped, or the public are to pay in the shape of increased postal charge; and I think I have shown in the words of Sir Charles Wood that there are considerations of an important character that would hardly justify the Government in imposing on the public such an increased postal charge. What I complain of in this part of the Minute is that, with the knowledge that the loss upon the India service, which it was the object of the Committee to keep wholly clear and distinct from the other services, owing to the unfairness of mixing them together, was only £48,000, the whole has been lumped up in the sum of £160,000, in order to magnify the amount. We were told the other day by a noble Lord in the other House of Parliament that the child of Aspasia governed Greece; and I think I am not going far out of the way in suggesting that, in reference to matters postal, Mr. Frederick Hill governs the Treasury. I do not suppose that this Treasury Minute, which was passed within six weeks after the present Government assumed office, was the production of the mind of my hon. Friend, for he would hardly have had time to give his attention to the subject so completely as the Minute indicates. I am not without reason in supposing that it was prepared in St. Martin's-le-Grand; and, if so, it could have been prepared by no one else than Mr. Frederick Hill. I do not question, in the slightest degree, Mr. Hill's fidelity to his own particular views, or to what he conceives to be the interest of the public in this matter, but I think he has not stated in respect of cost the figures in the fair way towards the Committee that he ought to have done.

There are also some important particulars with regard to which the Government have failed to recognize the recommendations of the Select Committee. Among other things it was especially recommended by the Committee that the service of India, being the most important, should be kept wholly separate and distinct from every other service to the eastward of Suez: that the Eastern mails being conveyed from this country through Egypt by one service should be separated into two divisions at Suez, one of which, the India portion, should proceed to Bombay and the other should take its departure for Aden, Ceylon, Singapore, China, and elsewhere. That recommendation was based upon other and more important considerations than those which have reference to the special importance of rapid communication with India. The fact is, that if there is any particular fault to be found in the proposed method of communication, it is the utter unsuitability for the purposes of trans-shipment of the port of Aden. I can refer this Committee to competent evidence which was given before the Select Committee as to the difficulties connected with Aden. Being a tidal harbour, vessels can only go in and out of it at certain periods. Thus, time must necessarily be lost there, and, independently of other considerations, there is this great practical objection to Aden being used for the purpose. But, surely, when the Committee were recommending an express service to India unconnected with any other on the other side of Suez, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they had in view the great impolicy of making the voyage to and from Bombay dependent upon certain other vessels keeping up the communication with Aden. The Treasury in their Minute use these words—

> "With regard to the conveyance of mails to China and Japan, My Lords are of opinion that the service to be constituted for the conveyance of the Indian Mails should be made use of as far as Aden."

There is therefore a distinct difference of opinion between the Committee and the Government on this point. The views of the Committee were based on strong public considerations independently altogether of the unsuitability of Aden for the purposes of a port. The Government, entirely disregarding the evidence which was given before the Committee, recorded their own view, or that of Mr. Hill, that economy should be observed, and that the mails for China and Japan should be carried not from Suez to the eastward, but from Aden to the eastward, thus making use of the Bombay line, and entirely passing over the view of the Committee that the Indian mails should be conveyed separately and with as much rapidity as possible between Suez and Bombay. It is true that, at the end of the paragraph in the Minute, it is said that the parties tendering are to state for what additional subsidy they would be willing to continue the service from Aden to Suez; but the view of the Treasury is strongly stated that in effect the recommendation of the Committee was not a wise one as regards Aden, and that it was better that Aden should be selected as the point of junction. Another matter was the speed at which the mails were to be conveyed. The Committee recommended that it should be eleven knots an hour; but the recommendation was passed over on reference to the Postmaster General, and a time fixed which, if observed correctly, would restrict the speed to ten and a-quarter miles an hour. Perhaps that is not a matter of so much consequence, seeing that the post is becoming daily more and more supplemented by the telegraph; so that the necessity which was felt some time ago for a highly increased rate of speed does not exist in the same degree now. Another point has reference to the place of departure from Europe. The Committee had under their consideration the Report made by Colonel Tyler, of the Royal Engineers, with regard to the new line of communication proposed to be opened over Mont Cenis, and by the new line of railway to Bologna and Brindisi in the South of Italy. The Committee inquired into the matter, and came to the conclusion, on the evidence before them, that Brindisi was not a port that was fitted at present, or until improved, as the place from which the communication could be kept up. Moreover, the line of railway between Bologna and Brindisi is a single line, and is not, therefore, so well adapted for the conveyance of mails by express train as a double line of railway. Again, the passage of the Mont Cenis is not yet in a state to justify the Government in relying upon its being at all times open for the conveyance of mails. The Committee felt that, in making any contracts, regard should be had to the possibility of this line becoming available during the term of the contract, and that arrangements should be adopted for its being used if necessary. What they had in view was the time when the tunnel now being constructed under the Mont Cenis pass should be finished. But the Treasury in their Minute adopted absolutely the view contained in the Report of Colonel Tyler, that the mails should, in future, be sent from this country to Brindisi instead of Marseilles, and be taken from Brindisi instead of Marseilles on to Alexandria. No doubt a small saving, which would not however be more than twenty-four hours, might be made by the use of that line, if the mails could be carried over the pass of Mont

Cenis, and the railway were practicable at all times and seasons for the conveyance of the mails by express train; but I think that, in the interest of commerce, it would hardly be a wise thing to rely entirely upon a means of communication which must be liable to be stopped at various seasons of the year by the inclemency of the weather on the summit of the Alps. There are very few persons in this House who have not been over that pass. I myself have been over it in the depth of winter, and I have known it for days together absolutely impracticable before the paths could be cleared sufficiently to enable ordinary travellers to pass. Surely it must be deemed an unwise thing as regards the interests of commerce that we are to be dependent upon a line of communication subject to these occasional interruptions. At all events I am satisfied of this, that if on any occasion interruption arises very great dissatisfaction would be expressed upon the subject.

The next point of importance, and it is, perhaps, the most material one in connection with these contracts, is the disposition which has been shown by the Government to follow up the principle of economy by affording to foreign companies the power of competing with our own steam companies, or other British subjects who might be inclined to tender. On the 3rd of June my hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) asked the Secretary to the Treasury whether any overtures had been made to the French Post Office with a view to render the French mail service to India and China more available for the purposes of this country, under the new system of postal communication, recommended by the Committee of last Session; and to this question the Secretary to the Treasury replied, that tenders had been invited, and that he hoped they would be sent in by the French as well as the English companies. Now, what I desire to do on this occasion is to protest, in the name of what I consider to be the interest of the country and the interest of commerce, and in justice to our own companies, against the ships of the Messageries Impériales, or of any other foreign company, being employed in the conveyance of our Eastern mails. You may carry the principle of economy too far. Such a course of proceeding would be Free Trade gone mad. I am convinced that the subject has not been sufficiently considered. For what would be the position of this country in the event of a war or any interruption of existing relations taking place? Supposing the Messageries Impériales or any other foreign company, to whom, as I understand, the forms of these tenders have been sent, are allowed to tender for one part, what is there, if that policy is adopted, to prevent them from tendering for any other part or for the whole of the service; and if they tendered on lower terms, and the contract were awarded to them, what would be the position of our commerce, what the position of our political and social relations with India, in the event of our being unfortunately engaged in hostilities with the country with whose people the contract has been entered into; or even in the event of that country being at war with some other? Take the case of the Messageries Impériales, and suppose them to have made a tender which, as regards price, the Government would feel themselves justified in accepting. Well, some cause of interruption to our friendly relations arises; not only have we lost all the advantages which we at present derive from the existence of a large and formidable fleet of vessels capable of carrying a powerful armament in the East and in the Mediterranean; but the foreign Power with which the difficulty occurs — the French it may be—has those advantages in its hands. We not only should be subjected to the disadvantages resulting from our being deprived of this service, but our opponents would be in possession of its advantages. I need not occupy the time of the Committee by pointing out to what uses those advantages might be put by any foreign Power, and especially France, being placed in that position. Besides, the Messageries Impériales are under contract with their own Government to perform certain services in the East. I find in this blue book a copy of their contract with the French Government, and the contract is one which I should think they would not relinquish for the purpose of taking up one with us; but the terms of it are wholly incompatible with the terms of any contract they could make with us. First, there is a sort of internal police maintained on board the vessels of the Messageries Impériales. Next, their Consuls have power to detain the ships from day to day, whenever they consider it to be in the interest of their Government to require it. And it has happened in the experience of the Peninsular and Oriental Company that the departure of the French vessels has been postponed in order that the commercial interests of the Messageries Impériales might be served by having the market to themselves before or after the Peninsular and Oriental vessel had taken its departure. Now, the peculiarity of the arrangement which I understand the Government contemplate entering into is this, that the competition is not a fair one. I am not speaking at all in the interest of the Peninsular and Oriental Company as a company. I have not anything to do with that Company; I never had, and am not likely to have, anything to do with it. That Company must hold itself—and it does hold itself—ready to meet any fair competition to which it may be subjected from other companies which are sailing under the British flag, or from any individuals who can fairly come in competition with it; but see what is the position of the Messageries Impériales Company as compared with that of the Peninsular and Oriental Company. The Peninsular and Oriental Company has received during the currency of its contracts various rates; but altogether its subsidy may be put down at 4*s.* 6*d.* per mile per annum, whilst the French Company receives from its Government a subsidy of 20*s.* per mile per annum. Some persons may say that we should act very foolishly if we do not avail ourselves of the great liberality, or perhaps extravagance, of the French Government in paying such an enormous subsidy to a mercantile company, and if they choose to be at the expense of carrying our mails, let them carry them. I confess that I cannot concur in that view of the matter. I am of opinion that there is a question of grave national policy involved in our maintaining these great lines of Packet service; and the French, seeing this, it has been a part of their policy for years past to construct a commercial marine of their own, propelled by steam, which shall enable them to compete with the large companies of this country. The French have seen what the Peninsular and Oriental Company's ships did in the Crimean war. They then carried upwards of 60,000 men from this country, 2,000 officers, and between 11,000 and 12,000 horses. We know, also, what the Peninsular and Oriental Company did at the time of the Indian mutiny. Where should we have been if its vessels had not been in existence then to take out our troops and military stores to India? We know, too, what was done by another company in the *Trent* affair. We know how 10,000 men were sent out to Canada by the Cunard line of steamers, and other vessels, almost at a day's notice. The French Government have seen all this, and are ready and willing to raise for themselves a power on the seas equal to that which we hold through the agency of these Packet companies. In point of fact, the Messageries Impériales must be considered as almost a department of the French Government. For not only do the Imperial Government pay the Company now, but they are under contract to continue to pay for years to come, not an uncertain subsidy (though a subsidy that will gradually diminish until the average is brought down to about 16*s.* a mile), but when the contract was entered into the French Government, moreover, advanced the Company £500,000 sterling out of the Imperial funds, to enable them to build their ships; and not only that, they also gave the Company £75,000 to represent the expense of putting the vessels on the station. So that the whole of the service is practically maintained out of the Imperial Exchequer of France. And this is the Company with which our steam shipping companies here, and our steam shipping companies in India, for there are persons there who will tender, are called upon to compete. Now, what I wish to do on the present occasion is simply to enter my protest against any act on the part of Her Majesty's Government which shall saddle this country with a contract either with the Messageries Impériales or any other foreign company. I hold that such a course would be contrary to public policy; that it would be unfair and unjust to the Peninsular and Oriental Company, and that it would be an act of political insanity for us to put such a weapon into the hands of any foreign Government whatever; and more especially so, bearing in mind that the weapon thus put into their hands has been first taken out of our own. I shall, perhaps, be called upon to explain what it was the Select Committee meant when they made the recommendation in their Report that regard should be had to—

> "Any facilities which may be afforded by the monthly service to China performed by the Messageries Impériales from Marseilles."

I can do so precisely and exactly. There is at the present time a fortnightly communication between Suez and China maintained under contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Company. We have also a monthly service—the two things seem, perhaps, to have no connection, but they really have in principle—between Southampton and the coast of South America, and a monthly one to Mexico. The French Government, also, in pursuance of their plan to carry on postal communication under highly subsidized contracts, have a communication once a month between Bordeaux and the coast of South America, and between St. Nazaire, at the mouth of the Loire, and Mexico. But the departures of these vessels are so timed as to fit in and harmonize with the sailing of our vessels from Southampton, so that while we have our subsidized line of steamers communicating with those countries once a month, our merchants have the opportunity afforded them of corresponding once a fortnight, at exact intervals, by means of the ships of this French Company. What the Committee had in view, therefore, was that the French Government should be invited to make such alterations in the departure and arrival of their vessels between Marseilles and Alexandria as to give the opportunity of communicating with India at intervals of a week. And speaking for myself individually, I must say that I never had an idea, in making that proposition, that our service would in any way be subjected to competition with foreign vessels, or that foreign companies would in any way be substituted for our own.

I have now gone through most of the subjects that seemed to require notice at this moment, and I shall now proceed to bring my observations to a conclusion. I have no Amendment to move, because the Vote is for the service of the current year; but I may say this, and I wish to give the Government proper warning of it—and I am sure in that respect that I shall be fortified by the concurrence, not only of a great number of the Members of this House, but by the public out of doors—that if we find that a contract has been entered into with the Messageries Impériales, we shall then avail ourselves of the Resolution which the House recorded in July, 1860, under which no contract is to take effect until it has been either approved by a direct Resolution of the House, or has lain unchallenged a month upon the table of the House. One word before I close with regard to that point. The Peninsular and Oriental Company have received notice of the termination of their contract on the 1st February next year, and the tenders for the new contract are to be sent in or received by the 16th of September next. Now I cannot conceive how, with that Resolution of the House before them, and as the contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Company will expire on the 1st of February next, the Government can feel themselves at liberty to enter into arrangements with any new company, seeing that the contract for such arrangements could not then have received the approval, or lain a month upon the table of the House. This brings me to another point, rather a small one, but deserving our notice at this moment, which I find embodied in a letter addressed by the Postmaster General to the Lords of the Treasury on the 2nd of March last, and I really must say that I cannot imagine how a person, having any regard whatever for the public interest, could have had such an idea in his mind as is contained in this letter. The Postmaster General says—

> "In order, therefore, to allow of effective competition, the forms of tender do not make it absolutely compulsory that the new services east of Suez should begin at the termination of the present contract—namely, on the 1st of February, 1868. Should a good offer be received from a company requiring more time, the difficulty must be surmounted, as far as possible, by the best temporary arrangement that can be made."

That is to say, the enormous interests which in India and in this country are dependent upon an efficient Packet service shall rely solely upon a temporary arrangement. [Mr. HUNT: Read on.]

> "The same plan was adopted when calling for the last tenders for the Australian service."

I will come to that presently. The meaning of this, stated in a few words, is, that, be the exigency what it may, if a cheaper tender be presented by anyone else, every interest connected with India or the East is to be suspended and hung up until some other arrangement can be made. All our commerce and communications, social and political, are to be subjected to the best temporary arrangement that can be effected. I was desired by my hon. Friend opposite to read on. I will do so—

> "The same plan was adopted when calling for the last tenders for the Australian service."

[Mr. HUNT: Hear, hear!] Yes, and who came to the relief of the Government on that occasion? Why, the Peninsular and Oriental Company; the very Company which, if the views of the Government with regard to the Messageries Impériales are carried into effect will certainly be ruined. It came to their relief. I think, then, it is rather too much to expect that the interests of this country, commercial, social and political, should be made to depend upon the good-will of any foreign Government whatever. As I said before, although I differ much myself from the views expressed in this correspondence, and from the manner in which the Government have generally treated this question of postal communication with the East, I am not in a position to offer any Amendment to the consideration of this Committee; but, in conclusion, I repeat what I said just now, that, as the whole of the arrangements which the Government may enter into with regard to these contracts must necessarily come under the review of Parliament next Session, so if they be not suitable in all respects for the exigencies of the service, and if proper respect has not been shown to the recommendations of the Select Committee to whom the matter was referred, I shall invite the House to express its opinion upon the manner in which the whole affair has been conducted.

Mr. HUNT: I am sure that the Committee feel very much obliged to my hon. Friend for the observations which he has made on the subject he invites us to discuss, and I am equally sure that Her Majesty's Government will not complain of the manner in which he has dealt with it; but I think it must be obvious to every Member of the Committee who has heard the speech of my hon. Friend that the main objection which he has raised to the slight deviations from the recommendations of the Select Committee is owing to the endeavours of the Government to promote economy. Of course, as there is a time to weep and a time to laugh, so there is a time to spend and a time to save; but I think the Committee can hardly blame the Government for making the most economical arrangements consistent with the efficiency of the service, and I am prepared to show that the whole spirit of the recommendations of the Select Committee has been embodied in the proposal authorized by the Government, and that therefore the appeal which my hon. Friend has addressed to the House is hardly borne out by the facts. My hon. Friend went in order through the recommendations of the Committee; and the first recommendation is—

> "That the time has arrived when tenders should be invited for a weekly service to Bombay alone, and the separate postal service between this country and Madras and Calcutta should be discontinued."

Now, my hon. Friend admits that the Government, although only recently come into office, took an early opportunity to deal with that question, and to give notice to terminate the existing contract with a view to establishing such weekly service. The second recommendation is—

> "That such service should be on the footing of an express service, entirely unconnected, to the eastward of Suez, with any other mail services;"

and the hon. Gentleman complains that that recommendation has been disregarded. It is true that another arrangement has been determined upon, as mentioned in the Treasury Minute; and the object of that arrangement is that to which my hon. Friend has alluded—namely, to promote economy as far as possible; for, of course if the service to Aden is made use of for the mails further east to China and Japan the expense of a double service between Aden and Suez will be avoided. My hon. Friend has called attention to the fact that in the Treasury Minute tenders are to be called for a fortnightly service between Aden and Japan, touching at Galle, Penang, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Shanghai, and those Members of the Committee who have read the tenders will see that the persons offering are distinctly asked to say for what sum they will convey the mails from Aden to Yokohama, and for what further sum they would be willing to continue the service from Aden to Suez. Therefore, it will be seen that this question came under the consideration of the Government, who naturally wished to have alternative terms before them. When this information has been obtained they will be in a position to carry out the second recommendation if it should be thought desirable. My hon. Friend will admit that the question of economy is one that must enter into the consideration of the Government, and if there should be a great difference, which I do not apprehend, between the services eastward from Suez and from Aden, it is a matter which we are bound not to overlook. My hon. Friend has alluded to and complains of the losses on the Eastern Postal services being so mixed up together that the loss on the Indian service cannot be distinguished from that on the China and Australian service. That is perfectly true, and he is quite correct in his figures when he says that the £160,000 of total loss is made up in this way: India, £48,000; China, £34,000; and Australia £78,000. My hon. Friend complains that that the £48,000 set down as lost on the Indian service is an over-estimate, and his calculation makes it only a little over £30,000; but he forgets to tell us that, according to the Post Office Estimate, when the weekly service to Bombay has been established there will be a further loss of £40,000 net, so that putting the two sums together there is an estimated loss of £90,000, or very nearly that amount. Then arose the question with the Government, whether the postal rate was to continue the same? My hon. Friend says that we propose an additional charge on the public; but I think it is fair to assume that it is not an additional charge upon the public, but an additional charge upon those who avail themselves of the service to the relief of the public. At the time when we were expecting that there would be so large an additional loss, it necessarily became a question for our consideration, whether the general taxpayer or those who used the service for carrying on their correspondence with the East should pay the difference, and this no doubt is a matter which is open to discussion. Three propositions were placed before the Government; they were these: should the postage rate remain the same, or should it be increased to 1*s.*, or should some middle point be taken; and after giving the question mature consideration, it was settled that the postal rate for the half-an-ounce letter should be 9*d.*, which is the medium between the 6*d.* at present charged and the 1*s.* which was proposed. It was felt that that would not be a grievous charge to persons who have correspondence with India, and that otherwise a great loss would be sustained by the general public. My hon. Friend did not dwell much upon the question of speed. Still he said enough to show that he thinks we have not fulfilled the recommendation of the Committee on that part of the subject. If he looks at the terms of the tender he will find that that is not so, because the advertisement asks for tenders for a rate of speed which is about ten nautical miles to the east of Suez, and about eleven on this side of Alexandria, and the persons tendering are also asked to state what terms they would expect supposing the rate of speed is increased. They are also to name the rate of speed which they can undertake to accomplish. Therefore, when the tenders come in, we shall be able to prescribe the rate of speed, whether it shall be the minimum recommended by the Select Committee, or any higher rate. Of course, the question of speed is one of money; and therefore it was thought desirable by the Government to specify different rates of speed, and that these should be placed in juxta-position with the different charges for those rates of speed. When, therefore, we have all this information before us, we shall be able to come to a conclusion as to what speed shall be prescribed. The next question which was adverted to by my hon. Friend was whether we should continue to use the port of Marseilles or go to the port of Brindisi as the port of departure from Europe, and I must say that we are not open to any imputation in having asked for tenders for each of these routes. Permit me to call the attention of this Committee to the fact that when the Government resolved upon asking tenders for Brindisi, they had received an important Report from Captain Tyler, which it was impossible to have laid before the Select Committee, seeing that Captain Tyler's Report is dated the 19th of July, whilst the Report of the Committee is dated the 20th. Consequently it is clear that Captain Tyler's Report could not have gone before the Committee. New matter, therefore, was in the possession of the Government which had not been submitted to the Committee; and certainly the Report of Captain Tyler, which is a very able one, put the Brindisi route in a much more favourable light than persons in this country had ever imagined. After perusing that Report carefully, we thought it was not open to us to discard the question of Brindisi altogether, and that we ought to ask for a tender for that route also. Captain Tyler's Report shows, I think, a saving at once of thirty-six hours between this country and Alexandria, supposing the Mont Cenis and Brindisi route were adopted. Under these circumstances, I think the Committee will be of opinion that Her Majesty's Government were not unjustified in inviting tenders for the port of Brindisi. At the same time we have not put by the question of the continuance of the service from Marseilles; but what we asked for was that, concurrently with tenders for a service from Brindisi, we should have tenders for the service from Marseilles to Alexandria. Probably, when the time arrives for deciding on the different tenders, we shall be in a position to judge whether the proposed route by Mont Cenis and the port of Brindisi can be relied upon. Next comes the question raised by my hon. Friend with regard to the French Company, the Messageries Impèriales. My hon. Friend seems to think that it is altogether wrong to ask a tender from a French Company; but let me call attention first of all to the recommendation of the Select Committee on that point. It is the sixth of their recommendations, and it is in these terms—

> "That Her Majesty's Government should take into their early consideration the arrangements to be made, in consequence of the proposed separation of the Indian service, for maintaining a fortnightly or half-monthly service to China, and a monthly or four-weekly service to Australia, having regard to any facilities which may be afforded by the monthly service to China now performed by the Messageries Impériales from Marseilles."

Any one upon reading that recommendation must see that the Committee had in view the making use, as far as they could, of the services of the French Company. My hon. Friend says that what the Committee meant was that they should use it as an intermediate service; but I have also heard another view expressed as to their meaning, which is that any arrangement to be made should be with the French Government, and not with the Company, for the conveyance of our mails once a month by means of the Messageries Impériales. And certainly the sixth recommendation of the Committee does not bear out clearly the interpretation put upon it by my hon. Friend. My hon. Friend has protested in energetic terms against any contract being made with a foreign company. Well, what did we do? We advertised for tenders from all the world. Were we to say, as is done in advertising for servants, that "no Irish need apply," that "no French need apply?" Ours was an open offer. We asked all the world to tender upon what terms they would contract to carry on the service. And we would not exclude French, or even Chinese or Japanese, if they choose to come forward. Not only did we issue tenders for the whole or any part of the service; but the Post Office also sent out copies of tenders to different companies, and among others to the French Company. I should say, therefore, that we are in a position to entertain any offer that comes from any company whatever for any part of the service, and certainly to consider any offer that comes from the Messageries Impériales. After all, I do not think that my hon. Friend need be so much alarmed as to the French Company being likely to take the contract, if the observations he himself makes be correct, because he says that the terms under which that Company are with the French Government would not allow of their entering into a contract with us. If that be so, there is no longer any ground for his fears. I should add that, in addition to these tenders having been sent out to different companies, we have been in semi-official communication with the French Government as to any arrangements that might be made for our mutual advantage. These semi-official negotiations, however, have not yet been brought to a conclusion. I am not therefore in a position to inform this Committee what they are at present; but, generally speaking, I should say that Her Majesty's Government are desirous of having before them the particulars of every possible arrangement that can be made for the efficient conduct of the mail service, and that when they have before them all the proposed arrangements, whether by the French Company or the French Government, they will be in a position to judge of the whole matter, and to place it on a sound basis. My hon. Friend has has referred to the Resolutions agreed to by this House in the year 1860. There were three of them. The first is—

> "That in all contracts extending over a period of years, and creating a public charge, actual or prospective, entered into by the Government for the conveyance of mails by sea, or for the purpose of telegraphic communication beyond sea, there shall be inserted the condition that the contract shall not be binding until it has lain upon the table of the House of Commons for one month without disapproval, unless previous to the lapse of that period it has been approved of by a Resolution of the House."
>
> (2.) "That every such contract when executed should forthwith, if Parliament be then sitting, or if Parliament be not then sitting, within fourteen days after it assembles, be laid upon the table of the House, accompanied by a Minute of the Lords of the Treasury setting forth the grounds on which they have proceeded in authorizing it."
>
> (3.) "That in case where any such contract requires to be confirmed by Act of Parliament, the Bill for that purpose should not be introduced and dealt with as a Private Bill, and that power to the Government to enter into agreements by which obligations at the public charge should be undertaken, should not be given in any Private Act."

My hon. Friend can hardly fail to observe that in the terms of the tender which we have sent and the conditions we have specified the second Resolution is included. Certainly there is a difficulty about a contract which has been made when the House is not sitting, but that is an inherent vice of the Resolution. And if this contract is made when the House is not sitting, it will be open to the House to refuse it when they meet again. My hon. Friend can hardly consider it to be the duty of the Government to call Parliament together in the month of October or November to express the opinion that the contract should not be made, but if that be his view, he will no doubt take means for giving expression to it. My hon. Friend has been very severe on the letter of the Postmaster General of the 2nd of March, to the effect that if an advantageous offer were made the period for the commencement of the contract might be postponed. He says, that is another of your mere economical notions, and that it would be preposterous for the sake of pounds, shillings, and pence considerations to postpone the commencement of a contract. But as this contract is proposed to be for six years, and supposing that we had a very reasonable offer and could make a temporary arrangement which would be perfectly efficient until the new service could be commenced—remembering, I repeat, that it is proposed the contract should last for six years—I think that considerations of pounds, shillings, and pence are important, and that we should consider whether the adoption of some temporary arrangement under the circumstances might not lead to a considerable cheapening of the service. I believe I have now gone through all the points which were referred to by my hon. Friend, and I hope after the observations I have made that the Committee will be of opinion that Her Majesty's Government are not really open to the strictures that have been passed upon them.

Mr. CHILDERS: I am sorry that I cannot agree with my hon. Friend opposite in the opinion that all the arrangements of Her Majesty's Government are entirely satisfactory. So far from that, having sat upon the Select Committee with my hon. Friend the Member for London, and having had the honour with him of preparing the Report of the Committee, and the Committee having unanimously adopted that Report, I think it is much to be regretted that in several instances the Government have not complied with the recommendations of the Committee, and that in cases where they have complied with them in the letter, they have, in several respects, departed from them in their spirit. In fact, it is easy to show that they have not been quite so regardful of what my hon. Friend describes as pounds, shillings, and pence, as to satisfy the just economical requirements of the subject which is entrusted to them. Let me remind this Committee of what is the nature of the service with the East which it is proposed to deal with. There are at present, practically, two contracts for the Eastern Postal service. One is for the service of India and China, consisting of two sections. The first of these has a trunk line to Point de Galle, with extensions to Calcutta and China respectively. The second section is the branch service between Suez and Bombay, which, during a portion of the year, has been on the footing of a weekly, or fourth of a monthly service. The service between Point de Galle and Calcutta is not, by the recommendations of the Committee and the judgment of the Government, in future to be carried on. Under the facilities which will in a short time be afforded by means of the railways which cross India, from Bombay to Calcutta, to Madras and to other parts of the Peninsula, the whole of the Indian Postal service will be carried on from Suez to Bombay, and the service *viâ* Galle will then only be available for the China service, with, perhaps, a branch to the Mauritius. The other contract is for a service from Point de Galle to Australia; and its expense is entirely unconnected with that for India and China. There is this further difference between the two contracts—that for Bombay, Galle, Madras, Calcutta, and China is terminable at one year's notice; and that for the Australian route, from Galle to Australia, is terminable at two years' notice. And the question which came before the Select Committee was, in what way these contracts should be dealt with; and, in the first place, was it expedient that the Indian service should be entirely dissevered from that to China and Australia? The evidence which was laid before the Committee was to this effect—The railways from Bombay to Madras, and from Bombay to Calcutta and the North Western Provinces of India, are not yet opened; but they will be in the course of next year. The Committee were unanimously of opinion that the future service to India should be exclusively to Bombay and over these lines of railway. But some regard should be had to the time when the railways would be open. If tenders are called for, and a contract entered into at once for the service to Bombay only, you will find yourselves in this most awkward and inconvenient position, that the steamers which carry your mails will not be available for passengers wishing to go to Madras and Calcutta, and that there must be kept up a branch service for passengers from Galle to Madras and Calcutta, carrying no mails. Adopting then the plan of the Committee, the sound policy would have been to give notice to the existing contractors to determine the whole service at the expiration of the two years, and that fresh tenders should be called for, for which other companies would be at liberty to apply as well as the Peninsular and Oriental Company, for the Indian service only *viâ* Bombay, and for the China, Australian and other services *via* Galle. But what the Government have done is to call for tenders for the India and China services only, to come into operation next February, whereas the railway from Bombay to Madras, Calcutta and other parts of India, will not be opened until a later period in the year. In doing this my hon. Friend has exposed the Treasury to the payment of a great deal more than they would have had to pay had they made a temporary arrangement on the basis of the present route, and called for tenders for the permanent service, to commence after the railways were open. This was clearly the view of the Select Committee. The evidence of Mr. Frederick Hill, the able officer of the Post Office to whom my hon. Friend has referred, given before the Select Committee, clearly sets forth these points. It is at page 14 of the Evidence. It is perfectly clear, I think, from that, and indeed from all the evidence which was given before the Committee, that what ought to have been done was this—not to have rushed at once into calling for tenders to come into operation in February next, a year, or at least many months, before the railways to Calcutta and Madras are open, but to have made arrangements by which tenders would be called for, to come into operation at the same time for the whole of the services; and it would only have been necessary so to have arranged the notices that the present contracts would cease to operate at the expiration of the two years' notice required by the terms of the contract for the Australian line. At the end of that two years' notice, it is clear from the evidence before the Committee that the railways would be in full operation, and that a weekly line of steamers to Bombay would carry not only the mails, but the whole of the passengers for Madras, Calcutta, and the North Western Provinces of India, as well as Bombay. I think, then, that my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury was ill-advised in taking this precipitate step, and calling for tenders all at once for the India and China services. But let me point out to this Committee that there has been committed a grievous mistake in respect of the Australian contract. As I have said, it was intended that notices should be given for the whole of the services, but up to this moment no notice whatever has been given for the Australian service. Instead of giving that notice, however, the Government entered into a correspondence with the Australian Governments as to what they wished to have done, and the effect of their doing so has been that the Australian Governments have said, "We should like a better and more complete service, and we estimate such a service to cost the Home Government and ourselves £300,000 instead of £160,000;" and, accordingly they have combined to press upon Her Majesty's Government to undertake a Postal service to Australia, costing this country more than double the present service. That has been the first effect of consulting them as to what arrangements should be made before giving the notice. But it will have another unfortunate result. I do not assume what company will have the contract for India, whether it be the Peninsular and Oriental Company, which has certainly done its work remarkably well, or any other company. But whether it be the Peninsular and Oriental or any other company, next year there will be a company in possession of the field, and carrying on the service for two-thirds of the route, that is, between India and China *viâ* Point de Galle; and, of course, if notice is only to be given now or some months hence for the branch service to Australia, the Company in the field will be able to make what terms it pleases with respect to that service; at least no other company would be able to compete with it on anything like an equal footing. I say, then, that I think Her Majesty's Government have not acted judiciously in postponing a part of the notice, and that in making arrangements prematurely in regard to the other part they are likely very much to prejudice the Australian contract. These are the two grievous mistakes which, in my judgment, they have committed in making their arrangements for the service. Let me now say a word or two about the Messageries Impériales. My hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury says there was some little difference of opinion with regard to the meaning of the paragraph in the report in which the Committee state that they think the Messageries Impériales service may be made more available than it is for the postal service with China. I explain at once that I entirely agree with my hon. Friend the Member for London that it would be most inexpedient for this country to enter into a contract for that service with a foreign company which has already a contract with another Government for the same service. No man can serve two masters, and I undertake to say that no steamboat company can have a contract for the same service with two different Governments. It is impossible that the conditions of both contracts could be the same. Therefore, putting aside the question of nationality, I believe it is practically impossible to make arrangements under which the Messageries Impériales could contract with us and also with the French Government. Such an idea as that could never have entered into the heads of the Committee. The policy distinctly advocated by the Committee was this: we did not think it was expedient that tenders should be invited from the French Company; but what we thought my hon. Friend ought to have done, and that a year ago, immediately after the Committee reported, was to have asked the French Government this question: You have now a service once a calendar month to China and some intermediate ports. We are going to alter the times of our service from calendar to lunar months; that is to say, we are going to carry on our India and China services at weekly, fortnightly, and four-weekly intervals: will you, the French Government, so alter your service that it shall fit into our service, and thus avoid the clashing between the two services which must arise from time to time if our boats go the lunar and yours the calendar month? That is the kind of arrangement which we wanted to make with the French Government; an arrangement under which the two services would fit in with each other, and whilst they would have had the advantage of our service we should have had the advantage of theirs. I repeat I regret that my hon. Friend a few weeks ago, in answer to my question, said that he had not made at that time, though he has done so since, any communication to the French Government on the subject. Let me now point out what will be the effect of our having neglected this. I think this principle will be admitted by everybody, that if we contract with any company for our mails, and do so for a larger service than is required for the business and traffic in passengers and goods going by that service, the public will have to pay the difference. Supposing, for instance, that you contract for a third service a month when two only would pay, the amount you pay for the third service will be its entire cost, or the contractors would get into difficulties, and the whole thing break down. The Peninsular and Oriental Company, most efficiently as it has carried out the service entrusted to it for a long series of years has, so far as its own interests are concerned, gone a little too far, and the present state of things is such that it has not been able to declare any dividend for the last half year in consequence of insufficiency of traffic for its number of communications in face of the severe French competition. It is clear, from the evidence of Mr. Howell, the Secretary to the Peninsular and Oriental Company, given before the Select Committee, that there is not, during many months of the year on the China route, in consequence of the competition of the French service, more passenger traffic than enough for one ship a month. Would it, then, be wise that we should subsidize a company to carry on a service more than there is business to justify, and that this House should pay not the proper proportion due for the mails, but the entire expense of the ships employed in the service? Supposing, for instance, there is only trade enough between Galle and China for two mail ships a month, and you establish now, on some principle of nationality, three mail ships a month, though the Secretary to the Peninsular and Oriental Company tells you that one ship is often enough, the result must be that this country will have to pay out of the Exchequer the whole of the cost of the third ship. I think, then, that in any permanent arrangement you should well consider the probable passenger and goods traffic which will come by mail ships, and not induce contractors to undertake unremunerative services, when you would have the company with whom you contract either unable to pay dividends or coming to the Exchequer and asking for additional sums. Upon the various grounds I have stated, I think sincerely that my hon. Friend is somewhat mistaken in the course which he has taken. I am of opinion that it would have been better to have given notice so that all the services should have ended at the same time; that until those notices had been given he should not have opened up the whole question with the Australian Governments, and that communications should have been made with the French Government at once, and not put off until within a few weeks of the tenders being opened, as I fear that the course he has taken will end in this, that we shall not be able to make a satisfactory arrangement with the French Government. We shall have thus expensive tenders for the service to India and China, and when we come to contract for the service to Australia, we shall find that we are practically handing over the service to the company then in the field.

Mr. SAMUDA: The question which we have before us to-night appears to have passed out of the category of an ordinary Vote, and to have assumed the importance of a question of national policy. It seems to me that, owing to some great misunderstanding which has taken place with regard to the Report of the Select Committee, especially the light in which the recommendations contained in that Report are understood by the Government, a totally different course has been adopted from that which, after careful attention by the Committee, they intended to recommend. In answer to a memorial from the Peninsular and Oriental Company, a copy of which has been placed in my hands, addressed to the Lords of the Treasury, and praying that no contract for any part of the Postal services with India and China may be entered into with a foreign company, the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury, says—

"I am desired by their Lordships to state that, in consequence of the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons which sat last Session on East Indian Communications, and adverting to the Report of the Committee which sat in 1860 on Packet and Telegraphic Contracts, Her Majesty's Government have felt it their duty to open to public competition the services in connection with the proposed postal communication with India and China; and they have, accordingly, invited tenders by public advertisement, without reference to the nationality of persons or companies inclined to submit offers for the whole or any portions of the services."

Now, it appeared to me, on reading the Report of the Select Committee, that there was nothing in it to justify this competition being asked for "without reference to nationality." Again, when I looked at the other Paper referred to, the Report of 1860 on Packet and Telegraphic Contracts, I could not find there any trace of an intention that a special application should be made to a foreign country to tender. The great question which the House ought to deliberate upon is, whether it be advisable that the Government should prosecute the idea which they have taken up of subjecting the Peninsular and Oriental Company to the competition of a company in the position of the Messageries Impériales. How does the matter stand with reference to the case of the two companies? First, let us take the position of the Peninsular and Oriental Company; and here I am free to say, before I go further on this subject, that, if the offer of the Peninsular and Oriental Company is not considered fair and reasonable, it is perfectly right that the Company should be subjected to competition, in order to obtaining fairer terms. I do not consider, however, that the simple figure of the tender ought to govern the decision of the Government. I know this is not a very popular proposition to make; but I am sure that if it be investigated very closely it will be found to to be a logical proposition, that the quality of a tender should receive more consideration than actual price, and in no case more so than where we have to place such implicit reliance in the contractors, as in the case before us. This Committee should remember what position the Peninsular and Oriental Company is in at the present moment, and the way in which it has treated the country during the many years in which it has been engaged in this service, and the advantages the country has received and continues to receive from the possession of this magnificent fleet that has been called into existence for this great mail service. In speaking thus of the company I desire to be understood as not seeking to obtain for it any advantage beyond that to which it is fairly entitled; but the Committee will bear in mind that this company was incorporated as far back as the year 1840, and that it has fifty-three vessels employed in the mail service of this country. These vessels have been brought into existence at a cost, including the establishments necessary to maintain them of upwards of £3,000,000. Now, to those who are at all acquainted with shipping, it is well known that an enormous depreciation takes place in the value of property of this description, and the effect on this company, if it were no longer found useful to conduct our packet service and only useful for a commercial service, would be to cause such a depreciation in the value of its stock as to be almost equal to 10 per cent per annum; and if that is taken over the last ten years of the Peninsular and Oriental Company's career, the amount of depreciation in its stock would be equal to £2,000,000 sterling. What I mean is that if by any act of legislation you deprive that Company of the opportunity of being longer useful to us as a mail-carrying company, and it is obliged to make use of its first-class vessels to do second and inferior class work, those vessels which cost £3,000,000 would not sell for more than £1,000,000; and thus £2,000,000 would be lost. If reference is made to what the Peninsular and Oriental Company has earned, it will be found that the total amount it has paid in dividend during the last ten years has been less than £2,000,000. In fact, the whole sum of its earnings has been less than the depreciation in the value of its property would be if we were suddenly and violently to stop its operations as a mail company. The whole sum paid in dividend during the ten years was only £1,800,000. I would also call attention to this fact, that this service is most exceptional in the exigencies to which it is subjected. The amount of money which has to be earned is so large in proportion to the margin of profit that a very little disturbing cause upsets the entire arrangements of the Company. Owing to this circumstance, as the hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) has told us, the Peninsular and Oriental Company has fallen from being a company paying a fair dividend, amounting to something like 9 per cent, to be a company without any dividend-paying power at all. The sums of money it has paid in dividend have generally been under £200,000 a year. Well, now let us take the item of coal. The quantity of coal which the company consumes is enormous. Last year a rise took place in coal to the company of nearly 12*s*. a ton. The effect of such an advance amounts in the Company's whole consumption to about £120,000 a year. The Company has, moreover, on every occasion that it has made a fresh tender, gradually decreased the prices at which it has done its work; and, whereas, it commenced with a rate of 17*s*. 6*d*. a mile, at the present moment it is charging the country only 5*s*. a mile. The Peninsular and Oriental Company has hitherto derived a large revenue from the conveyance of troops; now, however, it must look to the reduction of that revenue, for the Government themselves are about to become their own carriers of troops. In addition to that the Company is subjected to a severe competition with this Messageries Impériales; that competition, I believe, exists in its most intense form in the shipment of goods, silk, and specie. I find that the Peninsular and Oriental Company has experienced a deficiency of specie and silk for the year ending the 31st of March, 1867, as compared with the year preceding, of not less than £226,000. Now, this brings me to the question as to the advisability or propriety of putting the Company in further competition with the Messageries Impériales, in the shape in which it is proposed to do it, by allowing the Messageries Impériales to tender for the carriage of our mails. On that point I have no doubt whatever myself. I consider it to be a most ruinous policy. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hunt) says that we cannot complain of the Government because they intend to get the work done at the cheapest rate; but allow me to observe that if this course were pursued I think we should be working at the most disadvantageous rate at which the country could work. Why, how would it act? The Peninsular and Oriental Company would have to enter into competition with an establishment which is no company at all, but in fact is nothing more than a branch or an offshoot of the French Government itself. There remains only one other matter for me to notice: it is this—so long as we keep the Peninsular and Oriental or other English companies engaged in the large operations they have hitherto performed for us, we possess an enormous advantage as a maritime power. The other night, when debating the question of Army Reserve, we saw the importance of having a large stock of men to draw upon when occasion requires; and here we have employed in the service of the Peninsular and Oriental Company a force of not less than 16,000 men, who are constantly engaged in navigating and working the ships of the Company. That force is at this moment in a thoroughly efficient state. It is composed of admirable sailors who are invaluable to us in every possible way. Surely it is not desirable that these men should be drawn off into other channels of service, so as not to be available for us when required in a national emergency. There is also a point in connection with the cost of these mail services which has not been sufficiently noted. It is argued that it is an important object to obtain these services on the lowest possible terms on account of the great loss which is involved in the subsidy. But it appears to me that the subsidy involves no loss whatever. For how does the case stand? The subsidy paid is for a portion of the work done by the Post Office for the nation. But when the total receipts of the Post Office are ascertained and the total expenses (including all the Packet subsidies) deducted, at the end of the year the Post Office pays into the Treasury a balance of upwards of £1,000,000. The true policy of the Government is to look mainly to the efficiency of these great services. To obtain this result competition on fair terms should undoubtedly be made available, but when fair terms have been secured the contracting companies should not be kept continually under a harrow, and under the fear that they may be deprived on a short notice of the services they are performing, and which, it may be, has cost them millions to create and years to organize.

Mr. LAING: I am anxious to make a few remarks to the Committee on this occasion, because it seems to me, Her Majesty's Government do not fully appreciate the gravity of the issue involved. It is evident that the recommendation contained in the Report of the Select Committee was entirely different from the course which has been taken by the Government. The recommendation of the Committee went only to the extent of taking advantage of the bi-monthly communication established by the Messageries Impériales Company for the purpose of giving more frequent opportunities of corresponding on the China route. But the course taken by the Government, makes it quite clear that they contemplate something very much wider than that; that they contemplate throwing the tenders open for important portions or, it may be, the whole of the service to that foreign Company. It is not a mere theoretical question. In inviting tenders you cannot expressly exclude any particular nationality. You cannot say, "No French" or "No Irish need apply." But this is a very important part of the question; for only consider with what object and view this French Company was established. It was established by the French Government especially with a view to acquiring political influence in the East. The motive assigned by the French Government themselves, and which induced the Legislature to consent to an extravagant grant of money for subsidizing the Company, that we should regard as an intolerable burden upon our finances, was distinctly that of showing the French flag at as many points as possible in the East with the object of acquiring political influence and prestige for France in that part of the world. That being the case, if the Postal service throughout the East, especially with Bombay, which will hereafter be the emporium for the trade of the East, be thrown open to this French Company, we shall find that the French Government and the French Chambers will be prepared to back up the Messageries Impériales with any amount of additional subsidy in order to enable that Company to compete with the Peninsular and Oriental Company. Looking at the question broadly, are there any points of political interest involved in this matter which make it inexpedient to assign any branch of the service to a foreign company? Upon that point, having had some experience in the East, and having spent six months of my life in travelling backward and forward between England and India, I must be permitted to express my conviction that it is impossible to imagine a course of policy more disastrous to the security of our Indian Empire than that which is involved in the course proposed to be taken by Her Majesty's Government. I will venture to say that, if it had been suggested to any of the great statesmen who have governed India of late years—if it had been suggested to Lord Dalhousie, Lord Canning, or Lord Elgin—that a measure of this sort had been in contemplation by the Government at home, they would have received such an announcement, first with entire incredulity, and then with something like dismay. Now, look at the political interests and prestige involved in the question. I am not one of those who attach an exaggerated importance to what is called "prestige;" but when you come to a question like this; when all the steamers that enter the ports of the East, and which are employed in conducting the correspondence and communication with all parts of the East, are seen to carry the French flag, then I say there is nothing so dangerous to the prestige of the English name as to have it supposed that French enterprize and French influence have the preponderance, and that the French flag has taken the place of the English. There is nothing, I am satisfied, that tends so surely to keep up the name and the influence of England in the East as the sight of those splendid steamers coming and going with the regularity of clock-work on the weekly, fortnightly, or monthly performance of their voyages. Then look at the political considerations which are involved in the question. What complications might we not find ourselves involved in with France or with some other Power if we establish a contract with a foreign Company like the Messageries Impériales. Look at the questions which may arise respecting the establishment of coal depôts and stations on the route. But, independently of these broad political considerations, let us look at the question as one of economy—because it is on that ground alone, if at all, that the proposal of the Government can be justified. Take the following practical illustration of a case which has already occurred in India. When during Lord Canning's administration it was determined to abolish the Indian navy—what was the ground on which they were enabled to take that very bold step? It was because they knew that they had in the large mail steamers of the Peninsular and Oriental Company a powerful reserve for the purposes of transport in cases of emergency, and for enforcing the police regulations along the coast, far more efficient and universal than any special naval force. The Indian navy was abolished; and the result was that the annual expenditure was reduced from £1,250,000 to £500,000, a saving of £750,000 a year to be set off against a supposed loss of £40,000 or £50,000 a year. But supposing you enter into this contract with this foreign Company, you cannot rely on them for the conveyance of your troops and sustaining your authority; you must keep in India 5,000 additional European troops at an additional cost of another £500,000 a year. Here then, by your present arrangements, you have a saving of £1,250,000 against a "loss" of £40,000 or £50,000 on your Postal arrangements. With regard to the question of postage, it will be a great mistake to look upon it as a "loss," because that which you get directly in postage is only a small part of the revenue compared with that which you get indirectly. Looking at the postage alone, what a mass of correspondence is occasioned by that enormous traffic of £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 a year which is fostered with India? If you had not this Postal service with India, what would your commercial and mercantile transactions with it come to? Very probably not half the present amount. That being the case, do not you think that you are getting more than the £40,000 or £50,000 a year which you are nominally losing on the postage? What we ought to consider is the growth of wealth which has been caused by this great increase of commerce with India, and I say that it is preposterous to look upon the question as simply one of profit and loss on the postage, or regard it in the narrow way in which some of the Post Office officials view it, whose sole object seems to be to make a profitable contract. That being so, what the Government have to do is to keep in view the maintenance of the Postal communication with India on the best and most efficient system. Consequently they must not entrust it to any foreign company, and the problem is how to get the work done at the cheapest rate for the public consistently with the utmost efficiency. I do not wish to go into the question of the claims of the Peninsular and Oriental Company. That company, like railway and other companies, must shift for itself, so far as dividends are concerned; but it is our duty to look the whole thing full in the face and consider the position in which we stand in reference to these contracts. And I say that to put up these contracts to tender when no real competition is possible, is simply a device for sheltering departments of the Government from responsibility, and is not conducive to the best and most economical result. You cannot afford to try experiments and run risks. Your first object must be to deal with a company which, you are sure, has capital, power, experience and organization, and who are able to do the work successfully. If you have another company in that position by all manner of means invite competition; but if not, look the matter straight in the face, and try if you cannot make a fair bargain between the State and the Company which has hitherto performed the service in the best possible way. What you want is the weekly communication to Bombay conducted directly from Suez without stoppage at Aden. I look upon that as a matter of prime necessity, and that the service should be properly conducted at the highest degree of speed consistent with regularity, and, secondly, at a moderate expense. I only hope, after the unmistakeable expression of opinion given by so many Members of the House to-night, that Her Majesty's Government will correct what I may be allowed to say was a venial mistake arising from the fact that they were new to office at the time they made it. It would not be fair to find much fault with them under the circumstances; but I think it is clear that they quite mistook the recommendations and views of the Committee, and the wishes and views of the majority of this House. I hope, then, they will reconsider the question in the recess, and that in the next Session we shall not be not be under the disagreeable necessity of exercising, for the first time, the prerogative of the House of Commons to rescind a contract which has been made by the Government.

Mr. AYRTON said, as a Member of the Select Committee, that he was satisfied that no contract would be made on the basis of the tenders that had been issued. Any contract would be the subject of a great deal of negotiation, and would probably result in being arranged upon a very different basis from that which was now proposed. If that were the case, it was the more necessary to have a clear understanding with the Government regarding the view they took of that important Resolution to which the House arrived in July, 1860—because the hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Treasury took a very light view of that Resolution. He seemed to think that it might be treated as if it had been unadvisedly adopted by the House; but the Committee would recollect that that Resolution was the result of the labours of a Select Committee, and was come to by the House with the view of enabling the House to exercise a control over the conduct of the Government in entering into contracts of this nature. He should like to know how the House was to exercise the power it claimed for itself if the Government were to issue a tender which was to be accepted in September, and was to come into operation on the 1st of February? What possible opinion could the House express when it met next Session on a contract that was actually in operation on the 1st of February? But the Secretary to the Treasury said he proposed to put a provision in the contract to the effect that Parliament should be at liberty to rescind it. Such a provision could be of no value at all. If it meant anything it meant that if Parliament rescinded the contract it was to indemnify the party whose contract was rescinded by paying him all the expenses he had incurred in providing for the service. After a party had built or purchased the steamers required for the service, how could anybody propose to rescind the contract? But the matter did not rest there. The Government, as regarded a considerable portion of these contracts, proposed that the Governor General of India should make the contract with the parties, and in these tenders there was no such provision as the Secretary to the Treasury had intimated—that the contracts entered into by the Indian Government should be subject to the review of Parliament, or that Parliament should have liberty to cancel them. Therefore, as regarded the most expensive parts of these contracts, they had been withdrawn by the Government from the review of Parliament. A new scheme had, in fact, been devised. Instead of the Home Government making the contracts and submitting them to the review of Parliament, the Government of India was to make them, and then they would be free from the control of Parliament. That was certainly a most extraordinary mode of carrying out the Resolution; and if the Government persisted in taking that course, they would expose themselves, when the House met the next Session, to a Resolution of the House of a very serious character. Undoubtedly, if the Government persisted in the view which the Secretary to the Treasury had enunciated—if they held themselves at liberty to make contracts in such a manner as to render nugatory the power of revising them which this House had reserved to itself—it would be the duty of the House to take these matters into its consideration and arrive at such a vote as it was impossible to propose at this stage of our proceedings. The question was one that could not be treated lightly, and it would only be doing injustice to it if it were raised at this late period of the Session; but he for one should feel it to be his duty if, when they met again, he found that the Government persisted in those views, to propose a Vote of Censure at the commencement of next Session.

MR. HUNT said, the Government had been blamed for terminating the contract for the India and China service apart from that for the service with Australia. But it was clear from the speeches of hon. Gentlemen that the Report of the Select Committee was not interpreted in the same way by the different Members of it. The hon. Member for London (Mr. Crawford) understood it to mean that the Government should use the Messageries Impériales as an extra or intermediate mail, while the hon. Member for Pomfret would have an arrangement with the Company by which they were to fit their service into ours; but what difference was there in principle between a direct contract with a foreign company and an arrangement with a foreign Government which was equivalent to a contract with that company? All the objections, then, which have been raised by the hon. Member for London and the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) applied equally to that proposal. His hon. Friend said that the meaning of the Committee was that the services to India, China, and Australia should all terminate at the same time. What did the Report of the Committee say? Their first recommendation ends in this way—

> "The time has arrived when tenders should be invited for a weekly service to Bombay alone."

That points clearly to immediately inviting tenders. And what are their words with regard to inviting tenders for the other services? Their sixth recommendation is—

> "That Her Majesty's Government should take into their early consideration the arrangements to be made, in consequence of the proposed separation of the Indian service, for maintaining a fortnightly or half-monthly service to China, and a monthly or four-weekly service to Australia, having regard to any facilities which may be afforded by the monthly service to China now performed by the Messageries Impériales from Marseilles."

On the face of this recommendation, then, the simultaneous termination of the two contracts was not contemplated. But who, after all, must be the best judge of the meaning to be put upon the Report but the person who proposed it? He found upon reference to the minutes of the proceedings of the Committee that this Report was proposed by the Chairman (Mr. Crawford). What took place before the Government took any step on the subject? He invited his hon. Friend to furnish the Government with his opinion as to what were the views of the Committee respecting it; and it was his recommendation that we should give notice to terminate the contract for India and China, and not wait for the termination of the contract for Australia; he thought it would be advisable to wait until the expiration of the two years. So much, then, for the alleged unanimous opinion of the Committee that the two contracts ought to terminate together. But supposing that they had received no such advice from the Chairman of the Committee, it was really a case of "Hobson's choice;" for before the Government gave notice to terminate the contract, the Peninsular and Oriental Company came to them and said, "Are you going to terminate the contract? because if you don't give us notice we shall give you notice." That being the case, he did not think the Government were much to be blamed under any circumstances in giving notice to terminate the contract. But his hon. Friend then said, "See what you have done in the Australian colonies." Well, what was the case? Why, that the Australian colonies were constantly complaining of the service;—in fact, one of them threatened to withdraw its contribution to the subsidy, owing to its dissatisfaction at the way in which the service had been conducted. The Government then said, "If you are dissatisfied with the service, make your own contract;" and he (Mr. Hunt) thought that was a very reasonable proposition. The Government then communicated with the Australian colonies, to ascertain if they would like to combine for the purpose of making their own contract, and, if so, the Government intimated their intention to continue the arrangements now made. It was true that they had proposed new and extensive arrangements—three services instead of one; but the Government were not bound by that. It was said that the company that had the contract for India and China must necessarily drive all others from the field; but that was not so; there was a competitor actually in the field — the Australasian Steam Navigation Company — expressing their readiness to tender for the service. With regard to the question which has been raised by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), the Resolution of the House, to which he had referred, hardly seemed to affect the case of a contract which terminated at a time when Parliament was not sitting. At all events, it was no fault of the Government that that Resolution created a difficulty. He supposed his hon. Friend would hardly wish that the services should terminate, and the whole of the negotiations for the new services be suspended until Parliament met again. [Mr. AYRTON: Was that condition in the Indian contracts?] No, it was not.

COLONEL SYKES said, this was a most important subject. He had always been an advocate for obtaining the performance of public services at the least possible cost by means of competition; but those who were to tender for these services must be put upon an equal footing. And would that be the case in this instance? He understood that an offer had been made to the Messageries Impériales to compete by tender for this service. No doubt the question of the amount of subvention to be given to that Company must be left in the hands of the Treasury; but the Messageries Impériales was supported by an amount of subvention from the French Government which neither the Government of this country nor this House would consent to pay to any company. Therefore, to invite our public bodies to compete with a body which was supported by the French Government in that way was an act of injustice and mockery to English competitors. They could not afford to do it upon the same terms. Supposing, then, they had an offer from the Messageries Impériales Company, which would, of course, be infinitely below anything that could be tendered in England, would they accept it? If they did, what then? They placed our Postal communications with our Eastern dependencies in the hands of a foreign Government; for the Messageries Impériales Company was nothing more or less than a Government institution. It would therefore be an act of very great impolicy indeed to do it, or to accept any tender from any foreign body whatever. They knew that merely as commercial speculations many steam shipping companies had failed, to the cost of a large number of shareholders. With regard to the Peninsular and Oriental Company, it had for a lengthened period been considered as in the light of an auxiliary to the navy. It had fifty-three large well-manned ships, and the whole service was in such a state of efficiency, that at any time it might co-operate with the navy. Under these circumstances, if a contract were entered into between the rising of this House at the end of the present Session and its meeting again next year, the contractors should agree that, in case the contract was not assented to by Parliament, they should have no power to recover anything in the shape of compensation.

MR. CRAWFORD said, it was true that his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury spoke to him in February last with regard to these contracts; but that was six months after the Committee had made their Report, and he did not know what steps had been taken in the interval. He told his hon. Friend they were exceedingly anxious that the recommendations of the Committee should be carried into effect, seeing that six months had then expired. His idea was at the time that notice would have been given to the Peninsular and Oriental Company to this effect—"Take notice that a year hence we shall give you a year's notice."

MR. MOFFATT thought it a matter of great importance that the Committee should know what were the views of Her Majesty's Government with reference to the power of the Indian Government to enter into these contracts. He should like to hear what are the views of the Secretary of State for India upon that point.

MR. AYRTON said he wished to know from the Secretary to the Treasury whether the contract for that part of the service for which the contract was to be made by the Governor General of India, and half of which was to be paid out of the British Treasury, was or was not to be submitted to the British Parliament?

MR. CHILDERS said, he should like to ask the same question with regard to the Australian service. He should like to know whether that contract, one-half of which also is to fall upon this country, is to be subject to the approval of this House?

MR. LAING asked, whether the Governor General of India and the Lieutenant Governors of Bombay and Madras had been consulted with reference to this proposal to let the contracts to a foreign company?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that this matter was decided by means of communications between the Treasury and the India Office before he was connected with the India Office; and it was a matter to which his attention was not called until lately. The point raised by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets did not occur to his mind until now. He was not prepared, therefore, at that moment to give an answer to his question, but it was certainly a matter that demanded attention.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, it did not appear that the Government were in a position to give full information with respect to the exact state of things in connection with the contracts to be made by the Governor General of India and the Colonies. He hoped he was not wrong in construing the language of the Secretary of State for India, as meaning that, whoever the functionary by whom these packet contracts were to be made, involving a charge on the British Exchequer, effectual measures must be taken for preserving to Parliament the same control as if the contracts were made in Downing Street, so that the public interests may be protected.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he most entirely agreed with his right hon. Friend that it would be quite wrong if, by virtue of any separate contract made by the Government of India, the control exercised by this House should be withdrawn. In a letter written by the Under Secretary of State for India to the Secretary to the Treasury on the 11th February last, he found this passage—

> "I am directed to state that Viscount Cranborne agrees in the opinion of the Duke of Montrose that the contract for the Bombay and Suez section of the Eastern Postal services, for which new tenders are about to be invited, should be entered into by the Government of India, and not by Her Majesty's Imperial Government. With regard to his Grace's offer to include the service for this portion in the forms of tender for the other sections of the Eastern services, I am to state that Lord Cranborne is of opinion that it will be more convenient that the tenders for the Bombay and Suez line should be made to Her Majesty's Postmaster General, but in this case ample time should be afforded to companies in India to make their tenders."

He apprehended that those tenders would be brought before the Governor General, and his opinion be taken on the subject.

Mr. CHILDERS asked, whether in the case of the Australian Government undertaking the contract, seeing that we were liable for half the amount, a clause would be inserted in the contract making it subject to the approval of Parliament?

Mr. HUNT: The Resolution of the House said, that in all contracts extending over a period of years and creating a public charge, actual or prospective, entered into by the Government for the conveyance of mails by sea or for the purpose of telegraphic communications beyond sea, there should be inserted the condition that the contract should not be binding until it had laid upon the table of the House of Commons for a certain time. That was a contract extending over a term of years, and the Government must come to the House of Commons for the Vote for it; and it appeared to him that the House had complete control over the matter, and could refuse to sanction the contract by refusing the Vote if it thought proper to do so.

Mr. GLADSTONE said, it was clear that the hon. Gentleman's acquaintance with the subject dated from a recent period. No doubt that was the state of things which existed before the Committee of 1859 was appointed. At that time these contracts were made by the Government, and the House of Commons never heard of them until asked for the Vote. Technically and nominally it was in the power of the House to refuse the Vote; but that was a state of things from which the Committee of 1859 released us, and back upon which the hon. Gentleman would send us. It was now absolutely necessary, whether it be convenient or not that the contracts should be made elsewhere, that provisions should be inserted in them for reserving the control of the House of Commons the same as if the arrangements were made with the Treasury in Downing Street.

Mr. AYRTON stated the circumstances under which the Committee of 1859 had come to this Resolution; and said that the obvious meaning of the Committee was that the contract should come before the House in such a state that the House should be free to express an opinion upon it without incurring any pecuniary responsibility to the persons with whom the contract was made. He trusted that no violation of that Resolution would take place; but that when the Government submitted to the House their proposals next Session the House should be free to express its opinion upon them. If, however, they deprived the House of that freedom, they would incur a deep responsibility which the House would certainly take notice of.

Mr. LAING said, that as the tenders sent out contained no such reservation as now advocated, some inconvenience might arise, especially if the Messageries Impériales should make the lowest tender. He would therefore suggest that the most desirable and most practicable course would be to make some arrangement with the Peninsular and Oriental Company to continue the service for a certain number of months longer, so as to bring it up to the probable re-assembling of Parliament, when the new tenders had come in. If there be any insuperable difficulty in doing that they ought to amend their advertisement and let all parties know that, in tendering, they do so subject to confirmation by Parliament when it meets in February, by which means they would have no claim for compensation.

Mr. JERVOISE SMITH advocated the claims of Falmouth in preference to those of Plymouth as the port for embarking and debarking the West India mails. The hon. Member contended that much time would be economized by the selection of the former port; which was admirably adapted for such a service as this. The railway was constructed to within a very short distance of the water's edge, while the communication between Falmouth and other parts of the kingdom was free, good, and liable to no interruption. The only increase of expense might perhaps be a special train now and then between Plymouth and Falmouth; but if two such special trains were run every month the expense would only amount to £160 throughout the year. The advantages which Falmouth presented were so numerous that he trusted the Treasury would re-consider their determination to select Plymouth for this service.

Sir ROBERT COLLIER said, that the advantages of Plymouth were so patent, and had so been frequently pointed out by official authority, that the claims of Falmouth could be regarded as superior by no one but the Member for the borough.

Mr. KENDALL said, he hoped the Government would re-consider the claims of Falmouth, the claims of which were advocated by the Chamber of Commerce at Liverpool.

Mr. J. A. SMITH stated his opinion that Southampton had peculiar advantages.

Mr. Ayrton

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY thought that the experiment of sorting on the system about to be tried ought to have been made when Southampton was the port of departure.

Mr. MORRISON advocated the claims of Plymouth.

Mr. WYLD gave his opinion in favour of Falmouth, and hoped there would be a further inquiry.

Mr. MOFFATT concurred with the right hon. and learned Member (Mr. Russell Gurney) that the new system of sorting ought to have been tried when Southampton was the port for those packets. He believed that on the whole Southampton had claims superior to the other ports.

Mr. HUNT said, there seemed to be a pretty triangular duel between Falmouth, Plymouth, and Southampton, with which he would not interfere, except to say that if the Plymouth experiment did not answer, Southampton, he supposed, would have a trial.

Vote *agreed to.*

In reply to Mr. Childers,

Mr. HUNT said, he proposed to take Class 4 of the Votes to-morrow, with the exception of the Irish Education Vote, which would be taken on Monday.

House *resumed.*

Resolution to be reported To-morrow, at Twelve of the clock.

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, August 2, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—On Barrack Lane, Windsor (Rights of Way) *nominated;* on Great Eastern Railway (Finance) *nominated.*

Report—On Tenure (Ireland).

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Customs Revenue * (284); Sewage * (285); Courts of Law Fees, &c.* (286); Inland Revenue * (287); Dominica Loan * (288); Local Government Supplemental (No. 6) * (289).

Second Reading—Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal * (265); Poor Law Board, &c. (271); Royal Military Canal * (269); Customs Duties (Isle of Man) * (270); Canongate Annuity Tax (Edinburgh) * (264).

Committee—Representation of the People (227); Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication)* (255); Agricultural Gangs* (283).
Report—Tenure (Ireland)* (281).
Third Reading—Dundee Provisional Orders Confirmation* (257).

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—(No. 227.)—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

COMMITTEE.

House again in Committee (according to Order).

THE MARQUESS OF **SALISBURY**, in moving to insert after Clause 27 a clause enabling any voter for a county or borough to give his vote by a voting paper instead of personally, said that the principle was not a new one, having been introduced into the Reform Bill of 1859, which did not proceed very far in the other House. Although the plan was not then adopted, there had been some experience of its operation. The system had been for some years in practice in the election of Boards of Guardians, and he was not aware that there had been any complaints of its operation. The votes were given without difficulty, and the parties had an opportunity of exercising their best judgment. There had also been some experience of the working of voting papers in the election for Members for the Universities. This was a most important experiment, and it had been most successful. If he could show their Lordships that the difficulty of voting for the election of Members of Parliament under the present system was so great as to act as a positive disfranchisement of parties intrusted with the franchise, he should, he thought, make out a strong case for the adoption of his Amendment. He would, in the first instance, call their Lordships' attention to the very small number of voters who were able under the present system, from various causes, to tender their votes at elections, in comparison with the number registered on the electoral roll. He found from a singular Return presented to the House of Commons that at the last General Election very little more than half of those entitled to vote actually recorded their votes, the number varying from one-half to one-third. At Liverpool, out of 20,600 entitled to vote, only 14,600 voted. In the City of London, out of 15,500, only 10,900 voted; in Manchester, out of 21,000, only 14,900 voted; in Finsbury, out of 25,000, only 13,600 voted; in Marylebone, out of 23,000, only 11,600 voted; in Lambeth, out of 27,700, only 11,700 voted. In the counties there was an equally large proportion of the registered electors who abstained from voting, the last contested elections for South Lancashire and Middlesex being striking examples of it. In Middlesex, out of 13,700 on the register, only 6,000 polled. The explanation of this was that many persons, unless they took a very strong personal interest in election contests, or felt it their duty to vote, did not care to undergo the inconvenience, and in some cases the personal danger, of presenting themselves at the poll; and many, again, were physically incapable of bearing the excitement and crowding attending going to the polling-booth. The option of using voting papers was the obvious remedy, and it would be peculiarly advantageous to the new class of electors, to whom the loss of part of a day was a serious matter, by enabling them to vote without any pecuniary sacrifice. This provision was the more necessary, as the Bill contained a clause prohibiting the payment of the expenses of conveying voters to the poll. In Ireland there had been a recent striking example where the military had been employed in guarding voters proceeding to the poll, which would not have been necessary had the votes been taken by voting papers. He was satisfied, moreover, that the use of voting papers would have a wholesome effect in promoting purity of elections. He was not, indeed, so Utopian as to expect that bribery would thereby be put an end to altogether, but it would be made infinitely more difficult. He hoped that though the Government had met with a defeat on this point in the other House, they had not changed their opinion with regard to voting papers, and he was glad to find that the principle was embodied in the Scotch Bill, which had passed the second reading in the House of Commons. He had brought forward the subject very imperfectly, but he had done so from a sense of duty. If an election could not be carried on unless at the risk of tumult, intimidation, drunkenness, and, in fact, a variety of evil consequences, which had the effect of preventing nearly one-third of the voters from coming to the poll, he thought he had said enough to justify him in bringing this proposal before their Lordships. It was a proposal which was most deserving of their Lordships' serious consideration.

After Clause 27, *moved* to insert the following clause :—

"Any voter for a County or Borough may, in compliance with the Provisions hereinafter contained, give his Vote by a Voting Paper instead of personally.—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

THE EARL OF DERBY : My Lords, I confess I was very desirous, in the first instance, of hearing the opinions of noble Lords on the question submitted to them by my noble Friend. For my own part I have no hesitation in saying that to the principle of voting papers I give my unqualified adhesion. I believe it to be a principle eminently calculated to do away with many of the disadvantages of our present system of elections; and, if properly guarded as respects fraud and personation, I think it would enable the infirm, the aged, the sick, the timid, to give their votes without concealment of their opinions, while it would save them from the disturbances, the possible riot, and, at all events, the tumult of a contested election. I think it is also a mode which would enable persons to give their votes irrespective of any undue solicitation or influence. ("Oh!") I know it may be said, on the other hand, that it will encourage undue influence ; but I believe if due precautions are taken with regard to the circumstances under which the signature is attached that objection may be entirely obviated. But, even though some difficulties may arise from fraud and personation, still, I think, and have thought for many years, that the system of voting papers is eminently advantageous to the public service. The provision of voting by voting papers was introduced by the Government of which I had the honour to be at the head in their Bill of 1859, and very elaborate clauses were framed for the purpose of securing the voters and the public from possible abuse. Again, in the course of the present year, Her Majesty's Government were of opinion that they might introduce the same principle in the present Bill, but in a more concise form, by embodying in a single clause, *mutatis mutandis*, those provisions which I venture to think have been found eminently advantageous in the case of the Universities. The House of Commons has assented to the introduction of that principle with regard to the University of London, as well as the other Universities, but have hesitated to apply it to counties and boroughs. For my own part, I do not see why the same principle might not be safely extended to counties and boroughs—more especially to counties where there must be a considerable number of non-resident voters. Voting papers, too, would diminish the expenses of elections. I think the best trial of the system was made in the case of the Universities, because a very large proportion of the electors were non-resident, and its advantageous working has been shown in the recent election for the University of Oxford. I am not speaking now with reference to the result of that election, because I believe on that result it had no practical effect ; but the fact was that at the late election in the University of Oxford the electors who recorded their votes were more than double the number that have usually come to the poll at previous elections. Nor have I heard the slightest complaint of any abuse in connection with the system. It was entirely new and worked by persons utterly unacquainted with it, but I have not heard that any inconvenience arose or any disadvantage was sustained ; and certainly there was an enormous diminution of expense, even though double the usual number of electors recorded their votes on that occasion. I think that it is *primâ facie* evidence in favour of the practicability of applying this principle to places where there are a considerable number of non-resident voters. I do not think it ought to be so limited ; but if your Lordships are disposed to do so, it might be applied to counties alone ; but I am perfectly ready to go further. It would, I am convinced, do away with a great amount of tumult, bribery, and disturbance, and I believe that with it the community at large might frankly and freely give their votes according to their consciences, inclinations, and opinions. I hold, therefore, that the principle might be beneficially extended both to counties and boroughs. With regard to the particular scheme of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) I am not prepared at once to give my assent to its details. In point of fact I have not been able to consider those details, and I should like to have an opportunity of comparing them with those which provided for the same object in the Bill of 1859. I know that in that Bill very great pains were taken to obviate every possible objection, to insure that there should be no doubt as to the authenticity of the signature, and to guard against fraud in every possible respect. There was even the obligation of transmitting the voting paper in a registered letter, which was no doubt an insignificant check, but still it was a check upon persons desirous of availing themselves of the privilege. My Lords, if the question, as I understand it, be simply the adoption of the words that "any voter for a county or borough may, in compliance with the provisions hereinafter contained, give his vote by a voting paper instead of personally," and if "the provisions hereinafter contained" are to be subjected to subsequent discussion—say on bringing up the Report—perhaps my noble Friend would be content to act upon that understanding—I am prepared to give my cordial support to the proposal, as I believe it would be eminently advantageous. It was rejected in the House of Commons by a comparatively small majority; but I do not believe that the question was brought before them in such a manner as to enable the House to have a full and dispassionate inquiry. Upon the whole the decision was taken very hastily, and I should not be sorry that the House of Commons should have an opportunity of again debating this proposal, of re-considering the judgment they have passed upon it, and of seeing whether it would not be possible to introduce into this great measure of Parliamentary Reform provisions equally beneficial to the voter and to the community at large.

Earl DE GREY said, he was not surprised to find that Her Majesty's Government were prepared to support the Motion of the noble Marquess, because in doing so they would be acting in perfect consistency with the course they adopted both in the present year and in 1859. At the same time he confessed that he was somewhat surprised at the conclusion of the noble Earl's speech, from which it appeared that he and his Colleagues had not considered the details of the noble Marquess's scheme, though in substance it had been on the table of their Lordship's House for a considerable period. The noble Earl said he had not considered the details of a question which turned to a very great extent on details, and of which the general principle could not be adopted without the minutest attention to details. He hoped their Lordships would not take the same view of the matter, whatever their opinion might be as to the desirability of such a proposal, but that they would insist on having a definite scheme before them, whether it should be that of the noble Marquess or any other. The noble Marquess rested his first argument on the fact that this system of voting papers had been in force for some time in the election of Poor Law Gardians, where it had worked satisfactorily, the noble Marquess never having heard any complaints. Now, he (Earl De Grey) was of a totally different opinion, for he had heard many complaints from different parts of the country as to the operation of the system, and he trusted that before the discussion closed the noble Earl at the head of the Poor Law Board (the Earl of Devon) would state what he knew of it. He was surprised that the noble Marquess should have offered that argument, because the scheme of the noble Marquess himself was much better, and therefore the argument derived from the election of Boards of Guardians was more likely to have a prejudicial effect on the proposal than to serve it. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Derby) rested his case very much upon the precedent of the Universities; but there appeared to be the broadest possible distinction between the case of the Universities and that of counties and boroughs. He was not at all sure that the system of voting papers worked well, even in the Universities; but then it was quite clear that in the Universities there was a large body of non-resident voters, who were not open to corruption or undue influence of any kind. A very different state of things, however, existed in counties and boroughs. Then the noble Earl said that by the present Bill the system of voting papers was extended to the London University. Well, there was no constituency to which the system was more applicable than to the University of London, because, unlike Oxford or Cambridge, it had no resident members. But in the counties and boroughs you were dealing with a large body of residents and a small minority of non-resident voters. Their Lordships were told that by adopting this plan they would give facilities for voting to the infirm, the sick, and the absent. He (Earl De Grey) admitted this at once; but he ventured to think that, however desirable it was to afford such facilities, they ought not to be given if the door would be thereby opened to intimidation and bribery. Then the noble Earl said that the timid would be allowed the opportunity of voting without inconvenience, and that much of the turmoil and excitement of an election contest would be got rid of. Well, but only the other night the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury) objected to the proposal of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns), because he said it would introduce tameness and take away all the spirit of an English election. Now, he did not think we need be at all afraid of this result, but if it came to pass at all it would be in consequence of such a proposal as that now before the House. No doubt these timid gentlemen were entitled to consideration; but he confessed that in their case, as in that of the sick and infirm, he did not think that for their benefit a system should be adopted which was open to serious objection on general grounds. As to the electors in counties who resided at a distance from the polling-places, the true remedy was an increase of polling-places. While this system would, of course, afford greater facilities to non-resident voters there, it would also increase, to a serious extent, the facilities for creating faggot votes, to be held by non-resident electors. For himself he should be sorry to see a large infusion of the non-resident element either into the counties or the boroughs. He heard with great surprise the statement of the noble Marquess, that this system would put an end to intimidation. Probably, the noble Marquess meant that his timid friends would then be able to vote without fear of being hooted at, or, perhaps, having a rotten egg thrown at them. But he did not think that serious disturbances were characteristic of English elections. ["Oh, oh!" *and laughter.*] At all events, while the noble Marquess was afraid of intimidation in this way, he was opening the door to intimidation of a much more subtle and serious character. The plan proposed by the noble Marquess was that the voter should sign a voting paper in the presence of a justice of the peace, and then it was to be at once transmitted to the returning officer. This scheme had been described by one of its warmest and ablest advocates, the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Viscount Cranborne) as being a scheme for taking the poll into the magistrate's drawing-room. No doubt this was the effect of the scheme; but so far was he from thinking this an advantage, that it seemed to him to describe a most un-English and most undesirable state of things. The results could not possibly be good. Take the case of a magistrate who was a large landlord, a large employer of labour, or a large proprietor of houses. Such a man, if so inclined, had only to say to those over whom he had influence, "Come and sign your voting papers before me," and you would set up the most perfect machinery for individual intimidation which could possibly be devised. He was happy to say that he was not one of those who believed that at the present time intimidation largely existed in this country; it had greatly diminished, and was, he hoped, rapidly passing away. But he could not conceive any scheme more calculated than this was to re-introduce intimidation. By the adoption of voting papers they would be placing strong temptations in the hands of men who were strong partizans to abuse their power. This plan, in fact, would have all the disadvantages of secret voting, without those advantages which, as the advocates of the ballot alleged, belonged to that system. But there was another mode in which this voting was to be taken. In case the elector was unknown to the magistrate, a third person, known to the magistrate, was to intervene; and this person would inevitably be an election agent. The voters, many of whom would require to be told how to fill up their voting papers, would be brought into close connection with the agent, who would then be able to exchange his £5 note for actual value received in the shape of a voting paper. At present, if money were paid before the vote was given, there was some doubt whether that vote would be given on the right side. On the other hand, if money were promised to be paid after the vote was given, there was no guarantee for its payment, and in this way a double check was maintained upon bribery. But the voting paper system introduced an absolute certainty, and the money might be paid secretly and quietly, and the voting paper transmitted through the post to the returning officers, without any one having the means of ascertaining what was going on. When bribery was conducted on a great scale under the existing system, as at Wakefield and Lancaster, it always became known; it was rumoured about that a stranger with a lot of money was staying at a certain inn and an inkling of what was going on was quickly obtained; and no great difficulty was found in tracing the offenders. But here the election agent had only to take the voters outside the town to some magistrate who knew the agent but not the voters, and then the £5 could easily be handed over in exchange for the vote without anybody being the wiser, and it would be almost impossible to discover or convict those who were guilty of bribery. There was another serious objection to this proposal. He himself was a justice of the peace, and had the highest respect for his fellow-magistrates; but nothing was so likely to place them in a false position as to bring them directly into contact, as magistrates, with the machinery of an election. Almost all the magistrates were politicians and party men, and this proposal placed temptations in their way to which they ought not to be exposed, and also subjected them to attacks and criticisms upon their proceedings and upon the course they had pursued in respect to these voting papers, which, he thought, would tend much to lower their character and position as magistrates. This was true not only of county but borough magistrates; they were for the most part much more connected with cliques and parties, while their scruples might be less than those of the county magistrates. Thus you would open the door to a great amount of undue influence and intimidation, and you would weaken the authority of magistrates all over the country by exposing them to charges of this description. There was another objection entitled to considerable weight. The system of voting papers would afford the greatest possible facility for the creation of faggot votes in the counties. The 40*s.* freehold was a very low franchise, and it was very easy for persons to possess themselves of it, merely for the purpose of voting in counties with which they had no other connection. He did not object to those who had this franchise exercising their votes, but he did not think it desirable to encourage a class of voters, not otherwise connected with a county, and not likely to have its interests at heart. Under the present system practically a man could not give his vote in a large number of counties or boroughs, because at a General Election, when polls were going on simultaneously they could not go all over the kingdom for the purpose of recording their votes; but under the system now proposed to be established, great political associations—Conservative, Liberal, or Radical—might get a large number of votes in a great number of counties, and the voting papers might be sent out from the Carlton or the Reform Club, so as very seriously to affect the character of the elections, and greatly to interfere with the fair and just exercise of the right of voting by those who properly belong to the county. Another great objection to the system was the confusion and difficulty it would introduce into the conduct of elections. This was not a theory of his own, but he had arrived at it from a study of the Amendment of the noble Marquess. The noble Lord the First Lord of the Treasury said that the elections at the Universities had worked satisfactorily, but Sir Roundell Palmer, counsel to the University of Oxford, stated in "another place" that during the late election he was inundated with letters and telegrams upon various points of difficulty which arose out of the voting paper system. So under this clause all sorts of questions would be raised —some, perhaps, frivolous questions—by election agents at the poll, to be decided by the returning officer, who might not be the most competent person to decide them, and the result would be great confusion and difficulty. He was convinced this system would lead to all sorts of election dodges. For instance, when an election was running close, the close of the poll was near, and a candidate had a small majority, his agent would set to work to put all the questions allowed by law to electors, and delay their voting so as to keep his candidate at the head of the poll if possible. All kinds of wranglings might be got up as to the validity of a voting paper, and as to its being filled up in due and proper form, and he was confident that great practical inconvenience would result. If men who were members of the University of Oxford did not fill up voting papers in proper form, what would be the case when they had to be filled up by untrained men like many of those who would have the franchise under this Bill? It seemed to him that the arguments against this measure were more weighty than those in its favour. Above all he trusted they would not adopt an abstract general principle without knowing what were to be the details of the scheme. If he had succeeded in showing anything, he had shown how much depended upon details. He did not think the system was a good one under any circumstances; and it might be made almost infinitely bad if the details of the arrangement were imperfect. We were now arrived at the 2nd of August, and Monday, as we were reminded the other night, would be the 5th; and there would be some difficulty in settling the details of a new scheme in time to send the Bill down to the other House.

LORD CAIRNS: My Lords, most of the objections which the noble Earl who has just sat down, has urged against the scheme now before the House, have been stated before, and have been answered. The two with which he concluded are really a fair specimen of the general character of the objections to this proposal and seem to give some degree of plausibility and soundness to arguments urged against the adoption of some scheme such as is now proposed. The noble Earl said that the greatest possible confusion would be introduced into elections by the system of voting papers, and he appealed to what took place at the University elections. Sir Roundell Palmer as counsel to the University of Oxford, was deluged during the continuance of the election for that University, with applications as to points of law which arose with regard to voting papers. I should have thought it a wonderful thing if, with a system entirely new, and never tried before, there had not been communications daily and hourly with counsel respecting the proper form of procedure. Has the noble Earl had no experience of an election for a borough or county, and had no opportunity of observing what points have to be settled by the counsel for one of the candidates or for the returning officer every hour of the day? With our regulated and well-known sytem of voting many questions arise which have to be decided on the spur of the moment; and your Lordships would not expect a system of voting by papers to be free from questions which would have to be dealt with by professional men as they arose. The noble Earl says that "dodges" and wrangles will be resorted to in order to delay the recording of votes, and he illustrated the point by narrating very truly what has often been observed, namely, that towards the close of a closely contested election the agents in their zeal will endeavour to occupy time by putting questions to voters with a view to delay them in giving their votes. But it so happens that a system of polling papers must be absolutely free from any wrangling of this kind. With personal polling, when a man comes up to give his vote, you must settle the questions which arise before the vote is accepted or refused, and you cannot pass them over; but if any objection be raised to a voting paper it can be just as well settled after the close of the poll, and not a second need be occupied in discussing the matter.

EARL GRANVILLE: Has the noble and learned Lord read the Regulations in the new clause?

LORD CAIRNS: I will read that on this point, although I do not commit myself to the wording.

> "Any candidate at an election may inspect any voting paper received by the returning officer and compare the same with the counterfoil before the vote contained therein is recorded, and may object to the same on the ground of its not being in conformity with this Act, and the returning officer may allow or disallow the objection so made as he thinks just."

Is there a word in that which implies that this is to be done before the close of the poll? [Earl GRANVILLE: Before the voting paper is recorded.] But the voting paper is there, and the point can be discussed afterwards, and the poll proceeded with. Any question can just as well be discussed the next day as on the day of election. I say this is one of the merits of the system. I am quite willing to weigh every objection which can be urged against the plan of the noble Marquess, but it lies on those who oppose a system of this kind to show that there is some valid objection why it should not be adopted. Provided there are proper checks and safeguards to prevent fraud, you ought not to impose upon any voter that he should spend time and suffer trouble and anxiety in going to the poll when he states, as he would in any other matter of business, what is the vote he desires to record. I maintain that this is a proposition which so completely commends itself to one's reason that it ought to be accepted unless some tangible objection be brought against it. The first and greatest objection is that voting papers will tend to the creation of "faggot votes," the very name of which raises a certain amount of odium. There was a time when the creation of faggot votes was a very useful operation—when county constituencies were very small and a few votes would have greatly influenced the result of an election, and when persons would consequently be willing to go to the trouble, the expense, and the inconvenience of creating such votes; but if you have to deal with large county constituencies such as those which we at present have, and with the still larger ones as they will be created by this Bill, I venture to say that no person in his senses would undertake a work always so inconvenient and always attended with so much trouble and expense, especially when it is remembered that it is a game that can be just as well played by both parties. The idea, therefore, that the creation of faggot votes will be promoted by the adoption of voting papers is to my mind an idea which has no foundation to recommend it. It is next urged that the adoption of this plan will promote bribery, and that it would be a very easy matter for a person wishing to bribe to hand over a £5 note in exchange for the voting paper. But how is bribery now carried on? Do the Reports of Commissioners appointed at various times to inquire into these matters show that the money is paid beforehand, and that bargains are made quietly across a table in a manner that can be traced and detected? From the experience which we can all have gained from records of matters of this kind we know that the payment is made afterwards; and the mode in which that payment is now detected is quite as likely to lead to a detection of bribery committed in the case of voting papers as it is to the discovery of these practices when committed with open voting at the polling-booth. As long as the practice itself is not checked or put an end to, I am afraid that bribery will be committed just as frequently under the present system as it would be if we adopted the proposal before your Lordships. Beyond, therefore, the dogmatic assertion that bribery can be managed better by means of voting papers than under the present system, we have nothing to show that bribery would be increased by the adoption of these clauses, or to prove that any person would undertake to make exchanges of £5 notes for these voting papers. But, says the noble Earl (Earl de Grey), a large landed proprietor could easily have recourse to intimidation, and induce his tenants to sign the paper in his drawing-room, and it could then be transmitted to the returning officer. But, my Lords, if any large landed proprietor or any one possessed of the power is desirous of intimidating those whom he can influence in that way, that intimidation can be resorted to just as easily under the present system. If he does not exercise it in one way he will in another; if he does not exercise it in his drawing-room he will outside. My noble Friend opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury), in laying these clauses before your Lordships, referred to the case of voters who desired to avoid exposing themselves to the risk attending public disturbances, but, says the noble Earl opposite, our elections are perfectly free from annoyances of this kind.

EARL DE GREY: I beg the noble and learned Lord's pardon, I did not say that.

LORD CAIRNS: Then I suppose I may take it that the noble Earl does acknowledge the existence of such disturbances. At all events, if we can trust the reports that were furnished, there were some elections not very long ago which, to say the least, were characterized by an absence of tameness, while at others it would occasionally have been disagreeable to have intervened even as a spectator. Have we any right to compel a man who is prepared honestly and faithfully to record his vote to run the gauntlet of an infuriated mob or to submit to disfranchisement? I cannot understand the argument that a poor man must make his way to the poll through rotten eggs and brickbats in order to testify—if he survives — that he has sufficient public spirit to become a martyr, when necessary, to the welfare of the State. Now, my Lords, I wish to say a word or two on the subject of expenditure. Your Lordships are free to a considerable extent from considerations which influence persons in "another place" on that score; but still your Lordships cannot fail to have observed the increasing expenditure of the country in this direction. The House of Commons have thought it right to introduce a clause which prohibits the payment of the expenses of conveyance in boroughs, but it leaves the candidate practically to bear the expense of conveyance in counties. Now, I wish to know whether it is a desirable thing to continue an expenditure in this country on a scale which results in thousands being lavished in an election for a large constituency—an expenditure without which no man has a chance of success, and which has now been declared illegal. The noble Earl says that polling-places ought to be increased, but that course would also be attended with a large expenditure, while the present system could not be done away with unless you erect polling-places opposite men's doors. In no case, my Lords, are you likely, I apprehend, to sanction those expenses being thrown upon any general county fund. But the objection on this score to the present system does not apply merely to the case of the counties. Even in the case of boroughs of any considerable size voting oftentimes involves not merely trouble and occasionally danger, but frequently time and expense; and if the expenditure of time and money can be avoided by any legislation on our part, it is our duty to afford relief to the voters. I think that the objections urged by the noble Earl opposite, therefore, vanish into thin air when you come to consider the advantages which are to be obtained from a system such as that suggested by my noble Friend. But, says the noble Earl (Earl de Grey), your clause will place the magistrates of this country in a very invidious position—it will bring them into contact with the electors and oblige them, whether they wish it or not, to interfere in political matters. That objection is one well worthy the consideration and attention of your Lordships' House, but it would lead, not to the rejection of the clause, but to the substitution of some other check instead of the magistrates. In 1859 it was proposed that the voting papers should be signed in the presence of two witnesses, who should be householders, and who should be bound to give their names and addresses. This, therefore, is a very simple matter, and if your Lordships think that the services of the magistrates ought not to be resorted to in the case of the voting papers, nothing would be easier than to recur to the provision suggested in 1859 — a provision which to my mind would be quite as effectual a check. As to the time of the year at which we have arrived, though I think that that was an extremely good reason why we should not proceed to investigate an entirely new system of re-distribution, I cannot see that it is any ground for the rejection of such a proposal as this, which I feel sure is well worth acceptance and trial at your Lordships' hands.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY: The noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Cairns) has stated with great perspicuity and force the arguments which may be urged in favour of this proposal; but when he says that we regard our present system of polling as one of the elements of our Constitution, I must say that I think that view is held by scarcely any noble Lord on this side of the House. The question before us is one which I think ought to be decided by full and fair argument; and I am perfectly willing to admit that there are certain advantages at first sight in favour of such a proposal as this. The noble and learned Lord said truly that one of its effects would be a diminution of election expenses. That cannot be denied; and I give him the full advantage of the argument. My Lords, to a certain extent also, but only to a certain extent, the use of voting papers may diminish risk and intimidation. I do not think we could hope that it would entirely put an end to them, because there would still be a large attendance of voters and non-electors at the polling-places, and the same influences that now operate would still prevail in causing popular excitement. The noble and learned Lord rather ridiculed the idea of my noble Friend (Earl de Grey), who alluded to the case of timid voters being obliged to run the gauntlet of being pelted with rotten eggs; and the noble and learned Lord asked, whether it was a part of our constitutional system that voters should be exposed to those outrages? Not only do I not hold it to be a part of our Constitutional system, but if any plan could be devised by which it would be put an end to I should be very glad, because I think it a disgrace to the country. The advantages to which I have referred might follow from the introduction of voting papers; but when you come to consider changes proposed in a system which has long been established, and which has been found to work well, you ought to see whether any advantages which those changes would bring about might not be overbalanced by disadvantages. The most objectionable practices in connection with elections are bribery and intimidation. Now, after listening to the noble and learned Lord, I cannot find that he has answered the arguments of my noble Friend on this head. The noble and learned Lord said, "Whatever you do, there will be bribery and intimidation." I admit it; but the question we have to consider is, whether voting papers would not afford greater facilities for bribery and intimidation? My noble Friend argued that they would; and I do not think the noble and learned Lord has answered that argument. At present, no doubt, bribery very often takes place after the election, because the payment is made then, the briber being assured that the vote has been given; but under the voting paper system he would have an assurance of the way the vote was to be given before it was recorded. It is obvious, therefore, that this system would facilitate bribery. Then, if we look at the machinery the noble Marquess proposes, it is not at all satisfactory. I apprehend that it would be very difficult to propose any machinery which would not be open to objection. At all events, we have not got such machinery in the plan before us. The agent of a candidate might see the voting paper after it had been attested, and even get possession of it; but whether he took it into his own custody or left it with the voter he would have an assurance as to the way in which the voter was going to vote. It appears to me that would be a great encouragement to bribery, and I think it would also afford facilities for intimidation to landlords or employers, or any other parties who might exercise influence over voters. I may mention that I have heard from a very considerable number of gentlemen connected with Ireland that they have great apprehensions as to the introduction of voting papers leading to an increase of intimidation in that country. [*A laugh.*] A noble Lord laughs; but I venture to say that, with the priest on one side and the landlord on the other, scarcely a voter in the rural parts of that country would give an independent vote under the system of voting papers. I think that what my noble Friend (Earl de Grey) said as to the way in which objections might be taken to the voting papers is another point which has not been answered. One other argument against the system is the facility which it would afford for the manufacture of faggot votes. You may have clubs or societies which would make a practice of buying up 40*s.* freeholds for parties who would have no connection with the county, and the votes of these parties may, by means of voting papers, be sent in a mass to the polling-places. I would express a hope that your Lordships will not come to what I cannot but think would be a hasty conclusion in favour of this clause. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) admitted that there was some force in the objection to the employment of justices in attesting these voting papers; and he suggested, as a substitute for that part of the plan, attestation in the presence of two householders. But can the noble and learned Lord think that the selection at hazard of two householders would afford a proper security? The objections to which I have referred illustrate the exceeding difficulty of carrying out the scheme in a satisfactory manner; and therefore I hope your Lordships will hesitate to give it your approval.

Lord DE ROS said, the noble Earl (the Earl of Kimberley) who had just spoken had argued that the use of voting papers in Ireland would increase intimidation in that country. He was astonished that the noble Earl with his knowledge of Ireland should have used such an argument. He (Lord de Ros) begged to recall their Lordship's attention to what an Irish election was. In England the first step taken, preparatory to an election, was to withdraw all the troops from the place or confine them to their barracks. In Ireland, on the contrary, the first step taken was to call out every soldier that could be had, not to act in aid of the civil power—because there was no such thing as civil law in an Irish election—but to replace it. The noble Earl stated that intimidation would be increased; but he (Lord de Ros) asked were not the aged, the infirm, and the timid voters to be considered, or were they still to go to the poll by a road which would probably have a horse pond at one side and a pile of stones at the other, while they would very likely see the protecting detachment of cavalry attacked by volleys of stones. He assured their Lordships that that was by no means an exaggerated statement of what took place at an Irish election. When it was urged that there was little or no question of intimidation in England, he begged to remind their Lordships of the recent disclosures at Sheffield, and of the intimidation practised by tailors nearer home. He believed that the proposal commended itself to their Lordships' approval.

Lord CLONCURRY said, that the violence at Irish elections did not take its rise in the locality. There was an organized system of sending peripatetic mobs to Irish counties, in order to coerce the voters. There were certain well-known ringleaders of those organized mobs, and individuals such as Alderman John Reynolds, Mr. Grey, and Mr. Lane Joynt had great experience in their organization. To a great extent these mobs were drawn from a well-known body—the coalporters of Dublin. Before he had the honour of a seat in their Lordships' House, he was entitled to vote in two or three counties, and thus had personal experience of the way in which these matters were carried on. Upon one occasion, some years ago, in the county of Limerick, a personal friend of his—the late Wyndham Goold—was a candidate, and was opposed by a notorious person named Ryan, a miller, who stood on what virtually were Riband, though he called them Repeal, principles. The right-hand man of Mr. Ryan, his gutter-agent in fact, was the same Mr. Lane Joynt who had recently been made Justice of the Peace, and Deputy Lieutenant for the county of Dublin. On that occasion part of Mr. Lane Joynt's tactics, he being the manager of the election, consisted of delay. Some of the coalporters, he believed had not come down in time, and hence the great thing was by delay to hinder as many persons as possible from recording their votes for Mr. Goold. Accordingly, the bribery oath was tendered to all the respectable voters who came to the poll. This, their Lordships might not be aware, was a lengthy proceeding. To read out the bribery oath occupied from five to six minutes, and if the person reading it had any inducement to read slowly, ten minutes could easily be consumed in the process. The bribery oath was tendered to him and to others, who naturally felt with him that it was a deliberate insult. Being compelled in this manner to stand in the polling-booth longer than he would otherwise have done, he had the opportunity of watching the action of Mr. Lane Joynt, at whose instance the oath was administered. In the case of every frieze-coated voter who came to the poll, and who would not submit to his dictation, or to that of the coalporters and mobbites, he saw Mr. Lane Joynt give a nod towards the voter as he left the booth, indicating that something was to be done to him, and thereupon his right-hand man, Cullen, with a piece of chalk marked a cross upon the back of the frieze-coated voter. There was an old man named George Boyle in whom he felt an interest, and as this man was going out of the court he saw Cullen put the mark upon him. He knew at once what that meant—it was a signal to the mob outside to waylay and beat him. Having an interest in the old man, and wishing to protect him, he ran out of the court, and saw Boyle going up the street and Cullen following him. He lost sight of them at a corner about 200 yards from the court-house, and when he reached the spot he saw Cullen pounding the poor old man against the curbstone. He rushed at Cullen and collared him, threatening to inform the police and have him put into gaol for so gross an outrage. Cullen turned round upon him, and tried to push him down; but he found that was not so easy to be done. So he asked, "Are you a policeman? Do you belong to Limerick?" And while he was in the act of explaining that, whether he was a policeman or not, he would not allow such outrageous violence to take place, a friend came up—who could corroborate what he had now stated to their Lordships—and said, "Every man is a policeman when the peace is broken;" whereon the Dublin coalporter slunk off—for, happily, there were in Ireland some persons who did entertain that opinion. From that short narrative their Lordships might infer how elections were carried on in Ireland. He was convinced that a very large proportion of the Irish Members now occupying seats in Parliament would never have been returned if local feelings, local interests, and local wishes had been exclusively consulted.

THE DUKE OF CLEVELAND said, that the amusing speech their Lordships had just heard was really a little wide of the question, inasmuch as the present Bill did not apply in any way to Ireland, and though, no doubt, the principle of voting papers if adopted for England might be extended hereafter to Ireland; it was not then necessary for their Lordships to consider what might be the effect of the Amendment on the state of intimidation in that country. It was quite true, as had been stated by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) that the expenditure at county elections had been excessive, and hence any measure which would have for its object to reduce that expenditure ought to receive the support of the Legislature. One great source of expenditure it would certainly obviate—that incurred in bringing non-resident voters into the county in order to give their votes. It would also save the time and trouble of the voter; and their Lordships should remember that all voters in every constituency should have the power of recording their votes without inconvenience. It was said that if polling-places were multiplied, much of the expenditure and inconvenience of county elections would be avoided. But it must be borne in mind that it was impossible to multiply polling-places without increasing the cost of the staff in attendance at those polling-places. There must be agents to look after the voters, and those agents must be paid by somebody. On the other hand, there could be no doubt that by the use of voting papers the influence of agents over the scattered voters would be very much diminished. As to the question of intimidation, he did not believe that this species of influence, which was happily on the decline of late years, could be in any way increased by voting papers. In the counties there was very little bribery, though there might be some intimidation; but the influence of landlords over their tenants was a species of pressure which it would be difficult to remove by the use of voting papers. The adoption of that system would certainly enable persons infirm, or of retired habits, who now were unable to give their votes, to exercise the franchise. Many would fill up their papers in due form and send them in who shrank in person from the turmoil of an election. When we were about so largely to increase the constituencies of the kingdom, it certainly seemed but reasonable that facilities for recording their votes should be afforded to all who were desirous of doing so. He thought it was of essential importance at the present moment, when the constituencies were to be so much enlarged, that the principle of that proposal should be affirmed, and for that reason he should give his vote for that principle, reserving his opinion on points of detail connected with the safest and most effectual means of carrying it out.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, I think that the advantages which would result from the use of voting papers —the advantages as regards both the limitation of expense, and the reduction of intimidation, if not, indeed, also as regards the reduction of bribery—are advantages that are not denied on either side of the House. The only question really at issue is this—whether the objections to the proposal of my noble Friend below me (the Marquess of Salisbury) are not greater than the advantages which would result from its adoption; and I thought that point was very fairly and temperately stated by my noble Friend on the front Bench opposite (Earl de Grey)? It appears to me that the objections to the proposal of my noble Friend below me really resolve themselves into two, for in all these cases it is as fair as it is desirable to argue from experience and what we know. Now this procedure by voting papers has been tried under two systems—and only under two, as far as I know—namely, first of all in the Universities, and, secondly, under the Poor Law. The objection which has been made, and which was taken by my noble Friend opposite to the University system, was, I think a very fair objection in many respects. He stated, and truly stated, that at the last election for Oxford University, Sir Roundell Palmer was overwhelmed with legal questions which arose in regard to the use of these voting papers. But if I remember rightly, the point on which almost all these questions at the University election arose out of the proxy system, which is in force under the University Act, and the main point on which they hinged was the personal acquaintance with the voter which was to be vouched for by the proxy. I have always thought, and I expressed my opinion when the Bill was passing through Parliament that that was a very unfortunate provision, to introduce into that Act, and I believe that experience has shown that it has given rise to an infinity of legal difficulties. But the House will observe that this objection does not apply in the smallest degree to the proposition now before the House. There is no proxy who is to take a part in the matter under the scheme of voting papers which is proposed by my noble Friend. The voting papers will go direct to the returning officer and will be recorded by him. Therefore I think that this disposes of one great class of objections which has been urged. But there is a second class, of objections which may be fairly brought forward from the experience of the Poor Law system, and I think that these clearly resolve themselves into this—that the voting papers, after having been signed and attested, as my noble Friend proposes, are left in the hands of the voters; and, that it constantly happens under the Poor Law system, that, for various purposes, these papers are collected by agents, whose business it is to collect them, or are forged or tampered with, thus leading to great fraud and abuse. I am bound to say that, in my opinion, if my noble Friend's Amendments are carried precisely as they are at present framed, there would be an opening for fraud in this particular direction. But I would venture to suggest to him this Amendment—that when the elector goes before the magistrate, and the magistrate there and then receives his signature to the paper, and attests it, from that moment the paper should not pass back into the voter's hand, but should be forwarded direct from the magistrate to the returning officer to be applied by him on the polling day. This, it seems to me, would be an effectual answer to all the objections which have been urged on this particular point, derived from the experience of the election of the Poor Law Guardian, and would completely close the door against anything like the fraud, the tampering, or the mere trafficking in these votes which might otherwise occur. There have indeed been objections raised as to the facilities which this plan would give to the manufacture of faggot votes, and to personation. I think these objections were answered by my noble and learned Friend below me (Lord Cairns). I go so far as to admit that there might possibly be some facilities given under this Amendment to the creation of faggot votes and to personation;

but it would only be in the same proportion relatively to the increase of these enormous constituencies, and just as you add to those constituencies so will such facilities arise. But I do not see that in any other sense this proposal will increase those facilities. I wish also to point out another answer to the argument frequently used with respect to bribery. We know very well that bribery mainly takes place during the last hours of an election, when the price of votes rises to an almost incalculable value, because towards the close of the poll a very few votes may possibly decide the election. But if a considerable proportion of votes have been tendered by means of voting papers, no one can tell with any certainty what the real state of the poll is, and it will become far more difficult, as it seems to me, for such an impure traffic as often now exists to go on. Therefore, in this point of view, I think that the use of voting papers is an influence that directly neutralizes bribery in that most critical period of the election when it is most rife. These, in a few words, are the answers to some of the main objections urged on the other side of the House. I will only say this further—that you are now dealing with a very altered state of circumstances, You will have enormous constituencies to deal with. Take the case of Leeds, where, if I mistake not, you raise the number of electors there from 7,000 or 8,000 to some 27,000 or 28,000; or, of Dundee, where you raise the number from 3,000, 4,000, or 5,000 to some 24,000 or 25,000. Under these circumstances a personal canvass becomes absolutely impossible, and personal voting becomes very difficult. It is therefore only reasonable that Parliament should give every facility that can be afforded for the due registration and transmission of votes. The evidence adduced,in regard to personal voting and the voting by voting papers in the case of Vestries and Guardians of the Poor, before the Select Committee of this House which sat seven or eight years ago, and of which my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) was the Chairman, all showed that just in proportion as you multiply your constituencies, so you must give them some facilities of this kind to record their opinions. There appears to be an impression on the part of some of my noble Friends opposite that the use of voting papers for party purposes would be rather more favourable to this side of the House than to the other. I do not believe there is a more unfounded opinion than that. I believe this proposal would be valuable—as has been already pointed out—in the interest of property and of education, of age, infirmity, and sickness, and finally to those who are too timid to go in person to the poll; but I do not believe it would produce the smallest effect as regards the balance of political power. And I can say this, not on my own authority, but on that of a gentleman than whom there can be no better authority in this country—I mean the Secretary to the Liberal Association for the City of London—I remember that in the evidence which he gave before the Committee to which I have referred he urged most strongly upon the Committee the great importance at Parliamentary elections of allowing voting papers to be used. It is impossible to have a more trustworthy or, I believe, a more intelligent opinion than that of Mr. Sidney Smith on such a point. I do not believe that this Amendment would operate in any party sense. If I thought it would do so I should certainly decline to vote for it; but, believing that it will be beneficial to all classes, all parties, and all interests in this country, I shall heartily and readily give it my support.

Earl GRANVILLE: The noble Earl who has just sat down must, I think, have imperfectly heard the observations of noble Lords on this side of the House. Neither of those two noble Lords said that the system of voting papers would tend to diminish corruption, or that it would be more favourable in its operation to one party than the other.

The Earl of CARNARVON said, he had only stated generally that there appeared to be an impression on the minds of noble Lords on the other side of the House that the system of voting papers would operate more favourably on the one side than the other.

Earl GRANVILLE: I have troubled your Lordships so often in the course of these debates that I will only offer a few observations. I object to this abstract principle altogether, and I understand that it is only on the abstract principle of the Motion that we are called upon to vote on this occasion. Three sentences will express all that I desire to say against this proposal. I object to it because it greatly tends, notwithstanding the Regulations proposed, to increase the tendency to personation. I object to it in the next place because it will greatly aggravate the practice of bribery, by making it safe. I object to it in the third place because it will have a tendency to increase very greatly the practice of intimidation. I observe that the noble Earl opposite smiles at my enumeration of these reasons. I need not mention the person who first used them; but I will not quote the author for fear of being charged with that personal recrimination which has so much prevailed during these debates, or having some other hard word hurled at my head. They are, however, pregnant and comprehensive, and they include within themselves the real objections to these proposals. The noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) was inclined to deny the tendency of voting papers to increase bribery, but I think it would have that effect, because it would render bribery more safe. It is alleged that we never hear of money being given before an election; but that is exactly why this system will increase bribery to such an extent—by rendering such corrupt transactions more easy and practicable. My noble Friend (Earl de Grey) has objected to the scheme because it will tend to great confusion at elections and delay at the close. Now, one of the greatest improvements made by the Reform Bill was the abolition of the practice of employing counsel at an immense expense on the hustings. At present, all that is asked of the voter is, "Who are you?" "Are you the same person?" and "Have you voted before?" But by the scheme of the noble Marquess it is proposed that before the vote is recorded any candidate, or his agent, may inspect the voting papers, compare them with the counterfoils, and object to them on certain specified grounds. The parties must consequently be entitled to employ counsel for these purposes; and let your Lordships imagine the effect of such pleading at an election for Birmingham, and say whether it will not cause confusion, and delay the close of an election. The noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) says that the Government have not had time to consider this question, but that they will probably be able to make a great improvement in the details. I think, however, the clause so objectionable for the reasons I have given, and I am so certain that it will lead to the adoption of the ballot, that I shall object to the clause on the abstract principle. It is very hard upon those noble Lords who may be wavering in opinion, and who wish to consider how the plan may be carried out, that they should be called upon to vote "Content" or "Not-Content," to the proposition, when they are told that the details of the plan upon which so much depends, have yet to be thought over and considered by the Government, and they are therefore quite uncertain what shape the details and regulations of the scheme will ultimately assume.

Earl FORTESCUE said, the Bill proposed largely to increase the number of electors. It had been shewn from statistics in a recent article in the *Edinburgh Review* that in twelve boroughs containing the largest constituencies, and together comprehending 130,000 electors, less than 55 per cent voted at the then last election—that was to say one-half of the constituencies practically disfranchised themselves. Whereas, from his experience of the Poor Law Board he could state that the system of voting papers at elections for Boards of Guardians, even conducted in the unsatisfactory manner they were, at a cost so small as to prevent the adoption of the most obvious and not very expensive precautions against abuse and fraud, had greatly increased the number of votes. At the election for Guardians for St. Pancras, for instance, the votes had been more than doubled by the adoption of polling-papers. If, therefore, the object of their Lordships was really to enfranchise as large a number of persons as possible, he maintained that, after allowing a margin for a certain amount of personation consequent upon the use of voting papers, the adoption of the system would yet afford a much juster representation to constituencies than existed under the present system.

On Question? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 114; Not-Contents 36: Majority 78.

CONTENTS.

Cambridge, D.
Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Cleveland, D.
Marlborough, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M. [*Teller.*]
Westminster, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Bradford, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Effingham, E.
Eldon, E.
Ellenborough, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Gainsborough, E.

Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Grey, E.
Harrowby, E.
Hillsborough, E. (*M. Downshire.*)
Leven and Melville, E.
Lovelace, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Nelson, E.
Powis, E.
Romney, E. [*Teller.*]
Selkirk, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Tankerville, E.
Verulam, E.
Wicklow, E.

De Vesci, V.
Eversley, V.
Exmouth, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.

Carlisle, Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.

Aveland, L.
Bagot, L.
Bolton, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Cairns, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Chaworth, L. (*E. Meath.*)
Churston, L.
Clarina, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clinton, L.
Cloncurry, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Congleton, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Digby, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Feversham, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hatherton, L.
Heytesbury, L.
Londesborough, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Lyttelton, L.
Mont Eagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Northwick, L.
Overstone, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Raglan, L.
Redesdale, L.
Rivers, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Sondes, L.
Southampton, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Strathnairn, L.
Templemore, L.
Vernon, L.
Walsingham, L.
Wentworth, L.
Wharncliffe, L.
Wrottesley, L.
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Ailesbury, M.
Camden, M.

Abingdon, E.
Albemarle, E.
Camperdown, E.
De Grey, E.
Granville, E.
Kimberley, E. [*Teller.*]
Minto, E.
Morley, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Russell, E.
Spencer, E.

Bolingbroke and St. John, V.
Halifax, V.
Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)
Sydney, V.

Belper, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Camoys, L.
Clermont, L.
Cranworth, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*)
Houghton, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Leigh, L.
Monson, L.
Mostyn, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Romilly, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Seaton, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Stratheden, L.
Taunton, L.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

Clause *added* to the Bill.

Earl GRANVILLE asked, what course it was intended to pursue in reference to the Regulations?

The Marquess of SALISBURY said, that he proposed to read the clause, *pro formâ*, and to defer the consideration of the details until the Report.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, the noble Earl (Earl Granville) had entirely misunderstood the course suggested. The noble Earl had condemned in strong terms the conduct of the Government in dealing with this clause, as if these Regulations had been proposed by the Government. But the proposition did not arise from the Government. The Government were prepared to go on with the consideration of the Regulations at once, and they merely suggested delay because they gathered from some remarks which had been made that their Lordships were not prepared now to enter upon the discussion of the details.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he did not think his complaint at all an unreasonable one. Their Lordships were entitled to know what course the Government intended to pursue with regard to the Regulations.

The Earl of DERBY said, that the Government were ready to express their opinions upon the Regulations proposed by the noble Marquess, and they had only suggested that the discussion should be taken upon the Report, because they thought that would be for the convenience of the House. He was unable to understand on what ground the Government was attacked.

Earl GREY said, that if the consideration of the clause was adjourned till the Report, there would be no opportunity of re-considering the Amendments that might be introduced, except at the last stage of the Bill, and he was convinced that unless they were extremely careful in settling the details serious difficulties would result. He must express his extreme surprise that the Government seemed so little disposed to assist the House in the matter. It seemed to him that when the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) had made up his mind to recommend the House to adopt the scheme, the

Government ought also to have been prepared to go at once into a careful consideration of the details in Committee; for the Regulations proposed by the noble Marquess had been on the table some days. Their Lordships had a right to complain of the conduct of the Government, that they should now be unprepared to state what course it would be advisable in their opinion, to adopt in the settlement of the details of the clause. It would be extremely difficult to discuss these points properly in Committee without such assistance from the Government; but he should be prepared to do this if it was necessary.

The Earl of DERBY said, he was extremely obliged to the noble Earl for his advice, but could not concur in the view he had taken. This was not a question brought forward by the Government. The clause of the noble Marquess embodied a principle to which the Government had given their support in the other House. It was not accepted by the other House; and the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) had brought forward the question as an Amendment, and had given notice of Regulations for carrying out the principle. He (the Earl of Derby) was asked somewhat irregularly, before they had heard the objections to the proposal of the noble Marquess, whether he assented to the proposal or not, and his answer was that he accepted it in substance, and should be ready at any time to discuss the particular details which the noble Marquess sought to introduce. They had given a general assent to the proposal of the noble Marquess; but, because they were not prepared at once to enter into every detail, they were told they failed in their duty to the House.

Viscount HALIFAX said, as far as his experience went, he never saw a Government conduct a Bill in such a way. His noble Friend near him (Earl Granville) very naturally asked what the Government had to say to the Amendments moved in their own Bill. The noble Earl at the head of the Government had said with respect to the Amendment of the noble Marquess that he was prepared to assent *ex animo* to the proposal in principle, but that he had not had time to consider the details, and he would like, before the Report, to see how the scheme should be carried out. That showed that the Government, not having made up their minds, wished for time to consider how the principle might be carried into effect.

The Marquess of SALISBURY said, that he was quite prepared to go on now; or to have the clauses now read *pro formâ* and discussed afterwards on the Report.

Lord CAIRNS said, he was not quite sure that he understood what noble Lords opposite desired. What he was anxious about was that they should not do anything which was likely to be misunderstood by Members of the Committee who were present a short time since, but had left the House under the full impression that the course to be adopted was this—that these clauses were to remain in print until the Report, and that upon the Report the Government were to give a distinct expression of their views on the details of the plan, and the Members of the House to have an opportunity of stating their opinions upon those details. If they went through the clauses now, they must either do so *pro formâ*, and then no serious attention would be given to them; and if they went through them step by step that would not be consistent with the understanding upon which many noble Lords had left the House. His opinion was that they would be all better prepared to discuss the clauses on the Report.

Earl DE GREY said, he did not think that any such understanding had been come to. He and other noble Lords had stated that they hoped their Lordships would not take that course, and they on that side were no parties to any such understanding. The Committee was the proper place for dealing with questions of detail, and it was the business of every noble Lord, and especially of the Government, to give their opinions upon the details of all clauses proposed in Committee, and not to hand them over to the House to be dealt with at a later period.

Lord ROMILLY said, that, after the decision which had been come to, it was the duty of both sides to endeavour to carry this scheme into execution, and he felt satisfied that they were disposed to do so. He did not quite understand what was meant by passing the clauses *pro formâ.* He agreed with the suggestion that they should not pass these clauses at all; but that they should be printed for the purpose of being introduced upon the Report or upon the re-commitment of the Bill, after they had received the consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

Earl GRANVILLE suggested that they should rest satisfied with the clause which had been adopted, and postpone the consideration of the rest.

This course *agreed to.*

Clauses 28 to 32 inclusive *agreed to,* with Amendments.

Clause 33 (Payment of Expenses of Conveying Voters to the Poll illegal).

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, that the clause prohibited the payment of expenses for conveying voters to the poll, and enacted that—

> "If any such Candidate, or any Person on his behalf, shall pay any money on account of the Conveyance of any Voter to the Poll, such Payment shall be deemed to be an illegal Payment within the meaning of 'The Corrupt Practices Prevention Act, 1854.'"

He wished to know what was the penalty attaching to such payment under the Act in question, and whether it would vitiate the election? It could not have been meant that any person acting on behalf of the candidate, and making such a payment, should vitiate the election, and he should, therefore, suggest to insert after the words any other person "with his privity" or on his behalf.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, that if there was a case of bribery, and the payment constituting it was made with the consent of the sitting Member, he would be liable to the penalties provided in the Act.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the offender must not only represent himself as acting on behalf of the sitting Member, but must be acting on his behalf and must have authority so to act, or his act must be afterwards recognized.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON asked, whether there would be any objection to add the words he had suggested?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR thought it better not to add them, as they would only create a doubt where none existed.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 34, 35, 36 *agreed to.*

Clause 37 (Receipt of Parochial Relief).

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD moved an Amendment—

> "And the Overseers of every Parish shall omit from the Lists made out by them of Persons entitled to Vote for the County and Borough in which such Parish is situate, the Names of all Persons who have received Parochial Relief within Twelve Calendar Months next previous to the last Day of July in the Year in which the List is made out."

The noble Earl stated that they were able to do so easily, because under a recent regulation of the Poor Law Board a list of those who had received relief was supplied half-yearly to overseers. The Reform Act did not require this of the overseers, but merely said that those who had been in receipt of relief should not be registered.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that what the noble Earl had stated was correct, and accepted the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 38 to 42, which regulate the Election in the University of London,

THE EARL OF POWIS moved an Amendment for the purpose of assimilating the elections to those for the other Universities by enabling the poll to be kept open for five days instead of three days, by excepting Ascension Day as well as Sunday, Christmas Day, and Good Friday, by allowing the poll to be kept open later than four o'clock in the afternoon, and by investing the Vice Chancellor with discretion to open three polling-places instead of one.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, it was important the provisions as to elections should be the same at all the Universities, and, though he would rather have reduced the number of days from five to three for the other Universities than have raised those for London from three to five, he would, for the sake of uniformity, accept the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 43 (Residence for Electors of the City of London extended to twenty-five miles).

LORD CAIRNS said, that the clause as originally proposed by the hon. Member for the City (Mr. Crawford) was slightly different from the clause in its present form. By the old Reform Bill the franchise in London was given to occupiers and freemen who were liverymen residing within seven miles of the City. It was, however, evident that, from the alterations which had taken place of late years in habits of residence, the area must be considerably enlarged, or a great number of these voters would be disfranchised. Mr. Crawford proposed a clause extending the area to twenty-five miles; but the House, apparently under a misapprehension, believing that it was intended to refer to freemen generally—a body upon whom they did not look with much favour—struck out that portion referring to the freemen who were liverymen, adopting the remainder, which related to the occupiers. Now, these liverymen were an important class, and had paid heavy fees on joining the guilds to which they belonged, corporations which possessed large property in London, and whose interests would remain unrepresented unless their members were allowed to vote. He therefore proposed the restoration of the words struck out by the other House.

Amendment *agreed to;* words inserted.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 44 and 45 amended and *agreed to.*

Clause 46 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR moved the omission of the word "corruptly," as a limitation which might possibly lead to the defeat of the object they had in view.

LORD CAIRNS remarked, that if the word "corruptly" were left out a man paying his rate through his agent would be liable to disfranchisement. He suggested the insertion of the words "otherwise than of the proper monies of such voter."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Word "corruptly" struck out.

On Question That the Clause as amended stand Part of the Bill?

THE EARL OF DERBY said, that with the view of guarding against such a case as that suggested by Lord Cairns it would be necessary to substitute some word for the word "corruptly."

After some conversation, it was agreed to postpone the consideration of the word to be inserted to the Report.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

EARL DE GREY proposed to insert a clause after Clause 46, which, he said, was rendered additionally necessary by the recent decision of their Lordships with regard to voting papers—

(Returning Officer, &c., acting as Agent, guilty of Misdemeanour.)

"No Returning Officer for any County or Borough, nor his Deputy, nor any Partner or Clerk of either of them, shall act as Agent for any Candidate in the Management or Conduct of his Election as a Member to serve in Parliament for such County or Borough; and if any Returning Officer, his Deputy, the Partner or Clerk of either of them shall so act, he shall be guilty of a Misdemeanour."—(*Earl De Grey.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause *added* to the Bill.

EARL STANHOPE proposed to insert after Clause 46 a clause of which he had given notice. It had reference to the existing limitation of the duration of Parliament at the demise of the Crown. Blackstone, in his *Commentaries,* said—

> "The dissolution formerly happened immediately upon the death of the reigning Sovereign, for he being considered in law as the head of the Parliament (*caput, principium, et finis*) that failing, the whole body was held to be extinct."

It appears, then, that our ancient lawyers did not value this provision from any supposed Constitutional advantage, but only from a fanciful analogy between a living creature and the body politic. As a creature cannot continue to live when deprived of its head, so it was argued must a Parliament cease and determine when the Sovereign is no more. Soon after the Revolution, however, there was a change in the law. The Act 7 & 8 *Will.* III., c. 15, continued the existence of Parliament for a term not exceeding six months from the demise of the Crown; but that Act being embodied in the subsequent Act of Queen Anne had been superseded by it, and was now among the statutes repealed. The 6 *Anne,* c. 7, was "An Act for the security of Her Majesty's person and Government, and of the succession to the Crown of Great Britain in the Protestant line." Clause 4 of that Act provided that the existing Parliament at the demise of the Crown, might continue "for and during the term of six months and no longer." Such a provision might give rise to considerable inconvenience and detriment to the public weal, and he thought it required alteration. What he proposed was to make the dissolution under such circumstances permissive, not compulsory, leaving it to the option of the Ministry to dissolve the Parliament or to continue it to the time when it naturally expired. It might be desirable to have a new Parliament; but, on the other hand, if they took the case of a new Sovereign who wished to retain the Ministers in office at the time of the accession, and to pursue exactly the same policy as his predecessor, inconvenience might arise from the dissolution which the existing statute made obligatory. He thought he could quote several instances of inconvenience having resulted from the existing law; but he would confine himself to citing one. In 1818 there was a General Election, and the new House of Commons worked in perfect harmony with the Ministers of the day, and, in accordance also, he might add, with what seemed to be the feeling of the country. That Parliament sat till 1820, and in all probability would have sat for four years longer but for the decease of the Sovereign. King George III., as was well known, had long ceased to take an active part in the affairs of the State, as was sufficiently shown by the appointment of a Regent. Nevertheless, at great inconvenience and with loud complaints on all sides, Parliament was unavoidably, and without any possible alternative, dissolved. He need not trouble their Lordships with any further illustrations; there could be no stronger instance than the one he had just alleged, and he had now, he thought, sufficiently indicated the object which he had in view. He did not propose in any degree to limit the Prerogative of the Crown, the exercise of which would, as in other cases, be optional upon the recommendation of Ministers. But he believed the proposal to render the measure optional instead of compulsory was one that had in its favour plain practical advantages, and he therefore ventured to recommend it to their Lordships.

Moved, after Clause 46, to insert the following Clause:—

(Demise of the Crown not to dissolve Parliament.)

"Whereas great Inconvenience may arise from the Enactments now in force limiting the Duration of the Parliament in being at the Demise of the Crown: Be it therefore enacted that the Parliament in being at any future Demise of the Crown shall not be determined or dissolved by such Demise, but shall continue so long as it would have continued but for such Demise, unless it should be sooner prorogued or dissolved by the Crown, anything in the Act passed in the Sixth Year of Her late Majesty Queen Anne, Chapter Seven in any way notwithstanding."—(*The Earl Stanhope.*)

The Earl of **DERBY**: If I am called on suddenly to give an opinion upon the Motion submitted by the noble Earl, I should certainly say that it has considerable advantages in its favour, and, for my own part, that I do not perceive any disadvantages in the way of accepting the proposal which he has made. At the same time, as the question raised is one of a Constitutional character, it is one upon which I should be unwilling in the name of my Colleagues to pronounce a hasty assent. On the whole, I am disposed to believe that the advantages of the proposal overbalance any theoretical objections which might be raised against it. But I would ask the noble Earl himself whether, as the point at issue is one of Constitutional moment, he does not think that it is one hardly fitting to be introduced into a Bill which professes to deal with the Reform of Parliament only. If my noble Friend, on reflection, is disposed to press this clause with a view of submitting it in the present Bill for the consideration of the House of Commons, I certainly shall not think it my duty to throw any obstacles in the way. At the same time I invite him to consider whether, as the subject is not very closely connected with the provisions of the Bill, and as it is one which the House of Commons will no doubt wish carefully to consider, it might not be desirable to withdraw the clause at present, with a view of embodying it hereafter in a separate Bill.

Lord **CRANWORTH** thought that the clause proposed was at least as germane to the present Bill as it would be to any other. Its subject-matter was intimately connected with the Representation of tho People.

Lord **DENMAN** said, the Septennial Act (1716) had originated in their Lordships' House, and it was very desirable to make this clause part of the present Bill.

Earl **STANHOPE** said, the advantages of the clause seemed to be clear and manifest, and he thought the present peculiarly a time for introducing improvements in the constitutional forms relating to the Representation of the People. He was not at all willing to give up the present opportunity on the chance of effecting the same object by means of a separate Bill. He hoped, therefore, his noble Friend at the head of the Government would forgive him, under these circumstances, for not acceding to his suggestion.

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause *added* to the Bill.

Earl **GREY** said, he rose to propose to substitute for Clause 47 of the Bill a clause which, instead of merely allowing Members to be transferred from one office to another without vacating their seats, would do away with the necessity for re-election in all cases of Members of Parliament accepting any office under the Crown now tenable by law with a seat in the House of Commons. When the Reform Bill of 1832 was in progress, the expediency of making this change in the law had been considered by the Government of that day. He could not say whether the question had been formally brought before the Cabinet; but he could assert from his own distinct recollection that it had been seriously considered at that time by the leading Ministers in the two Houses of Parliament,—that they had been convinced of its being most desirable to alter the law in the manner he now recommended, and only abstained from advising Parliament to do so because they were of opinion that, in the face of an opposition so bitter and so powerful as that with which they had to contend, it was inexpedient to make any proposal which was not absolutely necessary, and would afford a plausible handle for attack. On this ground, and on this ground only, it was determined in 1832 to abstain from attempting to introduce into the Reform Act a provision to the same effect as that which he now proposed, though it was anticipated that much inconvenience would result from its absence in the altered circumstances that would arise from that measure. Experience had shown that inconvenience to have been even greater than was anticipated. Before the passing of the Reform Act of 1832, a large number of seats were at the absolute disposal of the Government for the time being; no difficulty therefore could arise as to bringing any Member of the Administration into the House of Commons, nor could serious inconvenience be caused by the failure of any person appointed to office to secure his re-election. But, since 1832, the case had been greatly altered; and it must be well known to all who were acquainted with the political events of the last few years that the existing law on this point had produced much inconvenience. Cases, were known to him, and, he had no doubt, to the noble Earl opposite, in which appointments that would have been greatly for the public advantage had been prevented, because it had been found that the re-election of persons on whom it was desired to confer offices under the Crown could not be reckoned upon. Other cases had arisen in which persons who had been brought into the Government had failed to get re-elected, and other seats had to be found for them by arrangements open to no slight objection. These difficulties would be increased by the change which was about to be made in the constitution of the House of Commons by this Bill. In his opinion, it would be highly desirable to give to the Crown facilities for filling the great offices in the State with the best men that could be found for them without depending for seats for them on the caprice of particular electoral bodies. But, if they were not prepared to go so far as this, they ought, at all events, to avoid throwing needless difficulties in the way of making a good selection of persons to hold these offices, by repealing the law which made the accepting them vacate the seats of those on whom they were conferred. An additional reason for doing this was afforded by the Motion carried a few evenings ago by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns)—indeed, this arrangement was almost a necessary consequence of the clause which that noble Lord had introduced into the Bill, because a Member elected by the minority of what had been called a three-cornered constituency would almost inevitably lose his seat if required to offer himself for re-election; all such Members, therefore, would be almost debarred from office without the clause he proposed. The existing law was moreover inconsistent in itself, and would be rendered still more so by the clause as it stood in the Bill. What could be more inconsistent or absurd than the law which made the acceptance of office by a junior Lord of the Treasury or Admiralty vacate the seat of a Member of the House of Commons, while no such consequence followed from his accepting the much more important and more lucrative office of Secretary to one of these Boards, or of Under Secretary of State? Within the last few days they had virtually put an end to the necessity of re-election, with regard to one office, by abolishing the office of Vice President of the Board of Trade, and instituting for it a new Under Secretary. The offices of Secretary to the Government Boards and of Under Secretary of State did not vacate the seats of those who were appointed to them, because owing to the form of the appointment they were not considered to be offices under the Crown in a technical sense, but there was no real distinction between these and other political offices, either in their character or in the tenure by which they were held; it was absurd therefore to apply a different rule to these two classes of offices, with respect to the vacating of seats by their acceptance. But the clause as it stood in the Bill would actually make the absurdity greater than at present. It provided that the seat of a person appointed to one of the offices enumerated in the Schedule should not be vacated if at the time the appointment took place he held another of these offices. Now, the Schedule referred to did not, of course, include the offices which might by the existing law be accepted without vacating a seat in the House of Commons. This absurd consequence would therefore follow from the enactment they were asked to pass: if a Member of the other House, holding the office of a junior Lord of the Treasury, were suddenly promoted to be Chancellor of the Exchequer, he would not incur the necessity of going to his constituents for re-election; but if his promotion were somewhat less rapid, if he were first advanced from being a junior Lord to being Secretary of the Treasury, and then, after ever so short a tenure of the latter office, promoted to the still higher one, his seat would be vacated. This could hardly be intended, but such undoubtedly would be the effect of the Bill in its present shape; and such was the absurdity into which they would be led by maintaining the existing law, which applied a different rule as to vacating seats to different political offices when there was no earthly reason for doing so. The truth was, this system had never been deliberately adopted by Parliament; it arose by mere accident in the course of a strife as to whether placemen should be admitted into Parliament at all. No doubt the compromise by which that strife had been settled had been an excellent one, in so far as it limited the number of the Servants of the Crown who could sit in the House of Commons, and to this limitation it was most important to adhere; but he maintained that for the efficiency of Parliamentary government it was essential that there should be no useless check upon the power of the Crown to select the fittest persons to fill the high offices of State. With these views he ventured to submit to their Lordships the substitution of the clause of which he had given notice.

An Amendment moved to omit Clause 47, and insert the following Clause:—

"Whereas, by the existing Law there are some political Offices of which the Acceptance does, and others of which the Acceptance does not, vacate the Seats of Members of the House of Commons, and it is desirable to establish a uniform Rule on the Subject; and whereas the necessity for the Reelection of Persons entering into the Service of the Crown is sometimes highly injurious to the Public Interest: Be it enacted, That no Member of the House of Commons shall vacate his Seat by the Acceptance of an Office which does not now disqualify him from sitting in Parliament if re-elected."—(*The Earl Grey.*)

THE EARL OF DERBY thought that the course adopted by the House of Commons on this question—a question which more especially concerned the House of Commons than it did their Lordships' House—was a rational and a sound one—namely, that where a person had been returned to Parliament with the full knowledge of his constituents that he was a person holding a high office, and consequently that he was a member of the Government, and should subsequently change to another office being still a member of the same Government, it should not be necessary for him to present himself for re-election. But, on the other hand, to propose, as the noble Earl did, that a person who had been elected—say for Liverpool—as being wholly independent of the Government and perfectly free to devote the whole of his time and attention to his duties towards that constituency, but who after his election accepted an office which bound him hand and foot to the Government, and not only deprived his constituents of a great portion of the time and attention which he had intended to devote to their service, but also to a certain extent crippled independence of judgment—to propose that such a person should not have to go before his constituents in order to know whether, in those altered circumstances, they were willing to continue him as their representative appeared to him a proceeding which considerably trenched on the constitutional rights of the electors. No doubt the course which the noble Earl recommended would be exceedingly convenient to the Government, who in arranging their distribution of offices were sometimes in doubt as to whether, if particular persons were selected, they would be able to secure their seats in the other House; but, on the other hand, they ought not to interfere with the rights of the constituencies in the manner to which he had referred.

LORD TAUNTON said, that the measure before their Lordships was necessarily to a great degree an experiment, and that there was one part of that experiment to which he looked with considerable anxiety,—namely, its effect upon that union between the Executive Government and the House of Commons, which was one of the most important elements in the practical working of our Constitution. The question therefore was not confined to the Government but affected the interests of the public. He did not think there was much chance that a Member who had been elected while holding office under one Government and therefore maintaining their principles would be likely to betray his trust by joining another Government holding different principles, and he therefore did not see why he should present himself for re-election on transferring his services from one department to another. The result might be that a Member of the other House particularly suited for the head of a vacant department might be passed over on account of the uncertainty of his re-election, and a Member of their Lordships' House appointed in his stead. This would lead gradually to a separation between the Executive Government and the House of Commons which might be productive of very evil consequences. His noble Friend had done good service in bringing the subject before their Lordships, and he thought their Lordships might insert the clause and give the House of Commons an opportunity of considering it.

Lord CAIRNS said, that in his opinion no stronger arguments could have been introduced in opposition to the clause than those which the noble Baron had brought forward in its favour. He agreed in every word he said as to the extreme importance of the Executive being in connection with and possessing the full confidence of the House of Commons; but how did the Executive possess that confidence except by having a majority in the House, and also from the circumstance that every Member of the Government enjoyed in his own person the full and perfect confidence of the constituency which returned him to Parliament? The purport of the noble Baron's remarks was that the inconveniences of the present system consisted in the uncertainty of re-election, and the danger that a Member of the Government would be rejected. If there was no danger there was no inconvenience. But what would be the position of the Executive towards the House of Commons if one-half or three-fourths of the Government were sitting for constituencies who would in all probability reject them if they went down for re-election? There was, of course, always a remedy for this state of things in a Vote of Want of Confidence; but setting that aside they might, if they passed this clause, have a Government, half the Members of which were afraid to face their constituents, and who yet might hold their seats in the House of Commons and profess to govern the country, although they had lost the confidence of their own constituents. Nothing would more tend to sever the connection and confidence between the Executive and the House of Commons. He agreed that the question was one mainly for the House of Commons; but he thought their Lordships would be taking a step as much at variance with the Constitution of the country as could be imagined if they expressed the opinion that Members of Parliament might become members of the Government without presenting themselves to their constituents for re-election.

The Earl of HARROWBY thought the present system was a relic of the time when the Crown and the House of Commons were looked upon as two antagonistic powers, and when the theory was that a person appointed to an office under the Crown might be looked upon with a certain amount of jealousy by his constituents. But now that the Government were identified with the House of Commons, the reason for this jealousy no longer existed. Experience had now shown that this practice was inconvenient not only to the Government, but to the country. There ought to be no obstructions in the way of the proper man being put in the proper place.

Earl BEAUCHAMP said, that the adoption of this clause would have the effect of sweeping away that venerable fiction of the Stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds, and there would then be no means of vacating a seat in Parliament.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY agreed in the opinion that a mere change from one Ministerial office to another should not vacate a seat; but he thought that when a Member accepted office for the first time it was but reasonable and natural that his constituents should have an opportunity of deciding whether they would continue their confidence in him as their representative.

Earl GREY would point out to their Lordships that not one of those noble Lords who objected to the Amendment had shown why the rule of vacating a seat should not apply to the Secretaries to the Treasury and Admiralty and the Under Secretaries for the Home Office, the Colonies, and India. The reason, as he had before stated, was simply the accident that they were technically appointed by others, and not by the Crown, although in reality their offices were completely political and under the Crown. If the principle was good why not apply it to all? It was absurd at that time of day that their legislation should be so inconsistent with itself. There was a great difference between the circumstances of the present time and that to which the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) had referred. He (Earl Grey) would remind their Lordships that when the noble Earl was appointed Secretary for Ireland in 1830 he lost his election, being defeated at Preston by Mr. Hunt. It was a very great loss to the Government of that day to be deprived of the services of the noble Earl—and how was that loss met? The King was considered to have the personal appointment to one of the seats for Windsor. The King accordingly used his influence with the Member in question, who vacated his seat and the noble Earl was elected. It had sometimes happened that determined efforts had been made to prevent the re-election of newly-appointed Ministers, who had only been able to re-enter the House of Commons by certain Members being induced to vacate their seats—an arrangement of very questionable propriety. If power were given to the Crown to bring into the House a limited number of public servants—a plan which he thought would be a very good one—there would be no necessity for his proposition; but he contended that, as things stood, its adoption would enable the government of the country to be more conveniently carried on.

On Question That the Clause stand Part of the Bill? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative.*

Earl GREY moved to insert a clause prohibiting all persons employed in the Civil Service or any other Department of the Government, except those holding offices tenable with seats in Parliament, from voting or interfering in elections. What he proposed was in effect to apply to all the branches of the Public Service the rule which was already imposed on officials in the Excise, Customs, and Post Office, which, at the time the Act was passed, were the only departments in which a large number of public servants were employed; but circumstances had changed, and there was now a large body of public servants to whom the prohibition did not apply. But the same reasons that prevailed to prevent Revenue officials from voting must be applicable to the other services of the Crown. In the other House, during the progress of the present Bill, a proposal was made to repeal the existing prohibition, but both the present and the late Chancellor of the Exchequer urged conclusive reasons against it, and it was rejected by the House. Now every word they had said against repealing the existing law as regarded persons employed in the Revenue Departments, applied in favour of extending the law to all other branches of the Civil Service. The Bill of last year contained a clause disqualifying persons employed in dockyards, but he thought all persons engaged in the Civil Service should be disqualified. One of the best features of our Public Service was that the great body of officials were not ousted when a change of Government occurred, whereas in America the contrary was the case, the consequence being great corruption and party virulence. The possession of votes, however, by public servants tended to detract from their neutrality, and there was a danger of their combining and exercising pressure on a considerable number of Members of the House of Commons in order to obtain from the Government concessions which were not for the public advantage. Instances were not wanting that showed the existence of this danger. One of the most remarkable occurred lately, in the case of a naval officer in Portsmouth, who wrote a letter recommending the persons in the Government service there to combine together in order that their influence might be brought to bear upon their Members for the redress of some grievances; and he was informed that, notwithstanding the stringent rules against it, Members were now induced to make most pressing applications to the Admiralty, in order to obtain advancement for particular persons, and he feared that if many persons engaged in the Public Service in a humble capacity enjoyed votes the practice would be greatly extended. Consistency required that the law wisely passed by our ancestors with regard to the only considerable class of public servants then in existence should be extended to other classes.

Moved, after Clause 47, to insert the following Clause:—

"Whereas all Persons employed in the collection of the Revenue are now by law prohibited from voting or interfering in Elections, and there is no Reason for making a Distinction between this and other Departments of the Public Service: Be it enacted That this prohibition shall extend to all Persons employed in the Civil Service of the Government in any Department, except those holding Offices tenable with Seats in Parliament."—(*The Earl Grey.*)

The Earl of MALMESBURY opposed the clause on the ground that this Bill was an enfranchising and not a disfranchising measure, and on that ground, if on no other, he should oppose the Amendment. But he also objected to it because it would disfranchise a class of persons as well educated and as competent to exercise the franchise as any body of men in England; and, thirdly, because it would be most invidious at the present moment to make an exception in the case of these persons, against whom no imputation, as far as he was aware, had ever been brought in respect of the way in which they had exercised the franchise. He could not conceive a more insulting act to this very useful body of men than to disfranchise them.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Clauses 48 and 49 *agreed to.*

Clause 50 (Temporary Provisions consequent on Formation of new Boroughs).

The Earl of DEVON moved to insert at the end of the clause the following words:—

"In the Case of a Parish wholly or partly situated within the Limits of a Borough constituted by this Act the Revising Barrister in revising at any Time before the summoning of a future Parliament the List of Voters for the County in which such Parish is situate shall write the Word 'Borough' opposite to the Name of each Voter whose Qualification in respect of the Premises described in the List would not after the summoning of a future Parliament entitle such Voter to Vote for the County; and at any Election taking place after the summoning of a future Parliament the Vote of every Person against whose Name the Word 'Borough' is written if tendered in respect of such Qualification shall be rejected by the Returning Officer."

Motion *agreed to.*

Words *added.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 51 *agreed to.*

Clause 52 (General Saving Clause),

The Earl of DEVON proposed in page 18, to omit from "the" in line 20 to "sheriff" in line 21, and insert—

"From and after the passing of this Act the County Palatine of Lancaster shall cease to be a County Palatine, in so far as respects the Issue, Direction, and Transmission of Writs for the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for any Division of the said County or any Borough situate in the said County; and such Writs may be issued under, the same Seal, be directed to the like Officer, and transmitted in the like Manner, under, to, and in which Writs, may be issued, directed, and transmitted in the Case of Divisions of Counties and Boroughs not forming Part of or situate in a County Palatine, and any Writ issued, directed, and transmitted in manner directed by this Section shall be valid accordingly."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 53 *agreed to.*

Clause 54 (Construction of Act).

Lord CAIRNS, in order to give effect to the decision of the Committee the other night, moved to add at the end of the clause—

"Provided that so much of Clause 78 of the last-mentioned Act as provides that nothing in that Act contained shall entitle any Person to vote in the Election of Members to serve in Parliament for the City of Oxford or Town of Cambridge in respect of the Occupation of any Chambers or Premises in any of the Colleges or Halls of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge shall not apply to the Franchises conferred by this Act."

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY reminded the noble and learned Lord that an understanding was come to the other evening that an opportunity should be given to the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of London) of bringing forward the Proviso which he had put on the paper.

Lord CRANWORTH said, that the persons to whom the clause referred had no interest whatever in common with the towns. The proposal of the noble and learned Lord would either alter the representation of the towns or it would not. If it did not, there was no reason for making the proposal; if it did, it would create the greatest ill-feeling between the towns and the Universities, and would be an unmitigated evil.

Earl GRANVILLE asked the noble Earl opposite, whether he had received any communication from the Universities with regard to this subject? because he had been informed that several of the most distinguished professors had expressed a very strong opinion as to the disadvantages attending the proposal, apart altogether from the political view of the case.

The Earl of DERBY said, that no communication from the Universities had been made to him on the subject.

Earl GRANVILLE reserved to himself, on the part of the right rev. Prelate, the right of reviving the question on the Report. He would be glad if the noble Earl would have the kindness to communicate with persons in the Universities in whom he placed confidence, in order to ascertain what they thought would be the effect of this provision.

Motion *agreed to.*

Words *added* to the clause.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 55 *agreed to.*

Lord CAIRNS *moved* to insert a Saving Clause as to the Dissolution of Parliament—

> "Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, in the Event of a Dissolution of Parliament taking place and Writs being issued before the First Day of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine, for the Election of Members to serve in a new Parliament, such Election shall take place in the same Manner in all respects as if no Alteration had been made by this Act in the Franchise of Electors, or in the Places authorized to return a Member or Members to serve in Parliament, with this Exception, that the Boroughs by this Act disfranchised shall not be entitled to return Members to serve in any such new Parliament."

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 55 (Interpretation of Terms).

The Earl of LICHFIELD proposed to add the following words :—

> "Where a Borough Rate or County Rate is levied as a separate Rate and not paid out of the Poor Rate, the term 'Poor Rate' shall for the purposes of the Franchises conferred by this Act, be deemed to include such Borough Rate or County Rate."

The noble Earl said the principle of the Bill, founded upon personal rating, was in his opinion a sound one, but it was only right that there should be uniformity of application in all cases. The abolition of composition in boroughs would give rise to great difficulty in levying the rates in some of these boroughs; and he hoped that before the final passing of the Bill some scheme would be adopted by which the difficulty might be met. Under the new system, a vast number of the small householders would have to be proceeded against for the recovery of the rates, and in this manner they would be literally forced on to the register. He thought there should be some arrangement by which the payment of the rate should be voluntary, and if not paid voluntarily within a certain time that then the person should be disqualified.

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, that the remarks of the noble Earl opened up a very wide question into which he would not enter. It was sufficient to say, with reference to the Amendment, that the term "poor rate" had been altered at the outset, in order to assimilate it to other parts of the Bill. Properly, the poor rate included the county rate; but there were some cases in which the borough rate or the county rate was raised separately. The Amendment would prevent a want of uniformity which would otherwise prevail, and therefore the Government would adopt it.

Motion *agreed to;* Words *added;* Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Schedule *agreed to* with Amendments.

House *resumed.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 282).

POOR LAW BOARD, &c., BILL—(No. 271).
(*The Earl of Devon.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of DEVON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that through the pressure of public business in the other House, it had become necessary to omit several important clauses; but he hoped to re-introduce them next Session. The Bill contained a variety of provisions to improve the working of the Poor Law, and one important clause provided, in conformity with the recommendation of a Committee of the other House, that instead of the Poor Law Board being renewed from time to time it should be made permanent.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY said, he quite agreed with this Amendment of the law. It was exceedingly desirable that a permanent character should be given to the Poor Law Board; and, indeed, it was a matter for regret that that had not been done some years ago.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Tuesday* next.

House adjourned at Eleven
o'clock, to Monday next,
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, August 2, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Report*—On Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts Committee. [No. 503.]

Supply — *considered in Committee — Resolution* [August 1] *reported.*

Public Bills—*Ordered*—Railways (Ireland).*

First Reading—Railways (Ireland)* [298].

Committee—Courts of Law Fees, &c.* [287]; Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings [14] [r.p]; Public Health (Scotland)* (*re-comm.*) [284]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [232]; Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* [294]; Recovery of certain Debts (Scotland)* [220]; Trusts (Scotland)* (*re-comm.*)* [266].

Report—Courts of Law Fees, &c.* [287]; Public Health (Scotland)* (*re-comm.*) [284]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [232]; Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* [294]; Recovery of Certain Debts (Scotland)* [220 & 296]; Trusts (Scotland)* (*re-comm.*) [266 & 297].

Considered as amended—Courts of Law Fees, &c.* [287]; Court of Chancery Officers* [235]; Factory Acts Extension* [236]; Consecration and Ordination Fees* [256]; Guarantee of Government Officers* [283].

Third Reading—Courts of Law Fees, &c.* [287]; Inland Revenue* [239]; Dominica Loan* [291]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* [244]; Prorogation of Parliament* [277]; Naval Stores (No. 2)* [289]; Militia Pay*; Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* [294]; Guarantee of Government Officers* [283], and *passed.*

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

ARTIZANS' AND LABOURERS' DWELLINGS BILL—[Bill 14].

(*Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens, Mr. Kinnaird, and Mr. Locke.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. BAZLEY moved, as an Amendment, the following Resolution:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient that the provisions in this Bill by which it is proposed to impose upon the local authority the obligation, if and when required by the owners, to purchase condemned properties at prices to be ascertained under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, should receive the assent of this House."

The hon. Gentleman objected to the provision requiring the corporations of municipalities to purchase dilapidated property, and to build houses for the working classes on the sites. Such a provision was calculated to induce owners of property to allow their houses to fall into a state of ruin in the hope that they would get a good price for them from the local authorities. It was impossible to expect corporate bodies to take those duties upon themselves in addition to their other responsible duties. This Bill was, in this respect, an interference with the free agency of the public at large and with the rights of property. The provision in question would necessarily enhance the value of dilapidated property at the expense of the public. He hoped that the hon. Member for Finsbury would consent to expunge this obnoxious clause, and would amend his Bill so as to make property responsible in its duties as well as its privileges. At that advanced period of the Session he thought that the hon. Member would do well to withdraw his Bill and introduce a more satisfactory one in the next Session.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient that the provisions in this Bill by which it is proposed to impose upon the local authority the obligation, if and when required by the owners, to purchase condemned properties at prices to be ascertained under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, should receive the assent of this House,"—(*Mr. Bazley,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. POWELL remarked that the proposition of the hon. Member for Manchester was a most inconvenient one, inasmuch as, if carried, it would seriously interfere with the further progress of the Bill, and thus set at nought the great labours bestowed upon it in advancing it to its present stage.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, the Motion of the hon. Member for Manchester was a practical way of getting rid of an objectionable Bill. He agreed with that hon. Gentleman that it was monstrous to suppose that the municipal authorities could provide houses for the poor. The ratepayers had quite enough to do with their money without being required to build dwellings for the working classes. If such a principle were admitted he did not know where it would stop. The next demand made upon them might be to provide clothing, if not carriages and horses, for the poor. He trusted that the House would support the Motion of the hon. member for Manchester.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he thought it desirable that this measure should be submitted to the consideration of a Committee. He however confessed he was of opinion that there was great weight in the objections of the hon. member for Manchester as to the policy of obliging corporate bodies to become the purchasers of dilapidated property. Such a measure would probably lead to great inconvenience.

Mr. WHALLEY agreed with the observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, as well as with the Amendment of the hon. Member for Manchester, which he contended was the only safe course under the circumstances, to adopt. If they allowed the Bill, in its present shape, to go into Committee it would be almost impossible to mould it into a proper form. It was extending the principle of centralization in perhaps, the most offensive way ever proposed in that House.

Mr. LOCKE said, he was afraid that neither the hon. Member for Peterborough nor the hon. and learned Member for Portsmouth could have considered this subject very deeply, seeing that this was the first occasion that they had ever turned their attention to it. ["No!"] Well, perhaps he should have said the second time. The hon. Members objected to the power of purchasing house property of this description being given to the local authorities; but if the local authorities were not to have that power, who was to have it? [Mr. Serjeant Gaselee: The people themselves.] But who was to set the people in motion? Where were they to find a body of men so capable of discharging such a duty as the municipal authorities? It was an extraordinary fact that people who were generally so anxious to promote the welfare of the poor always offered the most violent opposition to any proposition improving their condition which involved the levying of a rate. What did the Bill propose to do? Medical officers by hundreds had shown that in Manchester and in other populous towns there were places which bred fevers and other terrible diseases, and which, in other respects, were totally unfit for human habitation. These places were incapable of improvement; down they must come, and proper dwellings must be erected in their place. Well, the Bill proposed to give the local authorities power to perform this necessary work, and provided that the cost of doing it should be met by a rate. No objection was ever raised against the cost of making a sewer being defrayed by a rate; and it was quite as important for the general health that these nests of fever should be done away with as that new sewers should be made. The hon. Gentleman behind him felt no compunction at bringing forward a railway Bill by which hundreds of poor people would be evicted from their dwellings, but he shrank from any proposition which would, in any degree, remedy the evil the construction of the line had caused. He, however, denied that any eventual expense would be imposed upon the towns were this Bill agreed to, because experience had shown that in Liverpool, where a law of this kind was in force, the amount of the rate had been more than balanced by the decrease in the poor rates. He understood that the same might be said of Glasgow. He admitted that difficulties might arise as to the mode in which the owners of the property taken were to be compensated; but details of this kind might be easily altered in Committee; and he trusted that the House would not lose an opportunity like the present of getting rid of fever haunts because there happened to be an objection in one or two particulars to the machinery of the Bill.

Mr. GREENE remarked that this matter had been carefully considered by the Select Committee of which he was a Member. That Committee took into consideration both the welfare of the ratepayers and the requirements of the poor. If this Bill were rejected, the House would lay itself open to the charge that they cared very little for the interests and welfare of the poor except to make it a matter of claptrap on special occasion. The utmost that could be raised was a 3*d.* rate, and he contended it was a measure of economy, for nothing was more expensive or costly than disease and crime. When a man lost his work he became chargeable to the parish. Therefore, he trusted the House would go into Committee upon the Bill, and, if there were any clauses that required further consideration, make such Amendments as would render the Bill more satisfactory to the country, and more advantageous to the poor. The people ought not to be housed any longer in dwellings which were unfit for a sporting dog, while the House of Commons were wasting their time about matters of much less importance than the improvement of the condition of those classes whom they professed to desire to raise in the social scale. It was vain to attempt to educate the people and to talk morality to them as long as they dwelt in houses that were not even fit for the accommodation of cattle.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he did not understand the object of the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Manchester to be the defeat of the Bill; but, if that were the object, he could not give the Amendment his support. He was strongly in favour of the Bill, though, at the same time, the Amendment involved a principle to which he entirely subscribed—namely, that it should not be at the discretion of any owner of property to compel the municipality to purchase. If such a principle were admitted, a premium would be held out to a person who had encumbered property which he wished to get rid of to let it fall into decay in order that he might sell it to the municipality at a higher price than it was actually worth.

MR. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he wished the hon. Member for Sunderland would consider what conceivable object he and the other promoters could possibly have had in bringing forward this measure if the result of it would be to inflict loss on the ratepayers of the country. Was it likely that they intended to promote so suicidal an object? If the Bill were to work in the manner predicted by his hon. Friend, the supporters of it would be covered with discredit in less than twelve months. The Corporation of Manchester was the implacable enemy of the Bill; and he was not surprised that the hon. Member for Manchester had brought forward this Amendment with a view to the defeat of the measure. At a meeting of the Sanitary Improvement Congress, which was recently held at Manchester, the most disgraceful revelations on these dwellings were made, and upon that narrow issue he was willing to rest the necessity for this legislation. There was not to be found a more flagrant and scandalous case of inhuman habitations in existence on a larger scale than was to be found at Manchester. Yet Manchester now wished the House to adopt the *laissez faire*, and to defer this Bill to another year. Of course, if the Government wished the Bill not to pass this Session, it could not possibly pass. He was surprised at the statement that had been just made by the Home Secretary, because he understood that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government were in favour of the principle of the Bill; and without their assent it would be useless for him to attempt to pass the Bill through Committee. Great care had been taken in framing the various clauses by the hon. and learned Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke), the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City (Mr. Goschen), and the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird); and the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets had given notice of a clause limiting the price to be paid for property under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act to theprice which a willing seller would be ready to receive and a willing buyer to give.

MR. LEEMAN regretted that the hon. and learned Member for Finsbury had not answered the question contained in the hon. Member for Manchester's Amendment—namely, whether he intended to expunge the operation of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act from this Bill? If the hon. and learned Gentleman was as well acquainted as many Members of the House were with the practical working of that Act, he would at once perceive that no such clause as that proposed by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets would meet the difficulties which had been started, and he thought very properly, by the hon. Member for Manchester. He gave the hon. and learned Gentleman every credit for the object he had in view; but the machinery by which he sought to carry out the object must be most objectionable to the municipalities of the country. The Bill contained no machinery for enabling local Boards to offer opposition before a grand jury, nor did it give those Boards any power of appeal to the Court of Quarter Sessions. The Bill also offered a bonus to owners of old property to let it go to wreck, and would be an inducement to surveyors and architects to support the owners in their improvidence. When a property had become sufficiently dilapidated as to be seized on by the local authorities under the Act, the owner received the specified notice; and although the Bill said the property was to be sold at such a price as would be fixed on between a willing seller and a willing buyer, it did not more accurately describe what the price should be; and, of course, the ower, who had been waiting for the notice, would immediately declare he was a most unwilling seller; he would then take his notice to his surveyor, who would chime in with his employer's desires, and recommend the appointment of an arbitrator under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act. The surveyor would naturally recommend himself as arbitrator, another would be appointed on the other side, an umpire would be agreed on by them, witnesses would be called, and expenses would run up, in many cases to an amount greater than the value of the property arbitrated on; and what made the matter worse was that, under the provisions of the Lands Clauses

Consolidated Act, these expenses would, in most cases, have to be borne, not by the owner of the property, but by the corporation. He was as desirous as the hon. and learned Gentleman was to see old property improved; but he protested against the proposed mode of compelling town councils to buy condemned houses under provisions which would most unjustly entail expenditure on the part of the ratepayers, and reward householders for negligence.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the town council of Bradford were quite in favour of the principle of the Bill; but that they at the same time felt that it would be excessively unfair to hold out a premium to the owner of property to neglect it in order that he might get more money for it eventually. That objection might be met by the introduction of Amendments into the 22nd clause, which would preclude the owner of such property from obtaining for it more than the market value. It would be easy when the House went into Committee to introduce clauses to meet the practical objections which had been raised by the hon. Member for York (Mr. Leeman).

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON pointed out that at every stage of the Bill the language of the Government had been perfectly consistent in regard to its progress. The late Secretary for the Home Department warmly approved, on the second reading, the objects which it sought to promote, and his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had the other day given expression to similar sentiments. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Bazley) could, he thought, be regarded in no other light than as intended to induce the Committee to withdraw the Bill, and at the present period of the Session a perhaps not less certain mode of defeating it was to debate its provisions at length.

Mr. M'LAREN said, the hon. Member for York (Mr. Leeman) had argued against this Bill on grounds that would have prevented the construction of every railway in the kingdom. Two-thirds of the criticism on the Bill might be at once obviated by adopting Amendments that have stood on the Paper for the last two months.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, he was of opinion that the objections which had been raised against the Bill would be very well met in Committee.

Mr. HENLEY said, he thought the discussion on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Manchester showed that he was fully justified in bringing it forward because there was scarcely a single speaker who had addressed the House who did not appear to be of opinion that some other machinery than the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act should be introduced into the Bill. Where property was taken compulsorily the owner's interest ought to be well guarded. All questions of difference must come before some tribunal for decision. The hon. Member for Bradford said he would always have a jury. He (Mr. Henley) did not know what was the expense of a jury; but it was probably less than arbitration. The hon. Member for York had remarked on the necessity of giving to town councils the right of traversing presentments. In this he entirely concurred; and so he did in another remark of the hon. Member, that the power of building should be confined to large places. He believed that there already existed power to shut up places unfit for human habitation, or put them in repair. But in large places the inconvenience to the working men was extreme, if houses were taken down without the provision of other residences within a reasonable distance from their work. In smaller places the mischief was less. But all these points were questions for the Committee when they came to clauses. The Bill might do good, though he was not sure that granting power to public bodies to purchase property and re-build was not open to much discussion, as the tendency of interference on the part of public bodies in such matters was to check private enterprize.

Mr. BAZLEY said, as there seemed to be every desire to carefully consider in Committee the suggestion he had thrown out, he would withdraw his present Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 and 2 *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Interpretation of Terms).

Mr. GOSCHEN moved to add that—

"Building company shall mean and include any society, company, or association incorporated under 'The Companies Act, 1862,' or any other Act for the time being in force, for the incorporation of joint stock companies, or by any special

Act or Royal charter for the purpose either solely or amongst other things, of purchasing land and building thereon."

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (8 & 9 *Vict.* c. 18, and 23 & 24 *Vict.* c. 106 incorporated).

MR. WHALLEY moved an addition, providing that no rate should be levied until the scheme shall be submitted to and approved by Parliament, as in the case of inclosure of lands.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 5 and 6 *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (On Representation by Four Householders that Disease exists in a House, Officer of Health to inspect and report).

MR. M'LAREN said, he had been requested to move that in line 30 the following words be left out, "contagious disease then exists or has frequently existed in any premises."

Motion *agreed to.*

In line 31 the words "or that such" omitted, and "any" inserted.

In line 32, after "disease," the words "and have in fact occasioned disease," inserted.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Officers of Health to deliver Copies of Report to Clerk of Local Authority and Clerk of Peace).

MR. W. E. FORSTER moved in line 40 to insert—

> "Or if the premises be within a borough having a commission of the peace but no separate Court of Quarter Sessions, then to the clerk of the borough justices."

Words *inserted.*

MR. SAMUELSON moved to add at the end of the clause the following:—

> "In places where the local authority have appointed as one of their officers a surveyor or engineer, the officer of health shall furnish such surveyor or engineer with a copy of his Report, previously to sending a copy to the clerk of the local authority, and it shall be the duty of such surveyor or engineer to consider the Report so furnished to him, and to send his opinion thereon to the clerk of the local authority."

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Clerk of Local Authority to lay Report before Council).

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, it would, in his opinion, be quite impossible to make a grand jury in counties deal with these cases.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN thought it was unadvisable to place this class of work upon grand juries.

MR. W. E. FORSTER moved in line 7, after "sessions" to insert "or at a sessions to be holden by the borough justices for the purpose."

MR. HENLEY thought it would be impossible to make the language of Clauses 9 and 10 applicable to grand juries.

MR. W. E. FORSTER thought that if his Amendment were agreed to it would remove the objection urged respecting county grand juries.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY suggested that as far as England was concerned the ordinary course of the law should be followed—namely, of bringing these cases before Petty Sessions, when an appeal would lie at Quarter Sessions. He would suggest to the hon. Member to withdraw Clauses 9 and 10, and bring up a new clause on the Report to effect this object.

MR. M'CULLAGH TORRENS acceded to the suggestion.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clauses 9 and 10 *negatived.*

Clauses 11, 12, and 13 *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Owner may appeal against Presentment).

MR. M'LAREN proposed in line 25, after "proper," to insert—

> "Or may make an order closing the house, and requiring the owner to deal with the house either in conformity with the Report of the inspector, or in such manner as the Court may think fit, for the purpose of rendering the house fit for human habitation."

The hon. Member explained that these words were in the draft Bill framed by the counsel to the Home Office.

MR. GOLDNEY suggested that the Amendment should not be pressed now, but introduced into a later clause where it would be more applicable.

MR. M'LAREN said, he had no difficulty in acceding to the suggestion.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clause *ordered* to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 15 (Owner to execute specific Works or sell Premises to the local Authorities).

MR. GOLDNEY proposed to amend the clause to the extent of giving compulsory power to the local authority to purchase houses which the owner declined to render fit for human habitation.

Colonel WILSON PATTEN thought that if the owners were obliged to shut up such premises, all that was necessary to be done in this matter would be accomplished. The power which it was proposed to give to local authorities to purchase property of this kind would, in some parts of the country, be found a very obnoxious one.

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he could not concur in the view of the right hon. Gentleman. This question went to the root of the Bill, and unless compulsory power to purchase was taken, to be vested in some local body, the evil which this Bill was intended to meet would not be met.

Mr. HENLEY remarked that if the suggestion of his right hon. Friend the Member for North Lancashire were acceded to, it would do away with the good the Bill was intended to effect. There was plenty of power now, without this legislation, to shut up unhealthy houses. The object of this Bill was to put houses in a fit condition for people to live in, or else to pull them down and build up better ones.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU remarked, that if they merely shut up a house or forced the owner to sell it to another poor man it would be allowed to remain in the same state. But if they enabled the local authority to purchase it, the objectionable dwelling could be knocked down, and a better building erected on the site.

Mr. POTTER considered their only course was to close up such property leaving the owners to make the best they could of it.

Mr. POWELL remarked upon the important results that would arise from building warehouses on the sites of those dilapidated dwellings, thereby giving rise to a great demand for labour and benefiting the working man.

Mr. AYRTON said, he did not see how they could provide better dwellings for the people by merely shutting up the property in an objectionable state.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY reminded the Committee that the hon. and learned Member for Finsbury had consented to agree to the Amendment that was suggested, and therefore they were not at present in a position to discuss the question. A person having property should use it without injuring other people.

Mr. M'LAREN suggested that as an Amendment was to be introduced respecting the doubtful points of the Bill, they should go on with the other clauses, and, if possible, finish the Bill; and all other matters could be discussed when the new clauses were brought up.

Mr. Goldney

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 16, 17, and 18 *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

INDIA—BANDA AND KIRWEE BOOTY.
QUESTION.

Mr. DENMAN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, When the distribution of the Banda and Kirwee Booty is likely to be completed, and how much of it has been already distributed, and which portions of the forces entitled have received their share?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that according to the General Orders issued in India in May last it was stated that the first instalment of 500 rupees a share was authorized to be paid immediately in India, and that warrants would be issued making it payable in England on the 15th of May. He had been expecting those warrants since by every mail, but they had not yet been received. He could not say how much had been distributed in England, but he hoped to receive full information by the next mail.

JAMAICA—THE PROSECUTION OF MR. EYRE.—QUESTION.

Major ANSON said, he would beg to ask Mr. Attorney General, Whether he indorses the opinion of his predecessor with regard to the criminal prosecution of Mr. Eyre, published in *The Times* of July 29; and, whether, in consequence of that opinion, and taking into consideration the fact that more than one ineffectual attempt has been made by certain persons styling themselves the Jamaica Committee, to carry out the objects they have in view, the Government will now undertake to defend Mr. Eyre against any further persecution?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The opinion expressed by Sir John Rolt, my predecessor, upon this subject, appears, from the newspapers, when I read it, to have been formed after his attention had been called to certain statements and papers which were laid before him. Those statements and papers I have not seen, and it would not be right, therefore, for me to say whether I approve or disapprove the opinion of my learned predecessor. As to the latter part of the Question, I am not aware that proceedings either civil or criminal against Mr. Eyre are pending at the present time, and it would obviously be beyond my province to state what course Her Majesty's Government would take in the possible event alluded to by the hon. and gallant Member.

THE COMMISSIONERS FOR CROWN LANDS.—QUESTION,

MR. HADFIELD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Commissioners for Crown Lands are authorized or accustomed to grant sites for churches of the Established Church without charge; and, whether they are authorized or accustomed to refuse to sell land for sites in good situations, and on reasonable terms, for the erection of places of worship by Nonconformists?

MR. HUNT said, that the Commissioners for Woods had no power, as such, to grant lands for the purposes of sites for churches. The regulations in that respect were laid down by the 10 *Geo.* IV., c. 50. That Act conferred special powers to grant sites for churches and chapels, clergymen's residences and schools on the hereditary estates of the Crown, provided the extent of land were not beyond five acres, or its value above £1,000 in any one case. After the sale or leasing of Crown lands, the Commissioners had power to grant certain portions for the erection of places of worship, and in the exercise of that power, the Commissioners had frequently granted leases of land, for Nonformist places of worship.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to his statement that he had received no complaints as to weights and measures from Peterborough and other places, Whether he has made or deems it requisite to make further inquiry as to the fact of such complaints having been received at the office of his department?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he had on a former occasion stated that he had received no complaints as to weights and measures from Peterborough and other places. On instituting further inquiries he had learnt that complaints had been received from Hoxton, Birkenhead, and Peterborough.

PARLIAMENT—MEETING IN THE TEA-ROOM.—QUESTION.

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, he would beg to ask Mr. Speaker, Whether he has been informed of a meeting having taken place in the Tea-Room of the House on Monday the 29th instant, which was attended by other gentlemen than Members of the House, and at which speeches were made by such gentlemen relating to proceedings then about to be discussed on the progress of a Bill through this House, or in a Committee of the Whole House; and, whether such a proceeding is, in his opinion, in accordance with the established rules of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee Rooms of this House are, during the Session of Parliament, under the charge of the Sergeant-at-Arms. As the Question has reference to the duties of an officer of this House, I shall be happy to answer it. It is well known that occasionally Members desiring to confer together on matters of business before the House apply to the Sergeant-at-Arms to place one of the Committee-Rooms at their disposal, and when this request is complied with it is generally on the understanding that the room will be limited to the use of Members only. It is true that on Monday last a meeting of a different and of quite an unusual character took place—in the terms of the Question—

> "A meeting in the Tea-Room, which was attended by other gentlemen than Members of the House, and at which speeches were made by such gentlemen relating to proceedings on the progress of a Bill through the House."

And the Question for me is whether such a proceeding is in accordance with the established rules of the House? The proceeding in question is not in accordance with the established rules of the House. I believe the transaction is of a novel character. As soon as information of the meeting was given to the Deputy-Sergeant-at-Arms, who was in attendance, he, with great propriety, proceeded to the room and informed the embers mpresent that the course pursued was quite irregular. The meeting broke up and the members dispersed. It gives me great satisfaction to add that the Members who were instrumental in calling the meeting have informed the Sergeant-at-Arms that they were not aware that the course pursued was a breach of Order, and have expressed their regret that the irregularity should have been committed. I feel, therefore, that under these circumstances there should be no difference of opinion in the House on the subject. There will be a general agreement that the ancient rule and practice must be upheld, that the rooms of this building must be reserved for the use of Members only, and for such purposes as may be permitted. I have no doubt that is the opinion of the House, and that there will be no repetition of this proceeding.

Mr. AYRTON: I should like to put another Question to you, Sir, having reference to this subject. I have observed, as a matter of fact, that the Tea-room has been largely used for the convenience of Members who desire to consult with their constituents. It is obvious that if Members of the House have to communicate with their constituents, or other persons interested in the business before the House, some observations must be made upon the one side and the other, and in that respect the conference that took place on Monday last does not differ from any other conference I have seen in the Tea-room. The question then arises, is there no part of this vast building in which Members of the House of Commons can communicate with their constituents on subjects connected with the business of the House, and are Members of the House of Commons to be thus placed in a position different from that of any other body of persons who meet to transact business? If so, I must say that this is one of the most inconvenient buildings that have been devised for the use of man; and I would ask you, Sir, to be good enough during the recess to communicate with the authorities on such matters, in order that the convenience referred to may be extended to Members of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Question addressed to me by the hon. and learned Member is entirely different from that of which notice has been given; because, if I am rightly informed, the gentlemen present at the meeting constituted themselves into a sort of public meeting. A chairman was appointed, and addresses were delivered. Now, that involves a totally different point from that before raised. My answer was given on the point of

employing any room in this House for the purpose of a meeting of this description. With regard to the Question now raised, I am quite aware that inconveniences of the nature referred to arise from the arrangements of the House, and they have been lately increased in consequence of the hotels and other buildings in Palace Yard, where deputations were accustomed to assemble, having been pulled down. The Question of the hon. and learned Member is, I admit, important and worthy of consideration; but it should, perhaps, be rather addressed to those who have charge of the public buildings than to myself.

Mr. KINNAIRD: I wish to say upon this subject that it is impossible for Members who are really attending to their business in the House to go to distant hotels, in order to confer with their constituents, or any others who may wish to speak with them in reference to the business before the House. The House ought certainly to provide some accommodation of the kind asked for.

Mr. WHALLEY: The object of my rising is to address the same Question to the First Minister of Works. I ask him, in the first place, whether it is within the cognizance of the Committee that was lately appointed on the recommendation of this House to take notice of the inconvenience to which Members are subjected who have business to transact with strangers; and, if not, then, whether he would consider it within his own cognizance, and endeavour to remedy the inconvenience? I put this Question to the noble Lord, because whenever I had any communication with his predecessor on matters of a similar nature, I was received with the greatest courtesy, and the inconvenience was removed.

Lord JOHN MANNERS: There is no doubt that the subject referred to strictly comes within the province of the Select Committee appointed to consider the arrangements of the House. That Committee has concluded its labours for the present, but it is proposed that it should be re-appointed as soon as Parliament re-assembles.

Mr. J. STUART MILL: As one of the Members who was present in the Tea-room on the occasion in question, I desire to express my regret for having unwittingly been guilty of an irregularity against the forms of this House, an irregularity of which I was not aware at the time. In order to set one point right, I desire to say that the conference in question was not in the nature of a public meeting. It was really a deputation to consult with certain Members of Parliament, and nothing in the way of speech-making was done which is not usually done at deputations.

Colonel **STUART KNOX**: I would ask the hon. Member whether it is not a fact that members of the Reform League at that meeting in the Tea-room held out a threat that unless hon. Members voted in support of their views those Members need not put themselves forward again as candidates for metropolitan constituencies?

Mr. **J. STUART MILL**: I heard no such statement from any person present, whether a member of the Reform League or not.

METROPOLIS—THREATENED MEETING IN HYDE PARK.—QUESTION.

Mr. **NEATE** said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What steps he has taken, or intends to take in consequence of the notice given by the Reform League of their intention to hold a monster meeting in Hyde Park on Monday next, for the purpose stated in such notice?

Mr. **GATHORNE HARDY**: I have no official information of such a meeting, and I know nothing more about it than what has appeared in the newspapers. Of course, it will be my duty to see that order is observed when the meeting takes place.

COLONIAL BISHOPS.—QUESTION.

Mr. **KINNAIRD** said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the table of the House, in continuation of the Paper recently presented on the Church of England in the Colonies, an amended Return showing from what sources, whether from general donations and subscriptions, or from individual munificence, the Trustees of the Colonial Bishoprics' Fund have been enabled to provide competent endowments for the several Bishoprics erected since 1841 in the Colonies, under Her Majesty's Letters Patent, and in what way such endowments had been invested?

Mr. **ADDERLEY** said, the Return that had been made was compiled partly from official information in the office; but it was made more complete by information which he had received from the private sources of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He believed the hon. Gentleman was aware that the funds which the Society furnished for the salaries of the Bishops were derived from private munificence, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would be satisfied with having called public attention to that fact.

Mr. **HADFIELD** asked, if the hon. Gentleman would have any objection to lay before the House full information of all the grants that were made out of the Consolidated Fund to Bishops in Scotland or elsewhere, as well as in the Colonies?

Mr. **ADDERLEY**: All the grants from the Consolidated Fund are contained in the Returns.

Mr. **HADFIELD**: Are there no grants to Scotland?

Mr. **ADDERLEY**: No.

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

INDIA—FAMINE IN ORISSA.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Mr. **HENRY SEYMOUR** said, he rose to call the attention of the House to a very important question. In the course of last year 750,000 of Her Majesty's subjects in India perished from famine. Though Papers had been presented to the House, their information was very insufficient. A Commission had been appointed to inquire, and its Report had been presented to the India House in a perfect form; but it was not so when laid on the table of the House. There were important omissions which prevented their forming a complete judgment on the whole subject. The original Report contained an Appendix in which were collected various important letters, and a Supplementary Report drawn up by one of the Commissioners, showing the progress of the famine in various portions of the country. These had been withheld from Parliament. It was also important that hon. Members should know the opinions of the members of the Supreme Council of India. The Governor General was, of course, an important actor in the scene. But he did not act alone. He took the advice of his Council before he sent in his opinion. The Minutes of that Council, however, were not on the table. A despatch, reviewing the whole of the subject, had been presented to Parliament. He wished to know whether any dissents were recorded from that despatch, and, if so, whether the Government would not lay the particulars on the table? On former occasions similar Returns had been granted. He had moved for a Return relating to the progress of the famine in Madras, but that Return, although promised, had not yet been laid on the table of the House. No less than 56,000 persons had perished by famine in Madras. From the short extracts on the subject which he had read it would appear that there had been some degree of laxity on the part of the Government of that district, and that they were guilty of the fault of having taken the necessary measures too late. He hoped the Secretary of State would lay the Papers relating to Madras also upon the table of the House. One of the principal towns in Orissa was not more than 150 miles from Calcutta; yet, strange to say, there were no good roads leading from Calcutta to the chief towns in that district; and this, notwithstanding that the subject of roads had been agitated for ten or fifteen years. Orissa had a very important port at a place called False Point; yet there was no land communication between that place and Calcutta; and the port could not be approached during all the time that the monsoon was blowing. Orissa had a very heavy rain-fall, and was subject to terrible inundations. It had a fine river, but it had not yet been rendered navigable. There were very important irrigation works going on there, but unfortunately those works had been delayed, or probably the famine would not have happened. Orissa contained a territory of about 7,000 square miles, and tributary states contained 1,500 more. There had been a population of 3,000,000, but one-fourth of the whole population had perished in about twelve months. The territory was under the thirty years' settlement. That settlement was, unfortunately, approaching its termination at the period at which the dreadful calamity which he had to bring under the notice of the House happened. He said unfortunately because when the thirty years' lease of the Government was about to end the proprietors and farmers naturally looked to see whether they could not procure the next renewal for thirty years at a cheaper rate. The consequence was that they so let out their land as to make it appear as of as little value as possible. The settlement made, too, thirty years ago, was extremely high, and the Government took to themselves a very large share of the gross profits of the land. Under that settlement it appeared they kept for themselves two-thirds of the gross profits, leaving only one-third to the Zemindar, who owned the soil, and he got what he could from the ryots before he let it out. The population, therefore, could not be otherwise than in a miserable condition, seeing that capital could not be accumulated while so large a portion of the produce of the soil was taken by the Government. There was, moreover, always a fight between the Zemindars and the Government as to how much the former could pay and the latter exact. Of late years the population of Orissa had been in a better position than formerly, because of the money which had been poured into India to carry out the great railway undertakings and other public works which had been set on foot in that country. Orissa, too, was a great corn-producing district, the export of grain from it some three years ago having amounted to 30,000 tons. This had increased owing to a great deal of land being applied to the cultivation of cotton. There were reasons, besides the expiration of the thirty years' settlement to which he had referred, why the greater portion of the population were peculiarly unfit to bear the strain which had been put upon them. The salt manufacture had been taken away from them about three years ago. There had been great famines there in early times, but none since 1792 or 1793. The existing population, therefore, had grown up without a knowledge of the effects of famine, and were less prepared for the calamity than the inhabitants of the North Western Provinces and other parts of India. In 1864, though the exportations of grain were large, the crops were rather smaller than usual. The rain-fall began to be deficient before the month of September, 1865. The irrigation companies would in a very short time have completed some of the most important works in which they were engaged. But all those works were of no use in enabling the starving people to receive food by the canals. It was to be regretted that the new settlement had not been completed before; but it appeared that the irrigation companies waited for the Government, and the Government for them, to the great detriment of the province. In September, 1865, there was hardly one official connected with the Government well acquainted with Orissa. There were few Europeans in the province, and the irrigation officers and the missionaries were the first persons to give notice of the calamity which was impending. The deficiency at Orissa was greater on the recent occasion than had occurred in the case of any other famine in India. In the North Western Provinces in 1837 and 1838, and again in 1861, the deficiency of the crops were never more than four-tenths, but the scarcity in Orissa was of a far more extensive character. After the famine the district was exposed to another calamity. Scarcely had the population recovered from the drought when the floods came and struck them down in vast numbers. The Lieutenant Governor of Bengal attributed to these floods, and not to the famine, the mortality which prevailed. But the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject stated that Sir Cecil Beadon was the only person who entertained that opinion. They said that there was great mortality before the floods came. The officials at Bengal attached a different meaning to the word famine to that which was generally given to it, and said that famine ought not to be said to exist as long as any means of life could be obtained for money. No doubt in all cases of famine the wealthy were able to buy some food. Shortly before the 10th of October alarming reports came from a district in Orissa to the effect that the rice trade was completely stopped, and that no food had been procurable for some time. The Commissioner, who was new to the province and without experience there, attributed the stoppage of the sale of rice to a wicked combination among the dealers in the country. But that was not the opinion of Mr. Barlow, a sagacious officer, who had been long in the country. On the 11th of November he suggested that an inquiry should be instituted. It was most unfortunate that his Reports at that early period had not been attended to. In November Mr. Barlow made the important recommendation that a shipload of grain should be imported. A petition from certain Zemindars was also received, stating that the rice crop did not amount to one-third of that of last year. But the Board of Revenue rejected the petition, though while it was being considered at Calcutta the people in a particular district were, for want of rice, living on roots. He (Mr. Seymour) had himself passed through a province in Persia, which was at the time suffering from famine, and it was impossible to conceive anything more horrible than the sufferings endured under such a state of things. Petitions continued to pour in from the Zemindars, but the Commissioner opposed the making of inquiries for fear the Government should have to remit a portion of their revenue. On November 14th he again stated that there was no famine; that the scarcity arose from a combination among the dealers, and that there was nothing to warrant apprehension. He continued to refuse inquiry, and on the 20th of November he went away to the hills. The Commissioners who afterwards inquired into the matter said that the Commissioner's (Mr. Ravenshaw's) opinion was rash, and was founded upon defective information; that he was entirely new to the district, and that he was not in a position to form a competent opinion in opposition to those which he had received from a person who was well acquainted with the country. The Government of Bengal, on receiving Mr. Ravenshaw's letters, directed the Board of Revenue to report fully. On the 25th of November that Board reported, but upon wholly insufficient materials and without proper inquiry, and in that Report they declared their general policy. On December 11th, the Government of Bengal approved the circular of the Board, and stated that in an emergency of this kind the only dependence was on private liberality. At this very moment, a few days after the Board had issued this circular, a very different view was taken by the non-official people in Calcutta. A representation was addressed to the Governor General by the Messrs. Gisborne, eminent merchants there, stating the very serious apprehensions that were entertained of a famine, and that the only proper means of meeting so dreadful a calamity would be at once sending orders for the importation of rice to support the population. At that very time, also, the officers of the Irrigation Company in Orissa were sending home most alarming accounts that they apprehended famine, and that the only way of averting it was the importation of food. Therefore, there was a direct contradiction in the views of the higher officials and the non-official people, the opinion of the latter being backed by those who had the most official knowledge of Orissa. The Commissioners stated that the Board was not justified in issuing so important a circular as that, and that this was the point where there should have been a most careful inquiry. The Board determined by their circular on the publication of the retail prices of grain, that there should be no interference with the grain dealers, to employ the labouring classes, to wean the people from relying on Government, and if famine should come that they should rely on private liberality. These principles were brought before the Supreme Government and the Government in England, and approved by both those authorities. In certain cases these principles were right, but in such a condition of affairs as prevailed at Orissa they were wrong. When scarcity occurred there were no prices; no sales were effected. But the Board continued to publish those prices which were a mere delusion, the figures being purely imaginary, and thereby tending very much to mislead the public. After this no further attempt was made to gain systematic information, which was a very unfortunate omission. Who were the responsible parties for this state of things? The duties of the Lieutenant Governor and the Board appear to have been extremely undefined. But the Board was not responsible for the good government of the Bengal territory ; they were merely the subordinates of the Lieutenant Governor. He it was then who was responsible for faults made at this important period. The effect of the circular of the Board was very unfortunate on the public generally. In December a new state of things occurred. There was a new crop; but it was hurried so quickly into the market by the Zemindars, in order to enable them to pay their rents, that there was a sudden glut of food for sale, which was quickly bought up, at lower prices than usual by the public, who were thus led to believe that there were greater supplies for them than really turned out to be the case. This state of things lasted throughout December and January, and there was a lull in the alarm felt. The Lieutenant Governor applied for five lacs, or £50,000. At this time there were more applications for remissions, and a peremptory order came from the Revenue Board to the Collectors, which was final and conclusive against any remissions to the Zemindars. This marked an important epoch in the famine. The policy of the Board was settled. There was to be no famine, and there were to be no remissions. Consequently, the Collectors gave in to their superior authority, and ceased to represent what they knew to be the fact. The Report of the Commission said on this that the Board was certainly not justified in passing these resolutions. At this time they tried to get up relief Committees from private liberality. But seeing the inaction of the Government private persons did not attend, and the attempt entirely failed. Unfortunately the Chief Commissioner was absent, and the publication of the prices current was fallacious. At this time there was much correspondence between the Board of Revenue and the collectors. The collectors represented the state of the province to the Board of Revenue, but nothing would induce them to take proper measures for the importation of grain. At last they did agree to send a few bags to one place where the famine was very severe; but such was the difficulty of access to the place that the steamer would not stop unless 3,000 bags were sent, and they would only send 1,200, consequently none were sent. Then Mr. Barlow, Mr. Nolan, and the engineers had arranged a scheme for public works. One portion of it was that the persons employed should be paid, not in money, but in food. That also fell through. The Commissioner refused to sanction it. All the efforts made by Mr. Barlow, Mr. Nolan, and other officials in Orissa to alleviate the sufferings of the people of Orissa were paralyzed by the Government of Bengal. There was also an unfortunate order from the Lieutenant Governor that money-wages only should be paid, and at the ordinary rate. The officers of public works were not to assist in giving wages in grain, and the purveying of grain was left entirely to the civil authorities, who had too much to do to attend to the matter. Again, the Board declared they did not think it necessary to import grain. Mr. Barlow at last made up his mind to go through the district, however much his conduct might be disapproved. He made his tour, and in January he sent a full report of the dreaful state of things which he had witnessed to the Commissioner, to be forwarded to the Government of Bengal. That Report was forwarded to the Government of Bengal ; but it produced no effect. At the end of January Mr. Barlow again writes, "The only way to benefit the people is to make it a condition to import rice." The executive engineer of the works also wrote, "Not only our works, but the people's lives depend upon an early supply of rice." In spite of these applications the Government of Bengal decided that it could not have anything to do with the importation of rice. Mr. Ravenshaw visited the district about this time, and when he found what the state of the country was he sent a most important telegram to Calcutta on the 31st of January, in which he asked that rice might be sent. The answer to that telegram was sent by the authorities of Calcutta on the 1st of February, when they said that the Government must decline to import rice, since, if the market were favourable to its importation, rice would be sure to find its way there. Mr. Ravenshaw, not possessing sufficient official boldness for the occasion, let the matter drop. This was the turning point of the whole proceedings, for this line of policy being pursued throughout the whole period the population was doomed, and the frightful calamity that subsequently took place was inevitable. Soon after this, in the middle of February, Sir Cecil Beadon, accompanied by several officials, visited the province, when it might have been hoped that his eyesight would have convinced him of the necessity that existed for some steps to be taken to prevent the population dying of hunger. Extraordinary to relate, however, nothing he saw appeared to have the slightest effect upon him, and he states that he neither saw nor heard anything about the famine in the course of his tour, which lasted a week. It was only fair to him to say that he disclaimed all knowledge of Mr. Ravenshaw's telegram; but he (Mr. Seymour) could only say, as he thought the House would say, he ought to have had knowledge of it. Shortly after he had completed this tour Sir Cecil Beadon made a speech, which gave rise to great dissatisfaction, in which he said that the people must rely upon themselves, and that if he interfered with the prices of grain he should be little better than a dacoit or thief. It was apparently nothing to him if rice went up to a rupee a seer, at which it would, of course, be utterly unprocurable—he would do nothing. The Irrigation Company, however, took a very different view of the matter, and fed the large number of labourers employed upon their works with rice which they themselves imported in the beginning of January. From the end of February it became daily more difficult to give assistance to the district on account of the change in the monsoon. At that period the south-west wind commences, and the surf becomes very heavy in the Bay of Bengal, rendering it almost impossible for vessels to bring rice from the East. A most painful and extraordinary incident now took place. In November a large French vessel laden with rice was wrecked, as it would seem providentially, on the coast of the district, and the rice forming its cargo, which was found in good condition, was allowed to remain on the beach, guarded by the police, from the end of December to February while they were peddling about the price of it. When they could not come to a settlement, that same rice was actually packed up again and carried away from the starving district. At the time of the Irish famine the public would not allow the Government to remain inactive, but obliged them to send vast supplies into the country. The authorities in Bengal were so far afraid of contravening the principles of political economy laid down by the hon. Member for Westminster, as to Supply and Demand in his celebrated work, that they refused any assistance towards procuring supplies of food for a long period, although the people were dying in thousands of famine. If they had studied with greater care the principles of the hon. Gentleman they would have seen that what he laid down was this—that the Government ought not to interfere with the regular course of trade in such matters, but that if a case should arise in which no merchants would be found to come forward, and that there was no trading in the particular commodities required, then of course it became an exceptional case, and it was the bounden duty of the Government to interfere to save the lives of the people. [Mr. J. Stuart Mill: Hear, hear!] The question arose, how much blame attached to the Viceroy for not exercising the power entrusted to him in order to save the people? An interview upon the subject took place between the Lieutenant Governor and the Viceroy, when the latter took the common sense view, and intimated pretty strongly that the time had arrived when the importation of rice should be allowed to take place. It was for the House to decide whether the Viceroy had properly discharged his duty in the matter. In March a very important letter, not included among those which were laid on the table, was laid before the Government of Bengal. It was written on the 28th of December, 1865, by Sir Arthur Cotton, who, in the view of an impending famine, recommended that vast quantities of food should be imported, and that money should be given to the Irrigation Company to extend their works as much as possible, and to employ as many people as they could. Sir Arthur also recommended that rafts should be formed which could be towed by a steamer, and on which large quantities of food could be conveyed. If the recommendations in that letter had been attended to at once they might have been carried into effect before the monsoon set in; but, of course, after that they could be of no avail. After the visit of the Lieutenant Governor there was a dreary blank of three months, during which the Government and its agents seemed to have accepted the position of drifting helplessly into the great tempest of calamities which was about to burst on the country. The resident engineer, Mr. Cromlyn, and the superintendent of police both represented the state of things in the strongest language. At this very time, when the Government was so hard to move, the Commission was nearly trampled under foot by the starving multitudes clamorous for food. It was in May that the extreme misery was reached, and then Mr. Barlow, having failed to get his measures carried out, wrote a series of letters, which was not, though it ought to have been, included in the correspondence on the table. In them he gave a frightful picture of the state of affairs ; but having been so much discouraged with regard to his former Reports, he only made a modest demand for a grant of £50 a month from the Government. Mr. Ravenshaw did not receive the letter till the end of May, having been away for two months. Mr. Cromlyn, the engineer of the railway at Balasore, who had written in March, and had received no answer till the end of May, sent a telegram, saying that 60,000 rupees were no good, what they wanted was rice, and that a period of want for seven months was staring them in the face, which would not have been the case had the irrigation works been finished. Notwithstanding these and other Reports regarding the famine, the Governor General left quietly for Balasore on the 15th of April. The place was only 150 miles from Calcutta, there was a good metal road between the two places, and there was a telegraph, and yet he was not made acquainted with what was going on at Orissa. On the 10th of May the Governor General sent for a detailed Report from the Commissioner, who simply referred him to his previous one, and the Viceroy telegraphed to the Lieutenant Governor for information, having been alarmed at the non-official statements made in the papers. It was then discovered that there was a balance of £60,000, a portion of the North West famine fund, and that was applied to the relief of the distress. The Lieutenant Governor wrote to the Board of Revenue, authorizing it to send rice to the famine-struck districts, but they, adhering to their false principles of political economy, neglected to do so, and in the meantime rice was selling at ten seers a rupee. On the 22nd of May, although the famine was frightful and thousands were dying daily in the streets, the authorities adhered to the false notions of political economy and refused to send rice. The people were not in want of money but of rice. Then Mr. Chapman, finding that this North West fund existed, actually sent back to the subscribers a fund which he had raised for those affected by the famine, and this caused great satisfaction at Orissa. Mr. Ravenshaw at length telegraphed for rice ; and at length the Bengal officials recognized the existence of the famine. On the 22nd of May, when thousands of people were dying in the streets in Orissa, the Board of Revenue refused to send to Arracan for rice, and the Lieutenant Governor neglected to exert the power he had to compel them to send for it without further delay. He insisted there should be no interference with trade, until at length he discovered that they were on the eve of one of the most terrible famines which had ever been known in that part of India. The attention of the public of Calcutta had been called to the state of affairs by the press of India and a young gentleman named Sykes, to whom great credit was due, and as the result of his exertions £1,800 was raised as a famine fund for the starving population of India. That, as the Commissioners stated, was a crumb of comfort. There was another letter which had not been laid before Parliament. It was addressed to Mr. Barlow by the Lieutenant Governor, complaining of his "random statements," a term quite unjustifiable, thus proving that the latter, like the Board of Revenue, could not bear to hear that the famine was so bad as had been represented by Mr. Barlow and others. In June a series of weekly Reports were commenced of all districts visited, and these showed that everywhere rice was wanted. Mr. Ravenshaw, however, continued to insist that rice was in the country, and that ignorance of free trade principles alone kept the people from selling it. But soon afterwards he telegraphed that if the troops were to live rice must be sent, and at length a cargo of rice was ordered from Burmah, and the authorities at Bengal began to realize that a famine was raging. Even then Mr. Ravenshaw harked back on his old words, and begged that not too much rice should be imported, and that too many stores should not be opened. The Board refused to import rice as late as June 9th, although that was the time when the famine was at its worst. As late as the 9th of June Mr. Ravenshaw thought things would come round. At that date the Lieutenant Governor asked for the whole balance of the North West famine fund, and ordered £20,000 of it to be spent in rice; but even then the Board of Revenue would not avail themselves of the permission. It became a question for the House whether the Lieutenant Governor would not have been right to overrule the Board of Revenue, and insist on the rice being imported. On the 16th the Lieutenant Governor, who had been at Dharjeeling, returned, and on the 19th a consultation took place. From that time the famine was recognized, and rice was imported. An estimate had since been made that every maund of rice imported had saved a human life. Great difficulty however was experienced in getting the rice from False Point to the famine districts. It took sixteen days to get it from False Point to Kuttack. Moreover, two French ships—the *Charlemagne* and the *Pius IX.*—loaded with rice, left the port when the suffering was at its height, and took their cargoes elsewhere, in consequence of the haggling that arose as to the price to be paid for the rice. Several ships, too, which had been reported as on their way with rice, were afterwards found to have been ordered to China, and were only to take rice to Orissa on their way home, and one ship—the *Asia*—was actually at China when its coming was advised. The Commissioners said they could offer no explanations of these extraordinary statements. The *Tubal Cain* lost her cargo at Balasore, and the people of Kuttack were reduced to frightful suffering in consequence. In fact, it was not till September that there was proper relief to the people in the interior. The culminating point of the calamity was in the second week in August. When every one was expecting that the famine was drawing to an end, there came on the unhappy people a fresh calamity. A flood came on and swept away the crops. Mr. Marshall stated that the rice imported was scarcely enough to feed one-twentieth of the population at full rations during six months; Lieutenant Murray stated that he could hardly persuade the Board of Revenue that there was any famine in the country at all; yet one fact ought to have arrested their attention, and that was the enormous increase of crime, which was universally attributed to the distress. In one town, not more than sixty miles from Calcutta, the distress was frightfully severe, and there was a large influx of the starving population into Calcutta. Hospitals were established for the poor, and nothing was wanted in that city to provide for their wants. No greater contrast could be afforded than what was done at Calcutta and what was done in other places. Towards the end of the year the famine decreased, and a Commission was appointed to inquire into the circumstances of the case, and they had made a Report. In that Report they censured numerous officials, particularly Sir Cecil Beadon, and in the latter censure he particularly concurred. There were Minutes from Sir Cecil Beadon with regard to the observations of the Commissioners. But, after carefully reading those Minutes, he could not see that Sir Cecil Beadon had answered satisfactorily the censures which had been passed upon him. He did not think that, when he found the Board of Revenue stood in the way of the measures which it was necessary to carry out, he had discharged his duty properly in not exercising the authority with which he had been invested by the Government in this country. He stated that in his visits to Orissa he saw no indications of distress, and that it was the universal opinion that there were stores of grain in that district. There was, however, the evidence of the native dealers to show that they at an early period offered the keys of their stores to the authorities for the purpose of ascertaining whether they contained grain, so that the Lieutenant Governor could scarcely plead ignorance on that point. It further appeared that some of the most important acts which were done by the Board of Revenue were not known to him until afterwards. The real question at issue was, whether the loss of life at Orissa was inevitable, and, if not, who it was to whom blame really attached in the matter? He was very unwilling to pass a censure on the subordinate officials, though some of them were, he thought, deserving of it. The greatest responsibility rested on Sir Cecil Beadon. His ignorance was a crime, and a cause of the most intense suffering, and ought to be visited with the most severe censure. He was invested with the chief authority, and was therefore more responsible than the Viceroy, whose duty at the same time it was to call for details. If he failed to do so, he too, was of course, not free from responsibility. He now came to the despatch of the Secretary of State (Sir Stafford Northcote) which had been laid on the table of the House the day before reviewing the whole proceedings. That despatch was inconclusive and unsatisfactory. It was too sparing in apportioning blame to the various officers concerned. It only partially reviewed what had taken place, and left open the question of punishment that should be awarded to those who were to blame for this tremendous public calamity. It was difficult to find from it that anybody was to blame. Had the calamity been a trivial one they could not have been more gently dealt with. He regretted, as the despatch was looked forward to with extreme interest in India, that it was not of a more decided character. There was in that country a vast bureaucracy which was not under the eye of public opinion, and therefore despatches from home were regarded there as of the utmost importance, either when praising those who deserved well, or censuring those who laid themselves open to blame. It was only by despatches from the Government that the discipline of the Civil Service could be maintained and justice done to the Natives. Here was a calamity under which 750,000 of Her Majesty's subjects had perished. Similar calamities had occurred in other parts of India, but they were met in a different manner. The blame in this case was admitted, but it was hardly attributed to anybody, though a case which called for condign punishment. The despatch said in almost so many words that the matter was to be passed over in the hope that it would not occur again. That was not fair towards the Natives of India. They depended upon our good government, and it was our duty to see that their lives should be cared for as much as those of Her Majesty's subjects in this country. He was unwilling to call for the expression of any specific blame against any particular individual, because he thought that it was the duty of the Government to apportion the blame. Nevertheless, if no further action were taken by the Government in the matter, he trusted that some influential Member of the House would again call attention to the subject. He regretted that the House was not in possession of papers with respect to Madras, because, while the suffering there was great, the conduct of the officials was very meritorious, and if similar conduct had been pursued in Bengal the loss of life would not have been so great. But though no punishment was awarded to Sir Cecil Beadon ~~and others~~, they must suffer in their own minds on account of the dreadful calamity they had been the cause of producing, while men like Mr. Barlow and Mr. Forbes would receive in their own consciousness the reward of their own good actions.

Mr. SMOLLETT said, he was glad that the subject had been brought forward. He had been most anxious to see if the officials in this country had done their duty, whilst the officials in India had neglected theirs. When he read the Papers laid on the table of the House by the Secretary of State for India, he was greatly disappointed. If during the summer and autumn any grave disapprobation was expressed of the conduct of the officials in India, gentlemen in this country had contrived to conceal that disapprobation, and had not given any reprobation of the conduct of the authorities in India to the British public. The papers contained details of a great and most appalling calamity, yet not one functionary in India was equal to the occasion, or had the courage to rise above the region of routine or red-tapism. On the first day of the Session, the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Viscount Cranborne), informed the House that the most meagre account of these events had been sent to his Department, and yet 700,000 human beings had perished. This proved that the apathy and indifference of the authorities in India were extreme. The situation of Orissa was of itself a reason why the conduct of the officials was doubly culpable. It was a province contiguous to Calcutta, and the most distant part of it could be reached in a day and night by palanquin. He had himself seen two famines in India—the last of which occurred in 1852-3. At that time Sir Henry Pottinger proved himself equal to the emergency, and by the arrangements which he made, and the expenditure of between £150,000 to £200,000, the famine was stayed. But what was the case at Orissa? The famine commenced with the failure of the crops in 1865, and though that fact was thoroughly known to the officials and to the Supreme Government, the only alacrity shown was by the Board of Revenue, and that alacrity was of a mischievous kind, for they amused themselves by dispatching circular orders, stating, among other things, that the starving people must depend on private liberality, and that at the time when starvation and death were rife. More heartless and disgraceful letters were never penned by any Board in the world. The officials in the province of Orissa did their duty. They were alive to the dangers about to overtake them, and made suggestions which were set aside by the superior authorities. They, therefore, fell back into silence, and at last into sullen despair. Nothing was done in Orissa for several months. Letters occasionally appeared in the newspapers which he read with the belief that they were not true. It now appeared that they did not represent the real horrors that were passing in the district. In May, the Commissioner proposed that the Government should give £50 a month to feed 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 of people. In June, the Lieutenant Governor (Sir Cecil Beadon), proposed to send—£100,000? Not at all, but £20,000 from a private fund. And all this time the officials were reporting that the yells of the dying and starving multitudes were ringing around them. During that time 10,000 persons were dying daily—they were dying in heaps. There had not been such a terrible calamity as this at Orissa since the country had been governed by Christian authorities. Such a calamity had not occurred for the last 1800 years. 700,000 persons had died through neglect, and he called that a great crime, which demanded condign punishment. Sir Cecil Beadon, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, was of course immediately answerable for the government of that province, but he was himself responsible to the Governor General of India, by whom he had been appointed, and by whom he might be removed from his office. Sir John Lawrence, the Governor General, seemed throughout these proceedings to have condoned any *laches* on the part of Sir Cecil Beadon. During the whole period of that terrible calamity he resided himself at Simla; and, in the retirement of the mountains, appeared to have known as little of what was passing around his capital as if he had been living in California or Greenland. He appeared to have placed as much confidence in his Lieutenant Governor as the Lieutenant Governor had in his own good intentions. Sir John Lawrence never seemed to have moved from his apathetic indifference till he received some very pressing orders from England. Towards the end of 1866, he appointed a Commission to report. They gave a detailed narrative of what had occurred in Orissa—a narrative which had not been sent before. That Commission consisted principally of officials, and the duty imposed on them was to report on their superiors, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal and the Governor General. It was not to be supposed that they would deal with these gentlemen except in a very tender way. Accordingly, they found everything was slurred over in the most easy manner. The Lieutenant Governor of Bengal was, of course, mildly censured; but then he is described as an extremely estimable gentleman—a gentleman whose greatest fault was an incapacity to believe in disaster. With this mild censure, it was hoped the whole affair would be consigned to oblivion, as a circumstance over which the Government had little or no control. Now, that was not the opinion he entertained. He thought Sir John Lawrence was mainly responsible for this disaster. It was said in excuse of the Governor General, that he was kept in the dark by his Lieutenant Governor; but Sir John Lawrence had himself stated in 1866 that his mind had been greatly troubled by the state of things in Kuttack. With reference to the finances of India, the Supreme Government has the entire control, and therefore the Governor General must have known how much money was being spent in that province in relieving the starving population. General Durand stated that Sir Cecil Beadon had the entire revenue of India at his control, but not a single shilling could be spent in a district except by order of the Governor General in Council. All the evidence went to show that the authorities in India laboured for a considerable time under the impression that the public money ought not to be applied in mitigation of the disaster. But while the Government money was not to be spent in saving the people from death, immense advantage was to be taken of other people's money. He did not argue this from inference; he wished to state something from fact. Certain facts had been stated in the public newspapers which, if incorrect, ought to be contradicted. In autumn last year the newspapers in this country informed us that a telegram dated Simla had reached the Office of the India Department from Sir John Lawrence, stating that affairs in Orissa were very distressing, and desiring, to enable him to relieve the distress, that an independent subscription should be got up in the city of London through the instrumentality of the Lord Mayor. The public papers gave the substance of the reply of the noble Lord then at the head of the India Office (Viscount Cranborne)—to the effect that he would not countenance the application for alms to the City of London; that Sir John Lawrence was at the head of the Government which was in possession of £47,000,000 a year of revenue, and that the resources of the country ought to be devoted to the saving of life and the relief of destitution. That was a very proper and praiseworthy reply. The misfortune was it came too late. That reply was, he believed, sent by telegram to Simla, and the authorities in Bengal published its import in the Indian newspapers, although it was not to be found in the voluminous Papers laid on the table of the House of Commons. He had himself read in *The Friend of India* of October 20, the purport of Lord Cranborne's telegram. It was accompanied by some comments, which from their tone appeared to have been written by some high functionary in India. After giving the purport of the despatch, *The Friend of India* wrote as follows:—

> "With the receipt of Lord Cranborne's prompt and large-minded telegram to the Viceroy, directing the free advance of the public funds to meet the emergency, all difficulty on this score has been removed."

Now, what did that imply? It implied that at that time the authorities in India up to the 20th of October, 1866, had not thought it expedient or proper to take the public funds of India to meet the great emergency that had arisen. The commentator went on thus—

> "And if relief to the suffering people of Orissa be not immediately given the fault and censure will rest upon ourselves."

The following comment was well worthy of remark—

> "Deplorable as the statement is, death has done much to simplify the duties that will hereafter devolve upon us."

A more disgraceful observation than that he had never seen in any newspaper. What was the plain English of all this? That up to the 20th of October, the rulers of India never thought it worth while to devote the resources at their command for the relief of suffering humanity. They had not thought it their duty. They did not think themselves censurable for neglect; but they thanked Heaven that now death had much simplified their task, they would not have much to expend. He had only to repeat that, in his judgment, in the main the Governor General of India was responsible for this great calamity, and Sir Cecil Beadon was also responsible. The House would not be doing its duty if it did not take some serious notice of this disaster. He thought that those who by their apathy and indifference had caused it, should meet with some punishment and censure. He begged to second the Motion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Poole.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Papers which are necessary to complete the Report and Appendices of the Famine Commission, and of any Minutes by Members of the Supreme Council of India relating to the Famine, or Dissents or Minutes by Members of the Indian Council in London on the Despatch of the Secretary of State for India (Public, No. 99),"—(*Mr. Henry Seymour,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. BRUCE said, he was sure the House would not listen to him with less attention if he began by stating frankly that he should probably not have taken any part in the discussion had he not happened to be a near relation of one of those gentlemen who had taken an active part in these transactions—he meant Sir Cecil Beadon. The Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, Sir Cecil Beadon, was one of a class who well deserved the sympathy of the House—a class of public servants who left this country for India at an early age, and, if they rose—as often they did—to eminence, owed it only to their own industry, ability, and other high qualifications. In defending Sir Cecil Beadon it would become his painful duty to lay a portion of the blame, which had been thrown upon him, upon others, for he should have to contend that a large share of the responsibility for what had taken place rested upon Sir John Lawrence himself. In doing this, however, he trusted he should never forget the debt of gratitude which this country owed Sir John Lawrence for his conduct during the Indian mutiny; for it was in a great measure owing to the exertions of that distinguished individual that our Indian Empire had been preserved to British rule. But neither must it be forgotten that at the time when the outcries against the Sepoys were loudest and the demands for vengeance, both at home and in India, were strongest, no one opposed himself more strongly to sanguinary acts of retaliation than Sir Cecil Beadon. He thought there were reasons why these public men should be judged frankly and fairly, and he would ask the House to recollect the circumstances in which they were placed at the time. The House had not yet been told that the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal was the ruler of 40,000,000 of people, and of a territory many times larger than the British Isles, the different parts of which were not united by roads of any description which would have enabled a calamity of this kind to have been averted by immediate action. On the contrary, the different portions of the country were separated by great swamps and forests and by inaccessible mountains. How was the ruler of a country like that to act in the case of such an emergency as had happened in 1866? He was not going to deny the possibility of anything being done in such an event; he merely wished to show what great difficulties were inherent in the nature of the case, and he hoped by so doing at any rate to diminish the amount of responsibility which the last two speakers had endeavoured to throw upon this gentleman. A public officer in the position of Sir Cecil Beadon must necessarily have to rely greatly upon his subordinate officers for information upon all subjects connected with the country over which he ruled, and in the present case he was compelled to be guided by the reports of the resident Commissioners and Collectors of the district—men who had been selected to fill those offices from their peculiar aptitude for the position. It was always a matter of enormous difficulty to deal with national famines; thus in the case of the famine in Ireland, notwithstanding that the Government had the whole resources of this wealthy country at its command, and notwithstanding that the sister island was accessible from all points, 200,000 persons perished from starvation or died in consequence of disease resulting from the famine; and that the loss was not far greater was due, not to the action of the Government, but to the extraordinary exertions of private benevolence. Under no circumstances, therefore, could Orissa have escaped without considerable loss. Another point in this case which must not be lost sight of was that Orissa was not the only portion of the territory under the command of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal in which the famine was raging. It seemed that large quantities of rice had been exported from these parts of India to Australia, the Mauritius, and other distant places, and the result was that in 1865 there was a great scarcity of grain in various districts of Bengal. The Famine Commissioners in their Report said—

> "If this had happened in 1865-66, could the void have been supplied? We fear not. Probably, if the full extent of the actual calamity of 1866 had been anticipated by the Government in the end of 1865, the sufficient supply of rice to the population of Orissa would have fully taxed all the resources of Government. If nothing had been available from Bengal, we very much doubt whether a sufficient supply could have been obtained from Burmah and the limited surplus-producing districts of the Madras coast; without absolutely stopping exportation to other countries it might have been impossible, and in that case Mauritius, Ceylon, and other places would have starved. If these importations by sea would scarcely have sufficed for Orissa, much less would they have sufficed for all the population of Bengal and Behar. We may say broadly that rice could not have been found to supply a great deficiency in those provinces. Behar would certainly have been included in such a calamity, as we know that it was included in the great failure of 1769-70. In fact, it may be said to have its supply of rain from Bengal, and a failure in Bengal involves a failure in Behar. Altogether, gloomy as the view may seem, we must express our belief that if the same calamity which hap-

> pened in the last century to Bengal, and last year to Orissa, had happened last year to Bengal also, the failure to supply by importation which resulted in Orissa from want of information and other causes would have occurred in Bengal from the want of any adequate source of supply, and that rich Bengal, with abundance of money, would have perished for want of food."

It would have been, of course, improper for the Government to have interfered with the natural and ordinary means of supply until a great emergency arose, and until it became clear that nothing but the action of the Government could save the people. It must be recollected that hitherto in all the great famines that had devastated India the Government had never had recourse to the measures which it was alleged should have been taken in the present instance. Up to the end of the year 1864 Orissa had been an exporting country, and Mr. Ravenshaw, who was the Chief Commissioner of Orissa, said that the crops on the two lands were of average quality, and that there was plenty of grain in the hands of the dealers, which would sooner or later find its way into the market. The Board of Revenue also made inquiries, and the result of the information they obtained led them to infer that the time had not arrived for the Government to take any extraordinary action in the matter. Mr. Ravenshaw afterwards confessed that he had fallen into an error; but at the same time pointed out that it was an error which had likewise been fallen into by the Government, by all official persons, by the press, and by the public. It was asserted, however, that Mr. Barlow was an eminent exception to the general rule, and that the imminence of a famine had been foreseen by him. Now, it was undoubtedly true that Mr. Barlow did apply for a supply of rice for certain small districts in Poree, but he only did so upon condition that the rice should cost less than it could be purchased for in the Poree district itself. Such, generally speaking, was the purport of Mr. Barlow's earlier applications. But in February, 1866, the Lieutenant Governor himself went to Poree, and, of course, it was utterly impossible that he should not be guided to a great extent by the opinions and statements of the responsible officers in the district. Several officials then stated that, though there was a difficulty in procuring rice, an actual famine was not to be apprehended; and at a meeting held on the 25th of February, 1866, Mr. Barlow, who was now represented as knowing the real state of affairs, said he did not think matters were so bad that it would be necessary to write to the English newspapers, although it might be advisable to make an appeal to the Native press. That statement was a most important one, because it was now pretended that the Lieutenant Governor ought to have personally seen all the signs of an impending famine. He would undertake to say that any hon. Member who carefully studied the Papers which had been laid upon the table must come to the conclusion that there were no undoubted signs of famine at that period, although it could not be denied that there were indications of scarcity. It was maintained that Mr. Barlow was afraid to inform the Lieutenant Governor of the necessity of importing rice; but such an imputation was most unjust both to Mr. Barlow and to Sir Cecil Beadon, than whom no officer could be more accessible. Indeed, on the 30th of March, 1866, Mr. Barlow wrote to say that Sir Cecil Beadon's Government was so extremely ready to act on his suggestions and so liberal in their policy that he was compelled to be cautious in what he asked for lest he should get a great deal more than he required. In point of fact, the Lieutenant Governor was seen by many of the Natives and all the leading men among the population, and not one of them assigned any reason for supposing that a famine was imminent. Even as late as the 11th of June, 1866, Mr. Ravenshaw wrote to say that though there was little or no rice in the country up to the beginning of that month, yet he had received ample assurances that there would be enough to last till the next harvest, and he himself concurred in that belief. It was clear, therefore, that at that date Mr. Ravenshaw was only beginning to doubt whether there was a sufficient stock of rice in the country. It was plain that a hideous famine had occurred, and that great loss of life had resulted from it. This all must deplore, but who could parcel out the blame? He contended that when men like Sir John Lawrence hesitated, when members of the Council commented on the order sent by Sir Cecil Beadon for food as premature, when every person in authority in the district was of opinion that extraordinary measures were not necessary, it was impossible to fix the fault on any particular person. Sir Cecil Beadon naturally depended on information furnished him by others; he was not the governor of a small province, but of

40,000,000 of people, scattered over a vast territory, and the information furnished him was such as would have led any other man in his position to the conclusion that the threatened calamity was not nearly as great as it turned out to be. He was therefore of opinion that the Secretary for India had acted not only justly but wisely in the language used in his despatch. It was impossible for the right hon. Gentleman to say that no person was to blame; the knowledge which he had obtained showed that all the officers had acted in accordance with their light; he knew them to be earnest in the discharge of their duty; they had given proof to the country that they were as remarkable for humanity as for energy, and therefore the fair presumption was that, as in many others of the calamities which had visited this and other countries, as much was due to the system as to the men, and that hon. Members should be slow in passing condemnation upon a man who had rendered the most distinguished services, and who was returning to this country after an absence of thirty-three years, shattered in health from the effects of the climate and his arduous labours.

Lord WILLIAM HAY said, that it was not the system which was wrong, but the man who was at the head of the Government of Bengal. Taking into consideration the principles which guided the Lieutenant Governor, and the inaction which characterized his conduct, it was not to be wondered at that the evils which occurred last year had taken place. The question now asked in the House was who was to blame for the calamities of 1865, and the Secretary of State for India, anticipating that such a question would be asked, instituted a Commission to investigate the matter. That Commission was appointed by the Governor General of India, who placed at its head a man who combined in himself qualifications not often found in the same individual in the Civil Service of India, a knowledge of law only to be obtained by great study, and an acquaintance with the habits and means, and, above all, with the feeling and sentiments of the people of India, which was not surpassed, and hardly equalled, by any member of the Civil Service in India. He drew attention to that circumstance because the hon. Member for Dumbartonshire (Mr. Smollett) said that it was impossible for a Commission so constituted fairly to investigate the matter. He would remind the hon. Member that the officer who presided over the Commission was a Member of the Supreme Court at Calcutta, and was as fit to try a case of this sort as the Lord Chief Justice of England was to try a question connected with the rights of the Crown. The Report of the Commission did "nothing extenuate, naught set down in malice." It was composed of three Volumes, the first of which was the Report proper, and the Evidence taken by the Commissioners; the second, certain distinct narratives, which were placed in an Appendix; the third contained a mass of documentary evidence of the most interesting kind, commencing in the month of October, 1865, and giving a full and detailed history from that period down to the month of January, 1867. The Report arrived in this country at the end of May. What was done? The Secretary for India laid on the table of the House a blue book supposed to contain all the Papers necessary to elucidate this question. But, curious to say, the India Office took the trouble of striking out all the references to the Appendices. On the 22nd of July the House was presented with another blue book containing the Evidence taken by the Commissioners, and also the map of the district. It also contained the diaries of the police, of the revenue officers, of Mr. Barlow, and many other officials and demi-officials. There was in it besides a most important document — namely, the letter written by Messrs. Gisborne and Co., dated the 3rd of November, 1865, addressed to the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. That letter had the following paragraph:—

> "In reference to the famine, which is now an acknowledged fact, and in extent and severity is daily increasing, we have a proposal for obtaining a supply of rice, which we desire to submit to you."

The letter concluded in these words—

> "Should our proposal meet with his honour's approval, it is needless to remark that, considering the lives dependent upon the issue, we cannot act with too much promptitude."

Among the other Papers in the blue book was the diary of the sub-inspector of police which showed the real state of things. On the 26th of October, 1865, he said the absorbing topic was the impending famine and the scarcity which would arise. On a subsequent day he spoke of the state of things getting darker and darker, and of the actual distress and starvation which prevailed. In November he said the poorer classes were compelled to resort to jungle root for food, and in February, 1866—when Sir Cecil Beadon saw no signs of famine—he said that several persons, rather than die of starvation, committed suicide, and that great numbers were then dying from want of food. One circumstance he mentioned was this—that some poor villagers clubbed together to buy a jungle tree for what was equivalent to 5*s.* or 6*s.* of English money, and had it cut up and ground in hand-mills, and then made into cakes for eating. Another incident related in the papers was one witnessed by Dr. Jackson, of a woman whose bowels were actually being eaten by dogs while she was alive, but unable from extreme weakness to defend herself. They were told of a lunatic eating the dead body of a fellow-creature, and of another man who was not a lunatic doing the same thing, and also of the stench from dead bodies unburied at one station being so great that it extended for four miles. In one instance a Commissioner had his pockets rifled by a crowd of half-starved women and children. These things occurred at a time when the Lieutenant Governor saw no signs of famine. There were besides, among the documents he referred to, a copy of a speech delivered by the Lieutenant Governor to the people of Kuttack, which, considering it was delivered to a starving people, was outrageous, and a memorandum by the Secretary of the Revenue Board written in 1867, in which the conduct of that Board was defended in most astonishing language. What made these things the more horrible was that when relief came tardily and insufficiently, there was one inflexible rule that it should not be given on Sunday. When they acted in that way, was it surprising that Christianity had made very slight progress in India? It was said that, in this country, when any disaster or blunder occurred, there was great difficulty in finding out who was responsible, but that was not so in India. There the Government was a pure despotism acting upon enlightened principles, and the highest functionaries, the Governor General himself, were not in a position to disregard applications for aid or representations coming to them from subordinate officials. He wanted to know why the Secretary for India had not given a larger amount of information than appeared in the blue book? It could not be on the ground

of expense, because he had not grudged expense in other matters. If the authorities of the India Office had wished to make the subject as unintelligible and unpalatable as they possibly could, they could not have adopted better means for that purpose than by producing the Papers in their present shape. He supported the Motion because he wished all the Papers to be laid before the House. The despatch of the Secretary for India was a most unsatisfactory document, as it did not answer the question, Who was to blame? It seemed as if the Board of Revenue had been made the scapegoat to take away the sins of the Lieutenant Governor, who had unlimited power in times of emergency. Sir Cecil Beadon took a strange view of his duty, and the Secretary for India seemed to support that view when he said—

> "It is not to be wondered at in the early part of the famine that Sir Cecil Beadon should have placed implicit reliance on the watchfulness and sagacity of the Board of Revenue."

When he (Lord William Hay) first read that paragraph, he thought that the word "not" was written by mistake. That Board was nothing more than a department, and there were other departments and other sources from which the Lieutenant Governor could have obtained information. Sir Cecil Beadon's chief defence was, that he had not sufficient information; but ample information was possessed by Messrs. Gisborne, and captains of ships, and other persons. Sir Cecil Beadon was charged with an "incapacity for belief." This charge was supported by the statement that he had himself seen the people with roots in their hands. In reference to this fact, Sir Cecil had stated that when he saw the people with the roots one of them said something which he could not understand—and this ignorance of the language was an important point—and he was under the impression that the roots were part of the ordinary food of the people at that time of year. Very different had been the course pursued on the occasion of the famine of 1860. There was a total failure of rain in the North West Provinces in the month of June; and Lieutenant Governor Edmonstone issued elaborate instructions to all his subordinates as to what they should do. To revert to the case of the Irish famine in 1845, on the first failure of the potato crop, Sir Robert Peel held a Cabinet Council, and decided that £100,000 should at once be sent to America to purchase grain for the use of the people. There was one line in his Minute which was well worth consideration—it was this, "inaction, postponement of the thing is at any rate impossible." Sir Charles Trevelyan, in his book, which had been quoted in evidence, said it was folly to interfere; but he proved the very contrary. If that was true with regard to Ireland, so near to England, how much more so was it in the case of India and Orissa, which was isolated from the rest of the world in so remarkable a degree? What was the real secret of all this failure? The Lieutenant Governor (Sir Cecil Beadon) had been in ill-health about two years. His medical advisers said they would not be responsible for his life if he remained another year in India. He was unfit for the position both mentally and physically, and incapable of meeting the great emergency. This was very hard upon his subordinates. With regard to the censure passed on the Governor General, it was somewhat obscure, and he should be glad to know from the Secretary of State what it exactly meant. On the 30th of April last, Sir Cecil Beadon himself said—

> "I fully believed in the disaster that was likely to be caused by the failure of the crops of 1865, and I did all that a Government could do to avert it."

Sir Cecil then insinuated that long before Sir John Lawrence wished to import food, he (Sir Cecil Beadon) had recommended the importation of corn into Orissa; but in saying this he forgot that, in a former note, he had said—

> "I may perhaps be permitted to say that his Excellency the Viceroy consulted me personally as to the proposal to import rice into Bengal and Orissa; but at the time the proposal was made, and afterwards when I returned from Cuttack, in February, his Excellency was strongly inclined to act on that proposal, but he yielded to my opinion and that of others that it was not expedient or necessary."

An officer who defended himself in such a manner as this could hardly expect much mercy from those who viewed his conduct as he (Lord William Hay) did. With reference to the conduct of the Governor General, it was fully apparent that he had felt there was something wrong in Orissa, and was not satisfied until the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal had visited the spot. The Lieutenant Governor did visit the spot, and he reported that there was no reason for apprehending a famine. When the Governor General, before starting for Simla, called his Council together, and told them he was afraid there was something wrong in Orissa, he was told that Sir Cecil Beadon had been in the country thirty years, that he knew it thoroughly, and that he was a person in whom the greatest confidence ought to be reposed. Under such circumstance, a Governor General might almost be said to be in a subordinate position, as he had no alternative but that of reliance on the officers who had charge of the various districts. With regard to Mr. Barlow, he appeared to have been very hardly used in this matter. The district of Orissa measured 250 miles by 200, and of this district Mr. Barlow was Collector. It was unfair to accuse him of having ceased to give information of what was going on, when he was prevented by the Government from going to the district to make inquiries. The moment he heard of relief coming in the shape of public works he sat down and wrote a most admirable letter, showing that the people must be paid in grain. That was forwarded to Sir Cecil Beadon, and what was his reply — "You must on no account give rice." Not satisfied with this want of success, he again wrote to the department, and again met with a still more decided refusal. This sort of misunderstanding went on from February until June, displaying an amount of incompetency on the part of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal which was greatly to be deplored. The Board of Revenue had merely followed the ordinary course of business, they having transmitted to the Lieutenant Governor copies of all the proceedings in which they took part. He (Lord William Hay) could not approve of the despatch of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State. On the contrary, he thought that it was calculated to mislead people at home, and to do a great deal of mischief in India. There was nothing which those in India prized or feared so much as the praise or censure of this country as expressed by the House of Commons. But praise or censure, to be of any effect, must be discriminating and deserved. In this case the blame was so evenly distributed, was veneered over so many persons that no one felt disgraced by it. It was felt to be rather an honour than a disgrace to sin with Sir John Lawrence. He (the noble Lord) did not so much find fault with the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Stafford Northcote) as with the system that required a despatch, on which a Secretary of State might have bestowed great care and thought, to be submitted to the Council. Some members of that Council might think that Sir John Lawrence was chiefly responsible, and others that the responsibility belonged to the Lieutenant Governor, and thus the despatch had to be modified till it became the meaningless and colourless thing it was. There might be on his Council men who were still smarting under rebukes which they had received from the very man whose conduct was under consideration. No doubt there might be Indian Secretaries of intelligence, force of character, and knowledge of India so great as to enable them to insist on their original despatch; but it was far more likely that the result of submitting it to the Council would be to make it, as this was, a meaningless, colourless, and wholly inadequate document failing to represent any opinion whatever. He could only hope that the result of debate would be to excite in this country sympathy for the sufferers of Orissa, for there were many widows and orphans that were wholly dependent upon the charity of their fellow-subjects. If, however, their misfortunes should have the effect of turning the attention of the House to the system of Indian government, they would have the consolation of thinking that they would, at least, not have suffered in vain.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON said, that it was a matter of the deepest regret to him as a Member of the Government that in this painful matter he could not make a perfect defence on behalf of those who had held the highest positions in the public service for many years, and who, at the close of an official life of the highest honour, found themselves impugned by so heavy a charge as that which had been brought against them in the House of Commons that night. It was a most unfortunate circumstance that the despatch in question necessarily contained so much of censure and so little of excuse. Having held a position in the India Office during the past year he desired to explain that the Papers relating to the case had not been laid before the House earlier than they were because they had not arrived from India. The Report, with the Papers already in the hands of the Indian Department, were immediately on their arrival, several months after they were expected, placed in the hands of a printer in order that they might be laid on the table of the House at once. Consequently it was impossible that the press should be stayed so that the references to the Appendix might be placed in the body of the Report. So far, indeed, from there being any concealment, the truth was that it was owing to the great care and anxiety of the Secretary of State that the Papers were presented to Parliament as soon as they were. No doubt with some considerable delay more voluminous Papers might have been presented, but the Government had been content to lay before the House a succinct narrative of the painful events that had occurred as soon as possible. Those Papers had been placed on the table in their present form at the express request of the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. H. Seymour). He would not follow that hon. Gentleman into all the details to which he had referred, because as most hon. Members had read many of the papers, it would be unnecessary for him to relate afresh the terrible circumstances of the famine. Everybody must entertain a feeling of sorrow almost amounting to disgust that under the highly vaunted British Government such terrible events should have occurred, and that so little should have been done at the moment and on the spot to prevent them. As had been most truly stated in the despatch of his right hon. Friend the blame must be spread over a wide surface, and there were causes of palliation. They were judging of the conduct of public servants, who had to administer the government of a country not immediately under their own eyes, and where, in times of distress, the first signs of trouble did not reach the authorities immediately after the necessity for action had arisen. Considerations of this kind had not been overlooked by the Secretary of State when the despatch was written; and he thought the House would not be of opinion that the Secretary of State had done wrong in making allowances, while judging of the conduct of those who in former years had deserved well of their country and who had proved their capacity during a long period of service. With respect to Sir Cecil Beadon, he could not understand the remarks which had fallen from the hon. Member for Dumbarton and the noble Lord to the effect that the censure in the despatch of his right hon. Friend was light, and that the expressions used in it were no punishment. To a man of the known character of Sir Cecil Beadon, who had received marks of high honour for his services to his country, the expressions made use of in the despatch of his right hon. Friend, written with deep regret, brought with them the severest punishment which could fall upon him. When dealing with one like the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal it was not necessary to use violent language. The despatch it was true contained no expressions of indignation, but the censure it conveyed would be felt from one end of India to the other, as being, perhaps, not undeserved, but at all events, not wanting in weight. Surely it was sufficient censure for Sir Cecil Beadon to be told that he could not see the truth with his own eyes; and that as Lieutenant Governor of Bengal he had failed to sound and guage the evidence brought before him. His right hon. Friend the Secretary of State also pointed out in his despatch how grievous was the fault of those who did not bring under the notice of the Lieutenant Governor the alarming news which had reached them. A more terrible omission could not be imagined than the withholding Mr. Ravenshaw's telegram from the Lieutenant Governor. He was therefore unable to agree that the whole blame should rest on the Lieutenant Governor, and no blame on the subordinate officers. Hon. Members who had spoken in this debate had not been sparing in their censure, but they had distributed it in somewhat different directions. He could not agree that blame rested on the Governor General of India. With respect to the charges sought to be fixed on that high official, he must express his astonishment at the language of the hon. Member for Dumbarton (Mr. Smollett), who stated that the Governor General had turned his back upon the perishing thousands of Orissa, and that he had only been roused from his "apathetic indifference" to the fate of these people by the reception of strong remonstrances from the Home Government. He wondered that the hon. Member with the Papers before him could have suffered himself to make such a statement to the House. The Papers showed that the Governor General called upon the Lieutenant Governor for an explanation of the rumours he had heard, and the Lieutenant Governor informed him that there was no famine in Bengal. From the time that the Lieutenant Governor came back from Orissa, the Governor General was in constant communication with him with respect to the agricultural prospects of the district. In March he called for a special Report. On the 10th of May he called for an explanation of the alarming rumours then prevailing, and in the course of daily communications invariably informed the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal that every measure proposed for relief would be supported and that any money he might require for the purpose of meeting the evil should be placed at his disposal. It was so far from being true that Sir John Lawrence had only been awakened to a sense of his responsibility by the despatch of the noble Lord the late Secretary for India (Viscount Cranborne) that the letter which he wrote on the 16th of June, and which showed his just appreciation of the calamity, crossed that despatch on its way to India. His right hon. Friend the Member for Merthyr (Mr. Bruce) in defending his relative Sir Cecil Beadon had failed to establish his point that the Governor General was to blame for his ignorance of the state of affairs at Orissa; because if, as his right hon. Friend contended, Sir Cecil Beadon was to be excused for his own ignorance, it would be unfair to bring a charge under that head against the Governor General, who must have had to rely on the public officers in Bengal for his information. Some hon. Members had expressed their belief that the despatch of the Secretary of State in reference to those transactions was not sufficiently vigorous and decisive; but it was perhaps the severest despatch which had been written during this century upon the conduct of Her Majesty's representatives in India. Indeed, the whole facts of the case showed most clearly that the charge against Sir John Lawrence was absolutely without foundation. It was not by seeking for a victim that justice would be done in this matter. That was not the true lesson to be derived from the terrible events which had occurred in Orissa. It was not by seeking out this or that man, whom they must all admit had endeavoured to do his duty, though he may have failed in so doing, and holding him up to public reprobation as one who had sullied his hitherto stainless life by bringing ruin upon thousands, that they might hope to prevent the recurrence of so deplorable a disaster as that which happened in Orissa. These events should rather incite them to see by what means they could strengthen the machinery of the government of the province, in the hope that, by giving larger powers to the representatives of Her Majesty, the energies of the country might be stimulated to bar the recurrence of any similar disaster.

Mr. STANSFELD said, he hoped the Government would not refuse the papers for which the hon. Member for Poole had moved; at the same time he believed they had already before them all the information necessary to enable them to form a judgment upon the subject. In considering this question they ought not to forget the past services, the merits, and the character of the men on whom they had then to sit in judgment, and if that judgment should happen to be an unfavourable one, it ought not, at all events, to be accompanied by any presumptuous assumption that if they had themselves been similarly tried they would not have been found equally wanting. It was the duty of the House to express a judgment upon the events which they were now discussing, and upon the manner in which they had been dealt with by the despatch of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India. There could be no doubt about the great and appalling fact which was the subject of discussion, and that of the population of Orissa somewhere about 750,000 persons had perished. The Commission which, in consequence of the orders of the noble Lord (Viscount Cranborne) was issued, had to inquire into the causes of the famine, into its remedies, and into the faults of those whose duty it was to have met the coming evil by timely measures of relief, but who failed to do so. They had not on the present occasion to deal with the question of remedies. About the cause of the famine there could be no doubt, as it was well understood, and was not unknown in the history of India. There was no rainfall at the critical moment of the harvest; there were exhausted stocks from the large exports of previous years, and the consequences of these exhausted stocks and a failing harvest were aggravated and intensified by the fact that the harvest failed in a country which was peculiarly inaccessible. The first department responsible for any failure that might have occurred was the Board of Revenue, for if their Report of the 25th of November had been followed by due watchfulness it would be looked back upon now and interpreted in a different sense. It was not unnatural that the Board of Revenue—believing in a scarcity, but not in a famine—should guard themselves against claims for remission from some of the Zemindars able to pay the revenue due from them even in a period of distress. But nothing through the sad pages appeared to him more melancholy than their exhibition of inaptitude — their narrow fear of responsibility—their dwarfish pedantry—uttering worthless commonplaces of political economy, misunderstood and misapplied, to check the action that might have saved thousands of lives whose sacrifice now lay heavy at their doors. The Report of the Revenue Board expressed not only the first but the last views of that body; and it was apparently with unwillingness that they in the end yielded to the orders of the Lieutenant Governor to buy rice and bring it into Orissa. Theirs was only a departmental responsibility, it was true; but it was their pre-eminence—and a sad and unfortunate pre-eminence it was—to have resisted all the necessary measures of relief from the beginning to the end, There were two other departments also whose conduct called for serious consideration — he meant the Department of Police and that of Works. It was stated in the evidence that the local police had the earliest information of the state of the district, and the danger of approaching famine. That information, however, had never been communicated by the heads of the police to the Lieutenant Governor, nor was he aware that Sir Cecil Beadon had ever called upon them to furnish him with any information of which they might have been in possession. And what had been done by the Department of Works towards preventing the evils which had arisen? The theory in Bengal was that the Government were in favour of a system of public works; but how were their views in that respect carried out? The Lieutenant Governor seemed to be under the impression that everything had been attempted which could be attempted, and the only fault which he appeared disposed to admit was that he did not perceive from the information before him the necessity at an early period of importing rice. As to the Board of Works, the Lieutenant Governor seemed to be under the impression that it had done everything in its power under the circumstances, and he boasted of the liberality with which funds were placed at their disposal. In his communication to the Governor General of India the Lieutenant Governor declared that there had been no want of activity or zeal either on its part or on that of its officers, and that there was not a particle of evidence to show that there was an actual deficiency of food, or that the coming distress could not be relieved by a liberal expenditure of money. Now, what was that liberal expenditure of money? The Lieutenant Governor, almost with an air of triumph, said that in the first six months of 1866 not less than £30,000 was spent on public works in Orissa. But he (Mr. Stansfeld) should like to know how much had been spent in the first four months? During the latter period of the contributions they had degenerated into mere relief, whereas the money should have been timely distributed in order to avert the panic and the catastrophe which had ensued. The function of public works was to be beforehand with famine. But what portion of the expenditure was normal, and how much of it was really incurred by the Government of Bengal for the purpose of averting famine from the population? But taking the amount even at £30,000, he would ask what was the value of that sum as compared with the 500,000 or 750,000 persons whose lives had fallen a sacrifice to absolute starvation? The Lieutenant Governor seemed, however, to be so possessed with the idea that everything had been done, so far as public works were concerned, which could be done, that the only thing he would admit was some mistake of judgment with respect to the importation of rice. But the importation of rice or its non-importation was not, after all, a primary but a secondary cause of the evils which occurred. If we had a system of public works in Orissa, we should contemplate in a time of famine the necessity of feeding as well as employing and paying the native population. If a system of public works had been entered upon, and directed in a right manner from the first, the question of the importation of rice would have solved itself by a natural process. There were decisions of the authorities to which they might trace the evils that had afterwards occurred. The dates of them were the 26th of January and the 1st of February, 1866. In November a considerable scheme of public works was devised. A part of the scheme was to pay the labourers partly in money and partly in rice, and it was sanctioned by the Lieutenant Governor; but on the 19th of December he issued an order to pay in money and not in grain. The superintendent engineer communicated with the Commissioner that it was necessary to supply food for so many coolies. On the 11th of January it was suggested that the Public Works Department should advance money for a supply of food out of the funds granted for roads; and Mr. Barlow, having found that rice could not be had in the bazaars and shops of the country, proposed that rice should be imported. The people's lives were depending upon the supply of rice. The reply received from the Public Works Department was that it could have nothing to do with providing rice. On the 26th of January the Public Works Department refused, as far as they were concerned, to advance funds at their disposal to pay for rice. The Government declined to import rice, alleging that, if the market was in favour of that article, it would find its way to Orissa without the interference of Government. The decision was that all payments for labour to relieve the distress must be in cash. The Public Works Department and Revenue Department prevented the proposed action of the local officers, and closed the door, not only against the importation of rice, but against the possibility of feeding, as well as of employing, the population upon the public works. From that moment the doom of the population appeared to be sealed, and nothing was seen but the appalling growth of a dread calamity, until at last it burst on the consciousness of the official mind when it was too late to supply a remedy. His right hon. Friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil had alluded to the system which prevailed at Bengal. The *laissez faire* system in that province was not suited to a state of things like the famine; but that could not be stated in justification or excuse for what had occurred, because the two departments had determinedly adopted a policy which must end in evil. With every desire to do justice to the Lieutenant Governor, it was impossible to relieve him from the responsibility which devolved upon him. In not enforcing a policy of action on his subordinates, Sir Cecil Beadon showed a want of that foresight, that initiative, that control, which was due from him, and which the country had a right to expect, without demanding the degree of foresight and preparation recommended by Sir Arthur Cotton. When, on the 26th of January and the 1st of February, it was brought to the knowledge of the two departments most concerned in this matter that the public works which were intended to preserve the people from famine could not be carried out without arrangements for feeding the people, and that they could not be fed without importing rice, from that time a responsibility attached to those who took a wrong view and adopted a wrong policy. He approached with great diffidence and hesitation the question of the responsibility of Sir John Lawrence—a man whose reputation was the property of the country, who had been called "the saviour of India," and whose life had furnished ample evidence of vigour and capacity of action and of rule. The hon. Member for Dumbartonshire had been very unjust in talking of the "apathy" of Sir John Lawrence. Nothing was more patent than the lively interest which he had taken from the year 1865 in regard to the famine in Orissa. It was a mistake to impose any responsibility on the Viceroy with the view of lightening the responsibility of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. Sir John Lawrence brought the matter before the Council, and they determined that the matter should be left in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. In the despatches of Sir John Lawrence upon the subject there was a candour which was touching in its simplicity and truthfulness. It was manifest from the Papers that no officer of Government had given closer or more earnest attention to the subject of famine, or looked more anxiously to see how it might be averted. The Viceroy of India was bound, upon such a question, to listen to the views and opinions of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, with whom the government of that great district of India really rested, and to diminish the responsibility of the Lieutenant Governor was to weaken the action and efficiency of Government. But Sir John Lawrence had more experience and a truer instinct than any of those by whom he was surrounded. There was a time when he would have burst through the trammels of office, and acted for himself; as Lieutenant Governor, Sir John Lawrence would certainly have taken timely measures to meet the famine. He could only regret that, as supreme ruler of India, he had not thought it right, instead of yielding to the policy of his subordinates, himself to initiate the necessary measures. It was unnecessary for him to criticize the despatch of the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for India, which erred rather on the side of leniency than of severity. The calamity was so overwhelming, and the evil so complete, that it was not necessary to differ as to the words which might be used in expressing condemnation. The right hon. Gentleman, when, in his despatch, he spoke of the unfortunate want of foresight and energy on the part of the Lieutenant Governor of the province in which the famine occurred, expressed a great deal in the words he had used, and he thought that the House would agree with what he had said. England and India had both received a lesson which they would not soon forget. Deeply regretting the past, he trusted that our future rule would give indications of renewed vigour and energy of administration, and of an added and renovated sense of the beneficent effects of foresight and initiative power which could alone justify the despotic, though paternal, rule of a superior race.

Viscount CRANBORNE said, he should only weary the House if he were to follow in the footsteps of the hon. Gentleman who had just gone through the whole of the case with so much care and ability. In the criticism with which the hon. Gentleman had closed his speech he sympathized to some extent. His right hon. Friend must have felt it to be one of the most cruel necessities of his official position that he was bound to restrain the natural language of indignation. His right hon. Friend was not to be blamed; it was desirable that official expressions should be calm and measured. But it was likewise desirable that the opinion of the House should be expressed in no indistinct terms. The Lieutenant Governor of Bengal was to the fullest extent responsible for not having made any preparation against the famine if he had sufficient information before him. The question upon which they had to decide, and upon which posterity would have to give its verdict, was this—was there sufficient information to raise in the mind of a reasonable man any suspicion, any apprehension, of a calamity such as had overtaken the people of Orissa? The Lieutenant Governor of Bengal argued this question as if it were necessary that the proof should be undoubted and the certainty complete that the people were going to starve before the slightest step could be taken to relieve them. There never could be such a certainty. They never could be sure that the danger apprehended would overtake those they were bound to protect. The question was—did the danger amount to that degree of probability which should affect the mind of a reasonable man? Now, what were the probabilities? With scarcely an exception all who were untrammelled by official prejudices foresaw that a terrible calamity was impending. From the time the crop failed in 1865 the natives spoke of a coming famine as a certainty. In the second blue book was a series of accounts from various witnesses as to the probability of famine. They might be divided into three classes. First, Native witnesses, who never doubted that famine would arise from the failure of the crop in October, 1865. Next, the unofficial persons connected with the Government—irrigating companies, merchants, missionaries—who though more tardy than the first class at arriving at a conclusion, still spoke, all of them of the frightful famine. The third class was the officials, and they, with one or two honourable exceptions, seemed all to have been walking in a dream—to have been surrounded by some veil that hid from them what was visible to everybody else, and to have walked on in superb unconsciousness, believing that what had been must be, and that as long as they did nothing absolutely wrong, and did not displease their immediate superiors, they had fulfilled all the duties of their station. At the head of this official organization stood the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. Much had been said of the faults of the Commissioner. He did not deny them. His own feeling on reading these Papers was that, after these exposures, it was open to other nations to doubt whether it was possible, under any circumstances, that the English nation could learn the art of government. He did not wish in the least degree to detract from the blame that had been cast on the Board of Revenue; but he was surprised that they had been so long allowed to occupy the position they did occupy. The hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. J. Stuart Mill) had by his works been a great benefactor to mankind. But there was a curious reverse to the coin. No man's authority had been more systematically mis-used than his by unintelligent officials in propagating mischievous error. In Australia his authority had been used on the side of protection; in Bengal for starving some 750,000 persons. The doctrines of political economy had been worshipped as a sort of "fetish" by officials who, because they believed that in the long run supply and demand would square themselves, seemed to have utterly forgotten that human life was short, and that men could not subsist without food beyond a few days. They mechanically left the laws of political economy to work themselves out while hundreds of thousands of human beings were perishing from famine. While he thought the answer to the telegram which had been alluded to was the most grievous error which any department in this Empire had committed within recent recollection, none of these things entirely exonerated the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. The question came back to this—was there sufficient information conveyed to his mind of the danger that was impending? He would refer to one passage from the Native evidence that was given before the Commission—the evidence of the Collector of Pooree. This witness spoke of his intercourse with the Lieutenant Governor, when he visited the province in February, 1866, and said that the cry of alarm was raised in the presence of the Lieutenant Governor, who spoke to him of the past and present state of the district. The witness told him that he had never seen such a famine before, and that the people were dying of hunger. He did not speak of the proportion of the crops that had failed, but mentioned generally the fact of the failure of the crops, and of the people dying in thousands. This was upon the 7th of February before the time the Lieutenant Governor received warnings from the Messrs. Gisborne and others. The Lieutenant Governor, before February, 1866, had received warnings from Sir Arthur Cotton, Mr. Barlow, the police of the district, and others. The Lieutenant Governor said, indeed, that these people did not ask him to import rice. They did not; but he seemed to have looked on himself as a sort of machine, which other people were to bring into play, and then it would produce certain measures. Supposing it had not been human beings but cattle that were in question, and one had been informed on the authority of a merchant, a missionary, an official, and many other persons that the cattle were dying, and that there was a considerable danger that the deaths among them would continue increasing, would one have gone same 200 miles from those cattle, made some little further inquiry, and then taken another journey to the hills on the frontier of a distant country, and stayed there for two months, ordering no special inquiry, and not worrying nor vexing one's officials at all about what was occurring? True, the Lieutenant Governor did not receive any information which proved to him that the people would die, and it appeared that he did not think himself bound to move until it was absolutely proved to him that it was necessary to do so. But he knew, as well as anybody else, that unless he provided grain for these people before the bad weather set in the coast would be inaccessible. He must have known that if the famine which was impending occurred and he did not provide rice, hundreds of thousands of people would die, and on the other hand that if the danger passed away a certain sum of money might be wasted in providing rice. Having that choice before him, it would seem as if he chose rather to run the risk of losing the lives than to run the risk of wasting the money. He did not believe that that alternative really presented itself to the mind of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. He believed that that officer was in feeble physical health, and therefore incapable of giving the facts and warnings he received that attention which their importance demanded from one in his position. But, although that might prevent them from forming any bad conclusion as to his moral character, it could not relieve them from the necessity of apportioning to him a heavy blame for the calamity that ensued. He ought to have considered the frightful evils which depended on his being able satisfactorily to fulfil the duties of his high office, and no consideration ought to have induced him to continue in that office when his strength had ceased to be equal to the performance of his duties. In these despotic Governments they could not get rid of personal responsibility, or lay the blame for everything upon the system. The peculiarity of despotic Governments was that they they might be a great good if administered by competent men, and a frightful curse if administered by the incompetent. On the fidelity and capacity of the persons administering them would depend the weal or woe, the life or death, of millions of their fellow-creatures. He deprecated any attempt to divert the blame due to the individual by throwing it on the system. In England, where they were self-governed, if anything went terribly wrong, they thought that some system must be in fault; but it would be a great mistake to argue from their own experience to the case of despotic Governments such as existed in the East, where the man was everything and the system nothing. He did not think that the blame bestowed on Sir John Lawrence was fair, for the following reason—Sir John Lawrence had an enormous duty of supervision to perform; the Governors of Bombay and Madras, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, and various other high authorities were all under his supervision. He must take a general view of their main policy and decide the questions they submitted to him; but in deciding them in the first instance, he must accept the facts which others laid before him. The Lieutenant Governor of Bengal stated to Sir John Lawrence in the most distinct manner that no supplies of rice were necessary. It would have been something more than instinct, it would have been inspiration, if, without any evidence at his hand, the Governor General had said, "This testimony is not true, and I will go directly contrary to it." There was a rumour, which it was to be hoped was unfounded, that his right hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) intended to append a Council to the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal by way of remedying these evils. Another right hon. Friend of his (Mr. Henley), some months since, wishing to express his horror of a certain law, said it was an invention of Old Nick. If that remark could be applied to any institution, he thought it could be applied to Councils and Boards. Such things were trammels and screens to the incompetent. To the men who knew what they wanted to do they were useless; but they were excuses for procrastination to the men who doubted what they ought to do. If any instances of their evil action were wanting, it would be found in the course taken by the Governor General. The Governor General had that humility with regard to his own opinion and that deference for the opinions of others which was always the accompaniment of the greatest qualities to be found in human beings, and he believed he deferred unduly to the opinions of the Council by whom he was surrounded. When his right hon. Friend spoke of appointing a Council at Bengal he (Viscount Cranborne) must express an opinion that if the Governor General of India had not had that Council several hundreds of thousands who were now dead would have been alive. If the Governor General had not yielded to his Council large supplies of rice would have been imported at the proper time, and the people of Orissa would not have died. There was no greater error in our system of Government in India, than the perpetual effort to prevent maladministration by imposing checks, which frittered away responsibility and destroyed the individual and energetic action of men on the spot. If these events suggested any moral, it was the necessity of abolishing Dharjeeling. When the Governor General went to Simla he was still near his work, but it was difficult to convey an idea of the absurdity of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal going from Orissa to Dharjeeling. If they could suppose the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing), the Chairman of the London and Brighton Railway Company, going to his constituents at Wick, staying there six months in the year, and attempting to manage the affairs of the Company from the islands of Orkney, they would have a fair idea of what happened in India when the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal attempted to manage Orissa from the borders of Thibet. People must obtain leave of absence for a time in a tropical climate, but a Governor ought never to go from the seat of government, and when the Lieutenant Governor went away his powers should be delegated to persons on the spot. But the great evil, and it was a hard thing to say, was that English officials in India, with many very honourable exceptions, did not regard the lives of the coloured inhabitants with the same feeling of intense sympathy which they would show to those of their own race, colour, and tongue. If that was the case it was not their fault alone. Some blame must be laid upon the society in which they had been brought up, and upon the public opinion in which they had been trained. It became them to remember that from that place, more than from any other in the kingdom, proceeded that influence which formed the public opinion of the age, and more especially that kind of public opinion which governed the action of officials in every part of the Empire. If they would have our officials in distant parts of the Empire, and especially in India, regard the lives of their coloured fellow-subjects with the same sympathy and with the same zealous and quick affection with which they would regard the lives of their fellow-subjects at home, it was the Members of that House who must give the tone and set the example. That sympathy and regard must arise from the zeal and jealousy with which the House watched their conduct and the fate of our Indian fellow-subjects. Until we showed them our thorough earnestness in this matter—until we were careful to correct all abuses and display our own sense that they are as thoroughly our fellow-subjects as those in any other part of the Empire, we could not divest ourselves of all blame if we should find that officials in India did treat with something of coldness and indifference such frightful calamities as that which had so recently happened in that country.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, he had no objection to consent to the Motion, with the exception of the latter part of it. He was unable to produce any "Dissents or Minutes by Members of the Indian Council in London" upon his despatch, because there were none. He must take upon himself the full responsibility of the despatch in the form in which it had been presented to the House. Although that despatch was laid before the Members of the Council, still, with the exception of certain trifling alterations suggested by Members of the Council, it was the same despatch that he originally draughted, and he laid it upon the table as the expression of his own opinion under the circumstances. He entirely declined to shield himself from any shortcomings by saying that it was not his despatch, but that of the Council. On a late occasion, the noble Lord opposite made some remarks with reference to a despatch, in which he (Sir Stafford Northcote) had overruled and ignored the advice of the Council on an important matter. He should have done so now if occasion had required it. That was one of those questions on which the Secretary of State was able to write whatever he pleased; and, although on such an occasion he naturally listened to what his Council suggested, he was alone responsible for what he sent out. He had written the despatch with considerable care, and after much reflection. He was not indisposed to hear it criticized; but the criticisms which had been passed upon it did not induce him to alter the views he had formed. Violence of language was not synonymous with strength, and moderation was not feebleness. It might happen that it was a greater proof of strength to be able to take a calm and just view of the circumstances with which you have to deal than to throw yourself into the stream of what was a very natural feeling, but which, in calmer moments, you felt was not altogether a fair and just decision. He had thought it his duty very carefully to restrain and guard the language he had used, because he felt that, as his noble Friend (Viscount Cranborne) had said, official language ought to be carefully guarded, and expressions which might pass in speeches in that House ought not to be inserted hastily in a despatch. It was most essential that a Minister should not weaken his despatches by violence of language. A more important question was, however, whether the despatch was in substance fair and just, and that was the point on which he was anxious to have the verdict of that House. He had endeavoured in the despatch to get at what appeared to him to be the real root of the mischief of which they all complained, and he had endeavoured as far as possible to lay bare what he considered to be the root of all these evils. The hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Henry Seymour) said the despatch was not decisive. It was not so, because it was only the commencement of what the Government would have to do in consequence of these revelations. It was because he believed it to be only the prelude of what was to come after, that he had written it in the form in which it appeared. This was not a despatch in which the only thing he proposed to himself was to find out who was to blame, and to visit that individual with the severest censure. There was something more to do. In the first place, if the position of Sir Cecil Beadon had been different, his duty would have been also different. If he had written this despatch while Sir Cecil Beadon was Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, it would have been matter for serious consideration whether, after the evidence in these Papers that he was incapable of administering that Presidency in a satisfactory manner at a time of great emergency, it would not have been his duty to recall him from that government, or, at all events, to express himself in such a manner as to have left no doubt of his opinion that it was the duty of that officer to resign a post for which he was physically incompetent. But that was not the position in which he stood. Sir Cecil Beadon had ceased to be the Lieutenant Governor, and was on his way to England. There was nothing to be done for the interest of the province by visiting his conduct with any severe censure, or anything in the nature of a punishment. Again, had he merely blamed Sir Cecil Beadon and taken no notice of the conduct of his subordinates, he should not have fully laid open the evils which would eventually have to be grappled with by him and those who should succeed him. Those officers were still at their posts, and had no blame been cast on them, and all the mischief attributed to one man, it would have been very unfair. There were serious grounds for blaming others than the Lieutenant Governor, and also serious grounds for finding fault with the system which the Lieutenant Governor had had to administer. His noble Friend (Viscount Cranborne) had deprecated attacks on the system as allowing individuals to escape; but he had himself, before finishing his speech, animadverted upon the system. When referring to Sir Cecil Beadon his noble Friend put aside the advice and information he might have received from his subordinates, arguing that the system had nothing to do with it; but when referring to Sir John Lawrence he had urged that the fault was in the system, and that, had there been no Council, such great loss of life would not have occurred, for that the Viceroy would have insisted on the Lieutenant Governor doing his duty. The same rule, however, must be applied to both the Governor General and the Lieutenant Governor. He had the highest sense of the services which Sir John Lawrence had rendered, and believed, notwithstanding the unfortunate expression of the hon. Member for Dumbarton, that he was not only the "saviour of India," but that he was especially distinguished for his intense interest in the welfare of the people of India. If, on this occasion, he had failed, it was because he was incapable of doing the work of 100 men. Had he been an absolute despot, or a being capable of seeing everything with his own eyes, and doing everything with his own hands, everything possible would have been achieved; but being only mortal, his strength was overtaxed by the burden resting upon him. A single man could not deal with those matters except though agents, on whom, to a certain extent, he must reply. Although, therefore, it would have been very fortunate had Sir John Lawrence acted on his early impressions, and insisted on putting aside other matters and looking into the question for himself, no blame whatever could be imputed to him for not having done so. In some degree the same remark applied to Sir Cecil Beadon. He had a great amount of business which he had to intrust to agents, and those agents failed him in many important particulars.

He was to blame for not sooner finding out that his agents were failing him, and nothing could excuse his want of perception and energy when he personally visited Orissa. He (Sir Stafford Northcote) had no wish to palliate the blame attaching to him for his very cursory inspection of the province under the peculiar circumstances attending his visit. Sir Cecil Beadon, however, it must be remembered, had been systematically misinformed by persons to whom he trusted; and, when finding fault with the system which was the cause of his having been so misled, he did not do so for the sake of covering the Lieutenant Governor, but in order to expose something which required to be remedied, and of showing that the system of Boards of Revenue and the mode in which they were intrusted with business was a bad one. His noble Friend had misunderstood a passage in his despatch if he thought it indicated an intention of creating a Council to the Lieutenant Governor. Its meaning was this—that it must fairly be remembered that Sir Cecil Beadon had a very large Presidency to administer, equal in extent and in difficulty to Bombay and Madras, and that he had not the assistance of a Council or of a secretariat equal to that of those Presidencies. The consequence was that a great many matters of detail fell upon him, and prevented a due attention to more important matters. It was one thing to say that a Lieutenant Governor was better without a Council, and another thing to say that the assistance rendered by councillors was not worth having. Members of Council in the various Presidencies were something more than merely consultative. They took different departments, superintended details, and saw large numbers of persons who would otherwise go to the Lieutenant Governor and take up much of his time. Anybody acquainted with official life knew how attention to a large amount of details, and interruptions by persons whose business was not particularly important, exhausted the energies of the head of an office and lessened the attention he could otherwise pay to important matters. This was all he had said regarding the system in Bengal as compared with the other Presidencies, his object being partly to show the difficulty of Sir Cecil Beadon's position, and that some allowance—he did not say excuse—should be made for him, and partly to lay the foundation for measures for putting Bengal on as good a footing as Bombay and Madras. He could not understand why Bengal should be administered only by a Lieutenant Governor. The Governors of Bombay and Madras were selected by the Home Government, so that the Viceroy was not responsible for their capacity or incapacity; the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal was appointed by the Government of India, and was therefore in closer relations to it than the Governors of the other Presidencies. Hence the Governor General was somewhat responsible, even on matters of detail, for the Bengal Administration. He did not wish to go more fully into the matter, for much still remained open, and hon. Members who had read the latter portion of the Report would feel that it opened an enormous field for consideration. We had now an opportunity, better, perhaps, than had hitherto occurred, of revising many things in the administration of our Indian Empire which were a reproach to us, and which had been distinctly brought to light. He hoped the House would not be satisfied with censuring this or that officer, but would consider the relations between the Zemindars and the ryots, public works, irrigation, and other important questions. All of those questions were very well brought forward in the Report of the Commissioners, though they were too large for a debate of that sort, which naturally turned rather upon the conduct of individuals. We had not done with the subject. This catastrophe must always remain a monument of our failure, a humiliation to the people of this country, to the Government of this country, and to those of our Indian officials of whom we had been perhaps a little too proud. At the same time, we must hope that we might derive from it lessons which might be of real value to ourselves, and that out of this deplorable evil good of no insignificant kind might ultimately arise.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

EDUCATION—MR. ARNOLD'S REPORT TO THE SCHOOLS INQUIRY COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

MR. GRANT DUFF said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it would not be possible to lay upon the table of the House, before the Session closes, Mr. Arnold's Report to the Schools Inquiry Commission? The Report related to Continental schools, and ought to be produced, as that of Mr. Fraser had been on the schools in America.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that he really had no power in the matter. In consequence of the hon. Member having given notice of this Question, he had communicated with the Commissioners, and had received from them a reply that, although they had received Mr. Arnold's Report, as well as those of some of the Assistant Commissioners, they thought it would be inexpedient to produce it now, but that it would be presented with the general Reports in the course of the autumn. He could only add that, as soon as it was presented, the earliest opportunity would be taken of laying it upon the table.

Mr. BRUCE said, it would be a great advantage, and would secure greater attention, to have these Reports presented in detail.

Original Question, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE BILL—[Bill 232.]

(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Repeal and Continuance of Turnpike Acts).

Mr. WHALLEY moved, "That the Chairman report Progress."

Motion *negatived.*

Mr. WHALLEY said, he objected to the first clause. The public had been led to believe that in 136 districts the Turnpike Acts would not be renewed, but only thirty-seven were omitted from the Schedule.

Mr GATHORNE HARDY said, that all the trusts mentioned in the Bill existed, and that the object of the Bill was to continue these trusts for another year.

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. WHALLEY moved a new clause, providing that a Report should be laid before Parliament by the Secretary of State as to the debts of turnpike trusts.

Mr GATHORNE HARDY hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press the clause, as it would be impossible to carry it out without further legislation.

Clause *negatived.*

Mr. Grant Duff

Mr. READ moved the insertion of a clause providing that a driver of a waggon or cart of any kind should not be liable to any penalty for riding upon the carriage on any turnpike road providing he did not ride upon the shafts, but carefully drove by means of reins held in his hands.

Clause *agreed to.*

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH moved a clause providing that ratepayers should have access to the accounts of the trust where repairs had been borne by the parish.

Clause *agreed to.*

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH moved a clause providing for an extra audit of the accounts of the trust wherever one or more trustees should desire it.

Clause *agreed to.*

On Second Schedule,

Mr. WHITE said, he had to complain that a tollgate was permitted to remain at the main outlet of the town of Brighton, though the debt of the trust had been paid off. With the view of doing away with this toll he moved to insert in the Schedule "3 & 4 *Will.* IV., c. 43, intituled 'An Act for more effectually repairing the Road from Lewes to Brighthelmston, in the county of Sussex.'"

Amendment proposed, after line 2, to insert the words "3 and 4 *Will.* 4, c. 43, intituled, 'An Act for more effectually repairing the Road from Lewes to Brightelmston, in the county of Sussex.'"—(*Mr. White.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the main ground for preserving the existing arrangement was the excessive pressure of rates which the alteration would impose on some small parishes, increasing them in one case by 800 and another by 650 per cent. He felt bound to resist the Amendment.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 20; Noes 27: Majority 7.

Remaining Schedules *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Monday* next.

RAILWAYS (IRELAND) BILL.

On Motion of Lord NAAS, Bill to amend and extend, as to Railways in Ireland, the provisions of an Act of the seventh and eighth years of Victoria, intituled, "An Act to attach certain conditions to the construction of future Railways authorized or to be authorized by any Act of the present or succeeding Sessions of Parliament; and for other purposes in relation to Railways," *ordered* to be brought in by Lord NAAS, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Mr. HUNT.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 298.]

House adjourned at Three o'clock,
till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, August 5, 1867.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Barrack Lane, Windsor (Rights of Way).

PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading*—Militia Pay*; Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* (295); Factory Acts Extension* (296); Guarantee of Government Officers* (297).

Second Reading — Master and Servant (248); Weights and Measures (Dublin)* (266); Dublin Metropolitan Police* (267); District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland)* (272).

Committee — Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) (254 & 294); Galashiels Jurisdiction* (260); Royal Military Canal* (269); Canongate Annuity Tax (Edinburgh)* (264); Customs Duties (Isle of Man)* (270).

Report—Representation of the People (282 & 293); Galashiels Jurisdiction* (260); Royal Military Canal* (269); Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication)* (278); Canongate Annuity Tax (Edinburgh)* (264); Customs Duties (Isle of Man)* (270); Agricultural Gangs* (283).

Third Reading—Railway Companies* (276); Railway Companies (Scotland)* (277).

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—(No. 282.)—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs).

EARL RUSSELL moved an Amendment of which he had given notice—namely, to insert £10 in lieu of £15 as the qualification for the lodger franchise. The noble Earl said, that in the greater part of the towns of this country artizans, even of the poorest class, were the occupiers of dwelling-houses; but in London that was not the case; there the greater portion of the artizans lived in lodgings; and the object therefore was to fix upon such an amount of value to entitle the lodger to the franchise as should not exclude in London those of the working classes who were admitted in every other town in the country. As he was informed the amount of rent commonly paid by the artizans in London was about £10 or £12 a year; and therefore to fix upon a clear yearly value of £15 would have the effect of excluding the working men from the franchise, and of giving it to an entirely different class of persons. Such a proceeding appeared to him to be not only a very unjust and impolitic proceeding, but one that was wholly inconsistent with the agreement come to on that subject in the House of Commons. He had a copy of the Bill as it came from the other House; and there the amount stated was not £15 but £10; and, as he understood, there was no dispute on the question between the different sides of the other House, but the limit of £10 was generally agreed to. Their Lordships could hardly expect their Amendment to stand. There were, he believed, no better or more skilled class of workmen than those of London on the face of the globe; and it was impossible, if those workmen were shut out from the franchise, as they would be should the limit of £15 be insisted upon, that that could be a final settlement of the question. The workmen of London would naturally feel themselves injured by that provision of the Bill, and agitation would not cease until the decision lately arrived at by the House of Commons on that subject had become law.

Amendment *moved*, in line 12, to leave out the word "Fifteen" and insert "Ten" in lieu thereof.—(*The Earl Russell.*)

THE EARL OF DERBY: It may be in the recollection of your Lordships that this question of the lodger franchise is one which was not long ago regarded as not being of any very great importance; and even now it is doubtful whether it would not have very little effect except in the metropolis; but in the metropolis it would operate with considerable effect in respect of the number of voters. As your Lordships are aware, I was not in the House when the Amendment was moved the other night on this subject, and was carried by a majority. At the same time, I must take upon myself the full responsibility of having concurred in raising the amount from

£10 to £15, provided there was a general agreement among your Lordships on the matter. The misfortune of the position in which we are placed is that we have no reliable statistics on the subject. The question of the lodger franchise was first originated in 1859, when the Government of which I was a Member introduced a proposition fixing the amount at £20 a year; and I must fairly say that the object of fixing the amount at £20 was to introduce a class of lodgers not lower than the £10 householders. The Bill of 1859 was based on what is called a laternal extension of the franchise; and it was supposed that by proposing a £20 lodger franchise we should admit to the register a considerable number of persons of great respectability and of considerable means, and thus add to the constituency without, at the same time, introducing voters of a lower level than the £10 householders. But Parliament having thought fit—and I do not complain of it—considerably to reduce the occupation franchise, it is therefore very fair to take into consideration at what amount the lodger franchise ought to be fixed, so as to make it equivalent to the rating household franchise. Your Lordships will bear in mind that with regard to the lodger there is this additional security—namely, that the term of occupation required from the lodger is considerable, and must be an occupation, not of different, but of the same, lodgings; now, the lowest class of lodgers and those occupying the poorest kind of lodgings are most likely to be persons of a migratory character, and not those who remain in the same lodgings for a year, or who would be likely to put forward their claim from year to year. Consequently, a considerable reduction in the amount fixed upon for the lodger franchise would not be likely to operate very largely upon the numbers who would practically come upon the register. I have taken some trouble to get at the comparative numbers who would be admitted at £10 and at £15 respectively, but I have not been very successful; nor do I believe that any great means exist for obtaining the comparative numbers. But your Lordships will observe that the question is not one of the rent paid, but of the clear yearly value of the lodgings if let unfurnished; and that makes a considerable addition to the amount of the rent as a whole, inasmuch as it adds to the rent actually paid, among other items, the amount set aside for rates, supposing the premises to be separately rated. Probably £15 of clear yearly value would represent a rent of £18, and £10 clear yearly value a rent of £13. This is, as nearly as I can make out, the probable proportion. I think that when your Lordships had the question under consideration the other day, it was not clearly brought to your notice how the question had been discussed in the House of Commons. The question was discussed in the House of Commons, in the first instance, when the proposition made was that a £10 rental should be adopted. An Amendment was moved to introduce a £15 rental instead of a £10 rental; and after discussion it was agreed, as a compromise between £10 and £15 rental, not to adopt the principle of rental, but that of clear yearly value. On that understanding I believe the House of Commons, without a division, adopted a £10 clear yearly value. I was not in this House the other day; but I do not think that point was brought clearly under your Lordships' attention; and it certainly does make a considerable difference in our estimate of this matter. I believe it is generally calculated that one-sixth of the earnings of the labouring man goes in the shape of rent; and, taking that into consideration, a rent of £13, which is supposed to be equivalent to a clear yearly value of £10, would represent an income of the occupier of 33*s.* per week; whereas £15 of clear yearly value, or about £18 rent, would not include any person who receives a less amount of weekly wages than 40*s.* Therefore, subject to the restrictions imposed by this franchise—namely, the obligation to remain in the same lodgings for the whole period of twelve months, and to make a claim year by year before the revising barrister, I think if we adopt a qualification as a minimum, introducing a class of workmen constantly earning 33*s.* per week, it cannot be said that even in the metropolis such a qualification would introduce any dangerous class. Considering, however, that the House of Commons have come to an understanding upon the question; considering that a great deal of feeling may be raised on the part of the working men in London, and not of London alone, but of other populous towns; and, considering that practically the difference between £10 and £15—more particularly if you take the clear yearly value and not the actual rent—is comparatively small—taking all these circumstances into consideration, I think your Lordships will do well to re-consider the vote at which you arrived the other night; and although, for my own part, I should be satisfied with either one or the other, I should humbly advise your Lordships on this question not to raise a question of difference with the House of Commons which it may be possible to avoid, and not to send down this Bill with a second division in favour of a higher rate, possibly to be overruled by the House of Commons; but rather to consider whether it is of importance to maintain this slight difference, or whether it would not conduce to a more satisfactory arrangement of the whole question if the Amendment of the noble Earl were accepted by your Lordships, and not to insist upon the Amendment introduced by your Lordships.

Viscount HARDINGE thought the noble Earl had exercised a wise discretion in giving way on this point. He could not help saying on this occasion that he entertained the same gloomy forebodings that had been expressed by several noble Lords who had taken part in the debate. A noble Earl below him had said that the Bill would prove either a bed of roses or a bed of thorns. He thought it much more likely to prove the latter. Now that every security for so extended a suffrage had been swept away, with the exception of the personal payment of rates, it was impossible to calculate with any certainty upon the effects of the measure. In ordinary times the change might not be prejudicially felt; but circumstances might arise under which one class would be pitted against another, and he feared that the preponderance of numbers enfranchised by this Bill would swamp the existing constituencies as regarded property and intelligence; but, with respect to the lodger franchise, he thought the Government were most wise in not insisting on the £15 qualification. The noble Earl opposite (The Earl of Shaftesbury), in the debate on the lodger franchise, had told their Lordships very clearly that however low it was—and it was extremely low—it would let in a large number of artizans not very well qualified to exercise the franchise; but he had also explained very clearly that if this lodger franchise were raised to £15 there would be so much hubbub and agitation in the country as possibly to lead to very serious consequences. They had heard a good deal of the "give and take" principle, and it was never more needed than in regard to the present Bill. Important Amendments had been carried by considerable majorities in their Lordships' House, and he should very much regret if their principal Amendments should be in danger of being rejected by the House of Commons in consequence of any feeling of irritation produced by the raising of the lodger franchise. Their Lordships had heard a good deal of the "Conservative residuum," in which he had no very implicit belief; but he would ask those who the other night raised the lodger franchise from £10 to £15, why they should fear a £10 lodger franchise if they had so much confidence in this Conservative residuum? Much as he disliked the provisions of this Bill generally, and dangerous as he thought they were, the time had arrived when both sides of the House were called upon to do all they could to pass this Bill through both Houses.

Lord CAIRNS: As I believe the proposal was made by myself that your Lordships should raise the figure of the lodger franchise, I should wish to trouble you with a few words before the question is put. There can be no greater mistake so far as I am concerned, and as far as many of your Lordships are concerned, than to suppose that the object of raising the lodger franchise to £15 was to render secure and innocuous a measure which would otherwise have been dangerous. I took the liberty of stating, when I made the proposal, that, so far as I knew, the question of the figure had really not met with any consideration in the other House of Parliament—that it had never been debated—that it had been adopted somewhat hastily and at random—and that it appeared to me that it would be a safe and wise rule to consider what would be the weekly rental represented by the figure at which you placed the franchise; and that what you wanted, whatever the figure you adopted, was, that the possessor of the franchise should be a man who would exercise his privilege with independence and advantage to the State. I pointed out that 5*s.* a week would amount to £13 a year, and that the sum of £10 would fall below that amount; and we could hardly expect that in large towns, or in the metropolis, artizans of skill and independence living in lodgings would pay a less rent than £13 a year. I believe that in these matters a rough estimate is taken that the rent paid by the artizan is generally about one-sixth of his wages; and if you take a weekly rent of 5*s.* that will give

30*s.* a week wages; and I think that an artizan receiving that amount of wages may fairly be thought entitled to the franchise. I say, for my own part, that I should still be perfectly satisfied with a lodger franchise of £15, and I believe that by that means you would secure a very large number of voters in the metropolis very well calculated to exercise the franchise with advantage; but since this subject was last under discussion I have heard what I did not then know—namely, what was the actual course of proceeding in the other House of Parliament. I was under the impression that there had been no discussion, no arrangement, and no compromise in the matter in the House of Commons. I now find—and the error was a not unnatural one, because these matters appear to have been transacted without much public discussion—that the lodger clause, which was, in the first instance, introduced by a private Member on the Opposition side (Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens), proposed that the franchise should be taken at a rental of £10. Thereupon a rival proposition was made by an independent Member on the Government side that the rental should be fixed at £15, and after some private negotiation a compromise was made, taking £10 as the figure; but, in place of rental, substituting the clear annual value, bringing up the franchise practically to a rental of £12 or £13. Now, although we are not bound by any compromise or arrangement of that kind, yet, speaking for myself, I would say that after a franchise of this kind has been the subject of arrangement in the other House, and after an influential Member of the Conservative party has expressed himself satisfied with a clear annual value of £10, I should be unwilling to re-open the question for the purpose of introducing a change to which, under the circumstances, we could hardly expect the House of Commons to assent. As far as I am concerned, therefore, I should be quite willing that this question should be re-considered; and if it should appear to your Lordships that the clear yearly value of £10 is a sufficient qualification for the franchise, I certainly shall be very willing to concur in a vote of that kind.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, he thought that their Lordships had done exceedingly well in assenting to this concession. The real security of the franchise did not rest on the difference between 30*s.* and 33*s.* a week wages. Much better security would be found in enforcing the provision that every one should be disqualified from voting who had received parochial relief within twelve months previous.

Motion *agreed to*; the word "Fifteen" struck out, and "Ten" inserted.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he had an Amendment to suggest on this subject of a smaller scope than one which their Lordships might possibly be ready to adopt. He believed that the Amendment introduced into the Bill on the Motion of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) was disagreeable not only to the city of Oxford and the borough of Cambridge, but also to the authorities of the University. Petitions had been presented from Oxford city and Cambridge borough against the admission of the undergratuates to the constituencies, and his information was that the authorities of the University of Oxford were also strongly opposed to the Amendment carried the other night. Undergraduates were subject to restraints such as were not imposed upon other classes, and a common punishment was rustication. Now, if the Head of a College rusticated a number of undergraduates just before an election, he might be open to the imputation of wishing to prevent their voting on a particular side; and the same imputation might be cast upon Proctors if, on the morning of an election, they ordered undergraduates to keep within their Colleges. He did not believe any advantage would be gained by either party from academic votes, for the number of resident undergraduates above twenty-one years of age was very small; and if they voted on one side all the *esprit de corps* of the townspeople would be thereby enlisted in favour of the other party. Another consideration was this—the Heads of Houses had very creditably abstained from bringing any influence to bear upon town elections; but the same reticence could hardly be expected from young men in *statu pupillari*, who might bestow custom upon tradesmen or take it away, according as they voted for or against the candidate who possessed their sympathies. He hoped the noble Earl at the head of the Government had made inquiries, as Chancellor of Oxford University, as to how this matter was viewed by its leading members.

Amendment *moved,* at end of clause, to add the words—

"But nothing in this Act contained shall apply to any Members of the Universities of Oxford and

Cambridge not having taken a degree, and living in any College or Hall, so as to enable them to vote for any Members for the City of Oxford and Town of Cambridge."—(*The Earl Granville.*)

LORD CAMOYS said, the citizens of Oxford were exceedingly jealous of academic interference in their elections. It was apprehended that difficulties would arise if rusticated undergraduates came over to vote at an election, and that the participation of members of the University in local contests would lead to "town and gown" rows. He hoped their Lordships would accede to the Amendment.

THE EARL OF POWIS said, this question seemed to have evoked almost as much interest as that of the compound-householder. He could not see why the Proviso, if adopted at all, should be confined to undergraduates living in Colleges. An undergraduate of full age could be registered for any borough or county in respect of any qualification he possessed; and why was he less likely to exercise the franchise with discretion at Oxford or Cambridge? He did not believe that this had been looked upon in the Universities as a party question; but it had apparently been so viewed in some quarters, it being supposed, perhaps, that the majority of such electors would vote on a particular side. The University authorities would not think of interfering with rusticated members who came up for the purpose of voting; and, as the number of these electors would necessarily be very small, for very few undergraduates of full age resided in colleges, he did not believe that breaches of the peace would be thereby created. He would appeal to the noble Earl opposite whether, considering the small numbers to which the clause would apply, it would be worth while to create in their case a special disfranchisement.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, that he had been asked the other evening by the noble Earl (Earl Granville) whether he would not communicate with some of those in Oxford in whom he had confidence in order to ascertain, as far as possible, the feeling of the University on this subject. He had not neglected the request of the noble Earl, and he held in his hand the answer which he had received from one of the oldest and most respected of the Heads of Colleges, the President of St. John's College, Dr. Wynter. With respect to the lodger franchise in relation to the University, Dr. Wynter stated that its effect would be "so small as to be scarcely worth consideration;" and with regard to the general question of conferring the right of voting on the members of the University, he said, "there is no doubt a considerable difference of opinion, but the balance of opinion, as I think, is decidedly in favour of it, and I am satisfied that none of the arguments brought forward against it have any real weight or value." The Motion of the noble Earl was limited to the case of undergraduates having rooms in college, and therefore the noble Earl was ready to admit that other persons occupying rooms in college ought to have a vote for the town. Now, he would like to know how many undergraduates there were occupying rooms in college who had occupied the same rooms for twelve months and who were of the age of twenty-one? The number was absolutely infinitesimal. And on what principle could the noble Earl propose to exclude persons living in colleges while he would allow those to vote who had lodgings in the town? But if the noble Earl would exclude both the one and the other, then some special provisions must be introduced with regard to those who lodged in the towns; the noble Earl, however, made no proposition of that kind. He believed there was considerable jealousy on the part of the town in regard to the interference of the members of the University in their elections; but he did not see why any member of an enlightened body should be deprived of his electoral rights. He was decidedly of opinion that the addition of the resident members of the University and of the small body of undergraduates to the general body of the town constituency would be a very great improvement, and he, therefore, trusted their Lordships would reject the Amendment.

LORD CRANWORTH was of opinion that neither at Oxford nor Cambridge was it desirable that the members of the Universities should have anything to do with the town elections. He disclaimed any party view whatever in reference to this matter, he had not the slightest idea how it would work; but of this he was sure, that the allowance of this franchise would create the greatest heart-burnings in Oxford and Cambridge, and if, in a contested election, the members of the University turned the scale it would not be forgotten until next election. The noble Earl laid great stress upon the fact that the number to be enfranchised would be so few that the clause would be virtually inoperative; but the general principle was the same. So far from the University and the town having any interest in common, the feeling between both was entirely antagonistic, and there was hardly any one in the University that associated habitually with any one in the town. The general principle of the University was that of an *imperium in imperio ;* the Universities had elections of their own, and if they gave them a vote in the town elections also, they might depend upon it they would be said to have given them a dual vote — a thing that had been condemned on a previous stage of the Bill in "another place." It would be a very difficult thing to say that this was not a dual vote. At all events it would be sure to create a degree of heartburning between University and town. which, above all things, was to be avoided,

EARL GRANVILLE said, he had limited his Amendment to undergraduates residing in College in the hope that it would have received the assent of the noble Earl ; but he would prefer altering the words which he had suggested so as to make them apply to all undergraduates.

THE EARL OF DERBY : Would the noble Earl debar any member of the University of London from voting at town elections ?

EARL GRANVILLE said that the University of London was a most excellent institution, but it did not pretend to exercise any sort of academical discipline over the persons who belonged to it, but merely gave degrees after a very stringent examination. It was therefore very differently constituted from the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, which had bodies of officers for the purpose of preserving discipline.

The Motion having been altered as follows :—

> " But nothing in this Act contained shall apply to any Members of the University of Oxford or Cambridge in *statu pupillari*, so as to enable them to vote for any Members for the City of Oxford or Town of Cambridge,"

the Question was put and *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Clause 5* (Occupation Franchise in Counties).

LORD CAMPBELL, in rising according to Notice, to move that the words ("worth the Rent of Twenty Pounds or upwards by the year,") be substituted for ("of the rateable value of Twelve Pounds or upwards,") said : My Lords, if an apology is requisite for raising the important question of the county franchise at this stage, it will be found, I hope, in the circumstance that the clause passed the Committee at a very late hour of the night, just after a division, when noble Lords had scarcely got back into their places, and that it escaped me as most likely it did the House at large, in the confusion which occurs at such a moment. My Lords, it will not be denied that if there is one point on which rather than another the public is entitled to genuine and calm deliberation from your Lordships it is the limit of the occupation franchise in the counties ; and as regards that point there is nothing to control the freedom of the Legislature. Agitation and excitement do not bear upon it. The Parliamentary majority is not based upon the counties, and it is not therefore in that quarter that the democratic party look for the ascendancy they aim at. The House of Commons have not either come to any settled resolution on this question. This year a £20 rental limit has not been rejected, and last year a £12 rating limit had not been adopted. Nor has any league, as yet, inscribed the latter on its banners. It does not represent the judgment of the late Government, and it does not represent the judgment of the present one ; since both deliberately offered other propositions. It comes from no political authority whatever, and perhaps there are not many persons in the House who would be able to explain the circumstances under which it fell into the Bill before us. The *locus standi* of the limit I propose to substitute is a very different one. Originality is not, indeed, the merit which it claims. It has been sanctioned by a longer series of well-known politicans than any single change in the Reform Act you can mention. In 1851 the late Mr. Nassau Senior, one of the most enlightened thinkers who ever influenced the counsels of a party, wrote a letter, which I have in my possession, on the whole subject of Reform, in which he pointed out that although it might not be good policy to extend the Chandos Clause at all, if it was extended £20 would be the proper limit. In 1852, the Prime Minister of that time (Lord John Russell) gave effect in his Bill to the view which Mr. Senior had arrived at. At a later period Lord Palmerston, just before the General Election of 1857, went out of his way to declare in Parliament that £20 ought to be the limit chosen. In the General Election of 1865, Mr. Walter, while candidate for Berkshire, took the opportunity of intimating his opinion that such a change in the Reform Act was desirable. Last year the proposition was maintained by Mr. Spencer Walpole; and in the present year it has had the shelter of the Government who introduced it in their first deliberate proposal. During a range of more than fifteen years rival parties have endorsed, and unconnected individuals have united in approving it. My Lords, I will first state as rapidly as I am able the points in which a £20 rental and a £12 rating limit seem to be contrasted. A £20 rental would include the whole body of those who pay the house tax and rather go beyond it, because the tax falls on houses worth £20 a year, and the county franchise would be given to those whose lands and tenements together came to such a value. The £12 rating has not a shadow of coincidence with any institution which we have or any natural division of society. The latter, therefore, could not be maintained, the former might be easily defended. A £20 rental leaves the 40*s.* freeholders of England and Wales in a majority; the £12 rating flings them into a minority. This point I have fully ascertained by the statistics of last year, which every noble Lord is able to refer to. A £20 rental is likely to uphold the purity for which counties are distinguished, unless the twelve-pounder is very different from the ten-pounder; under the clause as it now stands, the counties will partake the reproach which has fallen on so many of the boroughs. The point of contrast which must, I think, be more seriously weighed by this House than any other is, that the limit I propose has, at least, a prospect of stability, and that the limit in the Bill will soon be swept away. It is not only because one connects itself with the incidence and operation of the house tax, while the other is as arbitrary as fantastic—capricious as any point you could select; but, because, according to a well-established law, the lower franchise is more difficult to guard against encroachment than the higher one. The more poverty you bring upon the register—and I shall not be thought to speak of poverty in order to disparage it—the more desire of organic change you have among electors who are able to bring their power to bear upon the Legislature. The law has been conspicuously exemplified against the £10 borough limit; since it was created there has been a certain agitation of which we now observe the unrestricted triumph. You could not point to a public meeting which has ever happened in an unrepresented town—where of course the grievance would be felt—to bring down the Chandos Clause to those it does not reach at present. My Lords, let it not be thought that I wish it to remain unaltered. With Mr. Senior I have always held that £20 would be the proper limitation; I refer to an admitted truth by way of showing that the clause ought to be amended in this way if duration is the object. No doubt there are cases in which objects of a different nature are pursued, as in the question of to-night on lodgers, in which your Lordships resolved to give up the higher and to adopt the lower limit in order to extend votes to a certain class in the metropolis; but in settling the county franchise you have no peculiar end except stability to look to.

I should wish to say a word as regards the effect of a £12 rating limit merely in the counties. To say nothing of venality, it adds thousands of occupying voters nearly everywhere, as we may see by looking at the columns of last Session. The legal outlay of the candidate will be extended to a very great degree. It is well known to your Lordships how far it is politic or how far desirable to add to it. The result must, I think, be, either that proprietors belonging to the counties justly fearing the expenditure will not be able to come forward, or that in the course of time their fortunes may be injured and non-residence occur, where residence has been so fertile of advantages. As regards cities, if the instability, which may fairly be anticipated in a limit so unauthorized, brings down the county to the level of the borough franchise, electoral divisions would be the natural development; and in the choice of representatives by such a system cities merge their separate existence. The question for the whole Empire is simply whether or not counties as well as boroughs should fall to the numerical majority; the question is too great to be encountered at this moment. But when a series of distinguished men and leading politicians have pointed out the course to be adopted, should the county franchise have to be enlarged, when nothing has occurred to change the wisdom of their counsel; when no other limit recommends itself except that which they have urged upon us; when no necessity of any kind debars you from adopting it; when it gives the very thing we want the reason for a preference, is it consistent with the ordinary prudence which ought to govern states to reject that path now, and at the same time to lose the future power of adopting it? Would it not be worth while, at least to ascertain, how far it is the true one? You can always quit but you can only now embrace it. If a £20 limit succeeds we may uphold, and if it fails we may reduce it. As regards the £12 limit, if it has the bad results which are anticipated you cannot hope to raise it; and even if it works well it is not likely to be permanent. I fear no answer, my Lords, to these considerations. If they do not prevail tonight it will be from a mode of feeling which cannot be encountered in debate or satisfied by argument. It is clear from what has passed before that the Bill is not regarded with any great degree of hope or exultation by your Lordships. It is seen that in boroughs, if the new rights are practically exercised, that transfer of power will arise which in this House and out of it has been so powerfully deprecated; and a reluctance is in consequence engendered to avert a risk, to vindicate a policy in counties, or to withhold the remnant of our system from a force by which the greater part is likely to be mastered. On this dangerous principle of lassitude, despondency, faint-heartedness, every retreat would be a rout, and every battle lost a capital abandoned. The man whom it controls, because his house was burning to the ground, would refuse to give directions for the safety of his furniture, his library, or children; and, if his property was gone, would not consent to move a step to rescue his existence. On such a principle alone, your Lordships will be able, because the boroughs have been drawn into a region you do not view as safe, by your own inaction, to permit the counties to be swept into the vortex. The House, I know, of course, will be determined, not by what they hear from me, but by what falls from the customary Leaders on this side and on the other. If the noble Earl, the head of the late Government has not lost all respect for his own convictions and engagements, he will sanction the Amendment I propose. He has never ceased to dwell on the position that to carry the Chandos Clause beyond a certain limit would bring humiliation on the freeholders, and so involve a peril to the State; and he cannot but know that a £12 limit will put an end to the ascendancy of freeholders in counties. It is on this account that the Amendment I have offered, instead of bringing obloquy upon the House, would give it higher claims on the affection of the people. As regards the noble Earl the First Lord of the Treasury, it would be absurd to recommend to his approval the proposition which in February he offered. He can resist it only on the ground which he is not prepared to take—namely, that no Amendment of the franchise should be permitted to your Lordships. There is not any reason to ascribe to the other House of Parliament tenacity of so unauthorized and so impolitic a limit as that which I have ventured to impugn; but even if there was, I utterly deny that your Lordships ought to be determined by the prospect of it. The House of Commons ought to have, at least, the option of accepting the proper limit, or refusing it. In that case — even if the clause as it stands should finally prevail, if after overpowering the freeholders it brings a train of outlay, of impurity, of agitation on the counties; if after that it gives to the numerical majority command of every place in which a representative is chosen, descending as a fatal blot on the institutions of the country, it will not sully, as it falls, the credit of your Lordships.

Amendment *moved,* in line 9, to omit the words "the rateable value of Twelve Pounds or upwards," and insert "worth the rent of Twenty Pounds or upwards by the year."—(*The Lord Stratheden.*)

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH said, their Lordships had determined to throw no obstacle in the way of the speedy passing of this measure, and they had already given a proof of that determination by reversing the vote at which they had arrived on a previous evening. The noble Lord had appealed to the Government to accept his Amendment on the ground that they had proposed the value of £20 on a previous occasion. But he would remind the noble Lord that the limit proposed by the Government was originally £15, and that its reduction to £12 was unanimously concurred in by both sides of the House. Not only, therefore, could not the Government concur in the Amendment proposed by the noble Lord, but the Amendment would certainly in any case be rejected by the other House.

Lord CAMPBELL said, it might not be a reproach to the noble Duke that he had not yet acquired the history of the Session but when he did so he would find that £20 was the original proposal of the

Government in the first Bill they introduced, although it had not been adhered to.

Amendment *negatived*.

Clause 17 (Certain Boroughs to return Three Members).

THE EARL OF HARROWBY begged to move the Amendment of which he had given notice, the effect of which would be that instead of forming Chelsea and Kensington into a new borough to return two Members, those districts with Fulham and Hammersmith, should be added to Westminster, which should hereafter return three Members, and a third Member would be given to Marylebone. Their Lordships on the Motion of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) had decided by a very large majority on giving to the minorities in some of the largest constituencies a chance of securing representation, although they had also determined by their vote the other evening not to go to the length contemplated by the Amendment of the noble Earl on the cross-Benches, (Earl Grey). The state of the metropolitan constituencies, however, deserved, in his opinion, some consideration at their Lordships' hands, and it seemed to him that as regarded at least Westminster and Marylebone a good case could be made out upon which the principle of giving minorities a share in the representation could be extended. In the City of London the minority could possibly elect one Member out of four; but the same opportunity was afforded to none of the other constituencies, although they were going to add to the representation of the metropolis. He would therefore suggest whether it would not be better instead of making Chelsea and Kensington a borough, and giving it two Members, to join them to Westminster, giving one additional Member to the latter city, and the other additional Member to the constituency of Marylebone, and extending to them the principle sanctioned in regard to the "three-cornered" constituencies. Marylebone contained already 473,000 inhabitants, and so narrow was the majority in this borough that no less than 200,000 of the inhabitants might be regarded as being totally unrepresented. He would ask was this fair? His proposal would have the effect of giving the minorities some chance of being represented, while the effect of giving as it was proposed to do, two Members to Chelsea would be to leave probably the two largest and most important communities in the world, composed of the minorities, as regarded superior education, position, and political intelligence, in Westminster and Marylebone, to all effects and purposes totally without representation. Westminster which at present had a population of 261,000 would with the addition that he proposed to make contain only 418,000 inhabitants—so that the number even then would be less than was at present the case in Marylebone, which possessed only two Members. He could not but think that the principle of which their Lordships had approved in respect of the boroughs of Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Leeds, deserved in some slight degree to be extended to the metropolis. He had not much hope of success, because he knew that their Lordships had been almost exhausted by the discussions on this Bill, and that they considered they had done the work of the Session. But he should not think he was discharging his duty if he did not, even with the view of entering a protest, bring under their notice the fact that the principle of a representation of minorities had not been extended to the metropolis.

An Amendment *moved* in page 7, line 8, after "Parliament," to insert—

"The Parishes of Chelsea, Kensington, Fulham and Hammersmith shall form part of the Borough of Westminster, and" also in line 9, after the second "of" to insert "Westminster and Marylebone."—(*The Earl of Harrowby.*)

THE EARL OF DERBY said, he objected to the Amendment on the ground that there was an ample constituency in the proposed new borough—it would contain a population of 173,000 persons. His noble Friend could not suppose that his proposition would be listened to for one moment by the House of Commons. He would not enter upon the general principle of the representation of minorities, to which their Lordships had given effect to a certain extent; but he confessed for himself that he should not like to see it carried much further. He hoped their Lordships would not consent to so material an alteration as that proposed by his noble Friend.

Amendment *negatived*.

Clause 29 (Power to vote by Voting Papers).

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he would now move the Regulations relating to voting papers, which he would ask their Lordships to insert at the end of Clause 29, THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he would read the Regulations *seriatim*. The first was—

"1. The Returning Officer of every County or Borough shall, on the Occasion of every Election, provide a Book or Books containing a sufficient Number of Voting Papers for the Use of the Voters at such Election:

EARL RUSSELL must say that the Regulations of which the noble Marquess had given notice did not reconcile him to the plan of voting papers. A strong objection to voting by ballot always had been that under such a system the voter would be exercising a great public trust in a manner which would keep from the knowledge of his fellow-constituents and of the public the way in which he voted. That objection appeared to him to tell with great force against the system of voting by voting papers. Then, an objection to open voting was that it exposed the voter to the revenge of his landlord, or of any other person who might have power to oppress him. That objection also appeared to him to apply to the plan of the noble Marquess; so that this latter system was open to the objection against the ballot, which he had always deemed to be very strong, and likewise to the objection against open voting. He could not conceive that such a plan would last long. When an election was going on, it was customary to publish returns very frequently throughout the day, showing the numbers polled for the respective candidates; but, under the voting paper system, a mass of papers unfolded at the last moment might show the candidate who had been supposed to be in a minority of 100 to be in reality at the head of the poll by double that number. He could not but think that there would be great public discontent at the system to which their Lordships had given their sanction.

THE EARL OF DERBY said, he would call the noble Earl's (Earl Russell's) attention to the fact that by Regulation No. 10, which would be proposed by his noble Friend (the Marquess of Salisbury), it was directed that the Returning Officer should, during the hours of polling, publicly open all voting papers transmitted to him, and read out from each voting paper the votes given for the candidates therein named.

Regulation *agreed to*, and *added* to the Clause.

"2. Each Voting Paper shall be attached to a Counterfoil bound up in the Book in which it is contained, and shall be in the Form numbered (1) in the Schedule (F.) to this Act annexed:

"3. On the Application of any Voter, in Writing under his own Hand, in the Form numbered (2) in the said Schedule (F.), transmitted by Post or otherwise, and received by the Returning Officer after the Issue of the Writ for the Election and before the Day of Polling, the Returning Officer shall, in manner herein-after mentioned, transmit to such Voter a Voting Paper:

"4. Previously to transmitting a Voting Paper to a Voter the Returning Officer shall enter the Name and Address of the Voter and his Number in the Register of Voters on the Voting Paper and also on the Counterfoil:

"5. On the Receipt of the Voting Paper the Voter shall enter therein the Name or Names of the Candidate or Candidates for whom he is entitled and intends to vote, and shall subscribe the Voting Paper with his own Name:

"6. The Entry of the Name or Names of the Candidate or Candidates as aforesaid and the Subscription by the Voter of his own Name shall be made in the Presence of a Justice of the Peace, who shall retain the Voting Paper, and cause it to be in manner herein-after mentioned transmitted without Delay to the Returning Officer:

"7. The Identity of the Voter with the Person named in the Voting Paper by the Returning Officer shall be attested, if the Voter is personally known to the Justice, by such Justice, or otherwise by some Person being a Householder and personally known to the Justice:

"8. The Transmission of a Voting Paper to a Voter by the Returning Officer, or to the Returning Officer by the Justice of the Peace, may be by Post, and if by Post shall be Post-free; but any other Mode of Transmission may be adopted, in the Case of the Returning Officer, upon the Application or with the Consent in Writing of the Voter, and in the Case of the Justice of the Peace, at his Discretion, if he think such other Mode more speedy than and equally secure as the Transmission by Post:

"9. The Returning Officer shall take proper Means for securing the prompt Delivery to him of Voting Papers, whether sent by Post or otherwise, and shall give Notice of the Poll Booth at which he will enter all Votes that are given by Voting Papers:

"10. The Returning Officer or his Deputy shall, during the Hours of polling on the Day of polling, publibly open at the Booth aforesaid all Voting Papers transmitted to him, and read out from each Voting Paper the Vote given for the Candidates therein named, and duly record such Vote in the Poll Book, and Votes so recorded shall be of the same Validity as if they had been given personally:

"11. The Returning Officer or his Deputy shall reject any Voting Paper that on Comparison with the Book of Counterfoils does not tally therewith, or which contains the Names of more Candidates than the Voter is entitled to vote for; but, except on the Grounds aforesaid, he shall not reject for Informality any Voting Paper that contains the Surname of any Candidate for whom the Voter is entitled to vote, and that purports to have been subscribed by the Voter with his own Name in the Presence of a Justice of the Peace;

"12. All Voting Papers the Votes in respect of which are recorded at the Election or which are rejected for the Reasons aforesaid shall be filed by the Returning Officer; and any Person shall be allowed to examine such Voting Papers, and take Copies thereof, on payment of a Fee not exceeding One Shilling:

"13. A Voter at an Election shall not be entitled to more than One Voting Paper; and when he has signed a Voting Paper in favour of any Candidate at any Election he shall not be entitled to vote personally at such Election:

"14. The Returning Officer shall, on the Occasion of an Election, give public Notice in some Newspaper circulating in the County or Borough within his Jurisdiction, and in such other Manner, if any, as he thinks fit, of the Manner in which Applications for Voting Papers are to be made, and of the Address to which such Applications are to be sent:

"15. No Person, except the Returning Officer, his Deputy or Clerks, shall be entitled to inspect the Counterfoils of Voting Papers before the Day of Polling, or to ask the Names of the Persons who have applied for Voting Papers; and it shall be the Duty of the Returning Officer, his Deputies and Clerks, to give no Information until the Day of Polling with respect to the Names of the Persons who have applied for Voting Papers."

"If any Person forges any Voting Paper, or attests or transmits any Voting Paper knowing it to be forged, he shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor.

"If any Person signs the Name of any other Person to an Application for a Voting Paper, he shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor.

"If any Person fraudulently defaces, destroys, withholds, or abstracts any Voting Paper, he shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor.

"If any Person wilfully delays the Transmission of a Voting Paper to the Returning Officer, with the Intent of preventing the Vote contained in such Voting Paper being recorded, and such Vote by means of such wilful Delay is not recorded, he shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor.

"If at any Election any Person who has signed a Voting Paper afterwards votes personally at the same Election, he shall be guilty of a Misdemeanor and his Vote shall be invalid.

"Instead of the Second Question authorized to be put to a Voter in pursuance of the Eighty-first Section of the Act of the Sixth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty, Chapter Eighteen, the following Question shall be substituted:

> "Have you already voted personally or by Voting Paper at this Election for [*describing the County, Borough, &c., for which the Election is held*]

and the said Section shall be construed as if the above Question were inserted therein in place of the said Second Question.

"All Expenses incurred by any Returning Officer in respect of Voting Papers under this Act, on the Occasion of any Election for a County or Borough, shall be deemed to be Expenses incurred in respect of Polls and Poll Clerks, and shall be defrayed accordingly."

These Regulations having been severally moved, and *agreed to,*

Clause, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Schedule F, containing the forms, &c., *agreed to.*

Clause 49 (Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the word "corruptly" had been struck out of the clause in Committee. As the clause originally stood it was rendered punishable as bribery for any candidate or other person, either directly or indirectly, to pay any rate on behalf of any voter for the purpose of enabling him to be registered as a voter. Now, at the time of the registration there were no candidates or voters. He should therefore propose to substitute the following words:—

"Any Person either directly or indirectly paying any Rate on behalf of any Ratepayer for the Purpose of enabling him to be registered as a Voter, thereby influencing his Vote at any future election."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*, and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 293.)

COURTS OF LAW OFFICERS (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 254.)

(*The Lord Chancellor*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

LORD CRANWORTH rose to move the insertion of a new clause. In England each Law Court appointed its own officers, and Lord Coke three centuries ago stated it to be one of the characteristic advantages of the English Courts of Law that the officers of the Courts were appointed by the heads of the Court, who were responsible for their conduct. In Ireland the practice was, and had been, different. Early in the reign of George IV. a revision took place in the Irish Courts, under which the Master of the Courts and one other officer were to be selected not by the heads of the Court, but by the Lord Lieutenant. That was an extraordinary provision, which would not have been tolerated for a moment in England. In the 7 & 8 *Vict.*, when Lord Lyndhurst was Chancellor, further inquiry was made, and a Bill was introduced regulating the Irish Courts. That Bill, which first passed through the other House, made no alteration in regard to the appointment of the Master and the other officer by the Crown. Lord Campbell, when the Bill reached their Lordships' House, pointed out the anomaly that the selection of these officers should be any other than a judicial selection. Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst entirely concurred, and a clause was introduced giving the appointment to the Chief Justices of the Courts. The House of Commons thought, however, that such a clause would rob the Castle of a certain degree of patronage which it ought to possess; but when the Bill came back to their Lordships' House, Lord Lyndhurst, to his great honour, adhered to the clause, and divided against the Government of which he was a Member. The Government, however, obtained a majority and the clause was struck out. A Royal Commission was not long since issued to inquire into the state of affairs in the different Courts of Common Law and Equity in this country and in Ireland; at the head of which was the late Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Mr. Blackburne. That Commission unanimously recommended that in Ireland, as in England, the appointment of chief officers to the Courts should be vested in the Judges of those Courts; but he was surprised to find that in this Bill, for no possible object except that of bestowing patronage on the Lord Lieutenant, it was proposed to continue the old system.

Moved after Clause 40 to insert the following Clause:—

"When and so often as any Vacancy happens in the Office of Master or Clerk of the Rules in any of the said Superior Courts of Common Law by the Death, Resignation, or Removal of the Person holding such Office, the Chief Justices of the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Common Pleas respectively as to Vacancies occurring in those Courts respectively, and the Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer as to Vacancies occurring in that Court, shall appoint some duly qualified Person to supply the Place of the Person so dying, resigning, or being removed."—(*The Lord Cranworth.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he found himself in the same position that Lord Lyndhurst occupied in 1844, in being compelled to support the Amendment of his noble and learned Friend. It was most unreasonable to vest in the Irish Government the appointment of these officers. The Bill professed to be founded on the Report of the Commissioners, and he could not conceive any reason for disregarding their recommendation in this respect. The present arrangement was one which ought never to have existed.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY also supported the clause. He could see no reason for vesting this patronage in the Irish Executive. It was more important, even in Ireland than in England, that these officers should have no connection with the political Government.

On Question? *agreed to.*

Clause inserted.

Clauses 41 and 42, as amended, *agreed to.*

LORD CAIRNS proposed an Amendment providing that the minor officers in each Court should be appointed by the Chief Judge thereof, instead of by the Judges in common. This proposal was consistent with the practice in England, and with the Report of the Commissioners, and it would avoid divided responsibility.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he entirely agreed in the propriety of the Amendment.

Other Amendments made.

The Report of the Amendments to be received *To-morrow;* and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 294.)

MASTER AND SERVANT BILL—(No. 248.)

(*The Earl of Lichfield.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that it was one which had a very important bearing on the relations between employers and employed in this country, and as such was deserving, and he was sure would receive, a very careful consideration from their Lordships. The main object of the Bill was to do away with certain inequalities which existed in the proceedings taken between master and servant on the one side and servant and master on the other. As the law at present stood, where a complaint was made by the master against the servant, either for neglect of work or misconduct, the case was treated as a criminal offence; whereas in a complaint of a servant against a master the case was treated only as a civil matter. The main principle of the Bill was directed to the removal of that distinction. But that was not the only point where the law was defective. Where a servant was complained of by his master either for neglect of work or misconduct, the usual course pursued was to take out a summons against him, but it was in the power of the master to get a warrant issued in the event of its being supposed that the servant was likely to abscond. Now the power of issuing a warrant worked at times very harshly, and if it had not been much complained of it was because, happily, it had not been frequently resorted to. In a case of wilful neglect or misconduct the only course left the magistrate was either to inflict the punishment of imprisonment, to order a deduction from the servant's wages—which in many cases was objectionable—or to discharge the servant from his employment, which could hardly be considered a punishment, because work generally was so easily obtained. But there was a still greater objection to the law as it stood, which was that, the proceeding being of a criminal nature, the man complained of could not be heard in his defence, whereas in the case of the servant against the master both parties were heard. Now the Bill provided that a summons should be taken out in the first instance, and it was only in the event of the servant not appearing that a warrant could be issued against him. The Bill further provided that all cases should be heard at Petty Sessions before two magistrates, and upon the hearing of the case the magistrates might require the servant to fulfil his contract, or might assess the injury which might be supposed to be inflicted by the servant's default, or where that would not meet the justice of the case might impose a fine not exceeding £20. The power of fine would remove a great part of the difficulty attending those cases in which the only question was between imprisonment, abatement of wages, or discharge. In an aggravated case imprisonment without fine might be inflicted. As far as the employers of labour were concerned, they had, on the whole, accepted the principle of the Bill, althought it would work a considerable alteration in their relations with those whom they employed. The Bill came up from the House of Commons under very favourable circumstances, so far as its principle was concerned. Mr. Cobbett, in 1865, moved for a Committee to inquire into the subject; but he lost his seat at the dissolution which took place that year, and in 1866 the Committee sat under Lord Elcho as Chairman. The Committee having reported, the noble Lord brought a Bill founded on the Report of the Committee under the notice of the Government. He was informed that the Government looked very favourably on the proposals of the Committee, and promised to give the measure a careful consideration, but declined to bring in a Bill on the subject. He could not help thinking that resolution on the part of the Government was very much to be regretted, because questions of that sort could scarcely be expected to be satisfactorily dealt with by a private Member; and he was confirmed in that opinion by finding that the Bill which he now asked to have read a second time was very defective in many of its details, and would require several alterations before it could be put to into such shape as to pass through a Committee of their Lordships' House. If their Lordships should read the Bill a second time and accept its principle they would do much to remove some of the ill-feeling which one could not help seeing had sprung up of late years between employers and employed in this country.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Lichfield.*)

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, he entirely agreed with the noble Earl that the subject dealt with by the Bill was one of great importance both to agricultural and manufacturing communities, and deserved their Lordships' serious attention, and his noble Friend had won credit for himself for the care he had bestowed on the subject. Her Majesty's Government entirely agreed with the noble Earl that the Bill should go through its present stage without opposition, but it certainly demanded considerable alteration in Committee. For example, considerable delay would take place, as the Bill now stood, before disputes could be settled, particularly in the agricultural districts, in some of which the Petty Sessions were not held oftener than once a month. If the dispute occurred five days before the sessions the summons could not be answered until after five weeks. He threw out this point for the consideration of the noble Earl, at the same time assuring him that the Government would be happy to assist him in making any Amendments in Committee.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD said, he had not been unmindful that such an objection might be raised, and there was some difficulty in meeting it. But it was rare that Petty Sessions were not held once a fortnight; and throughout the districts where the Bill was most likely to operate they were held once a week. The case, therefore, would very seldom arise, and the

Bill met the claims of justice in the great majority of cases.

LORD DENMAN thought that as every meeting of two magistrates formed a Petty Sessional meeting, and as notice was constantly given of meetings to try cases of summary jurisdiction, it would not be difficult to make opportunities for expediting the hearing of these cases.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM said, that cases of this description were just those which required adjudication as speedily as possible, and the delay which would often take place under the Bill would, therefore, be peculiarly undesirable.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the whole House on *Friday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before Nine o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, August 5, 1867.

MINUTES.]—NEW MEMBER SWORN—Edward Arthur Somerset, esquire, *for* Gloucester County.

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Greenwich Hospital [R.P.].

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Naval Knights of Windsor * [300].

Second Reading—Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation * [267]; Companies Act (1862) Amendment [221]; Railways (Ireland) * [298]; Consecration of Churches and Churchyards * [276].

Committee—Army Reserve * [148]; Militia Reserve * [149]; Merchant Shipping * [274]; County Courts Acts Amendment * [212] [R.P.]; Recovery of Certain Debts (Scotland) * (*re-comm.*) [220]; Trusts (Scotland) * (*re-comm.*) [266].

Report—Army Reserve * [148]; Militia Reserve * [149]; Merchant Shipping * [274 & 299]; Recovery of Certain Debts (Scotland) * (*re-comm.*) [220]; Trusts (Scotland) * (*re-comm.*) [266].

Considered as amended—Public Health (Scotland) * [284]; Turnpike Acts Continuance * [232]; Masters and Workmen * [77].

Third Reading—Factory Acts Extension * [236]; Masters and Workmen * [77]; Consecration and Ordination Fees * [256], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Courts of Law, &c. (Salaries and Expenses) * [285]; Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland) * (*re-comm.*) [268].

The Earl of Lichfield

NAVY—TWIN SCREW.—QUESTION.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, whether any Memorial has been received from Mr. George Gill, of Hounslow, claiming the invention of the twin or double screw plan of propulsion, together with other scientific and mechanical changes now in use in the Royal Navy; and if so, what answer has been returned to the said Memorial praying for acknowledgment of such alleged services?

MR. CORRY in reply said, numerous memorials from Mr. George Gill had been received by the Admiralty, and his proposals had been reported on ten times since the month of April, 1864. In the opinion of the late as well of the present Board of Admiralty Mr. Gill had no ground whatever for preferring any claim against the Government either for compensation or reward.

IRELAND—COLLEGE OF SCIENCE IN DUBLIN.—QUESTION.

MR. LEADER said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether Sir Robert Kane, the President of Queen's College, Cork, has accepted the office of permanent Head of the College of Science in Dublin; and, if so, whether the Government will now carry out the following recommendations of the Royal Commissioners on the Queen's Colleges:—

"We regard the non-residence of a President of a College as a serious bar to its well-being and progress; such an officer is pre-eminently required in the Queen's Colleges. To the reasons relied on by Sir Robert Kane as supporting his view of non-continuous residence we cannot for a moment give our consent. We therefore consider that residence should be a condition of holding the office of President, and residence in the sense that the College shall be the President's home?"

LORD NAAS said, in reply, that the College of Science which had lately been established in Dublin was not in any way under the control of the Irish Government, and they had, therefore, no cognizance of what was going on there. But he thought the best Answer he could give to the Question of his hon. Friend would be to read the following letter he had received that morning from Sir Robert Kane:—

"I have not as yet accepted the office of head of the New College of Science, nor has it yet been offered for my acceptance. I am now in charge provisionally of the Industrial Museum, doing the same duty as I have hitherto done, pending the completion of the new arrangements, as its director. I have been offered and accepted the honorary office of Chairman of the Council of Professors, which involves no new duties, and to which an honorarium, not a salary, of £100 a year is attached. This is an entirely distinct matter from the headship or presidency of the new College. Your Lordship is already fully aware of my entire willingness to be retired from Cork College if the office which I am proposed to fill in the new College of Science be rendered really that of administrative head and similar to that of President in the Queen's Colleges."

IRELAND—IMPORTATION OF SHEEP.

QUESTION.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the Irish Government are taking steps to remove the prohibitory restrictions upon the importation into Ireland of North Country Sheep, in accordance with the prayer of a Memorial recently addressed to the Chief Secretary by the Farmers and Stockmasters of Northumberland, setting forth the injury inflicted upon them by the continuance of this prohibition, which does not apply to Scotland?

Lord NAAS said, in reply, that the Government were considering whether it was advisable to extend the same permission which was given some months ago for the importation of Scotch sheep into Ireland to sheep from the Border Counties of England; and he hoped that in the course of a week an Order in Council would be issued for that purpose. For the present this permission would only be extended to Northumberland and Cumberland, and it would be necessary that sheep sent to Ireland from these counties should go from ports in the counties, or from Scotch ports.

CRETE—TREATMENT OF CHRISTIANS.

QUESTION.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to the statement which appeared in the public newspapers, that telegrams had been sent to their Governments by Foreign Consuls in Candia, that—

> "The Turks are massacring women and children; the Turkish authorities are neither able to subdue the insurrection nor to put a stop to these massacres; humanity demands the immediate suspension of hostilities or the transference of the Christians from Greece;"

and, whether he has received any such communication from Candia; if he has, what is its date, when did it reach his hands, and whether he has any objection to place it upon the table or to state its contents to the House?

Lord STANLEY replied, that his attention had been called to the telegram to which the hon. Gentleman referred. All the information they had received at the Foreign Office, except what he would refer to directly, was a despatch from the British Consul, dated the 21st of July, in which it was stated that no doubt massacres had been committed by the Turkish soldiers, especially by the Irregulars. The Consul did not, however, speak from personal knowledge, but only from what he had heard from other sources. On the other hand the Turkish Government entirely denied that any acts of cruelty on a large scale had been committed, and they declared that whenever such acts had been discovered they were severely punished by the military authorities. If he had any personal opinion on the subject, he should say he believed the Turkish authorities were really desirous to prevent such outrages, but they had comparatively little control over their irregular troops. Just before leaving the Office to come down to the House some fresh despatches arrived, which he had not had time to examine except in a very cursory way; but, so far as he could see, it appeared by them that there was very considerable suffering and distress among the inhabitants. With regard to the presentation of Papers, it would be better that they should all be laid on the table together, rather than extracts from a few. But as at present negotiations were still going on on the subject, their production would be premature.

IRELAND—SEA COAST FISHERIES.

QUESTION.

Mr. BLAKE said, he rose to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the Government will afford an opportunity during the present Session for the Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, as amended by the Select Committee, to be proceeded with; and, if not, whether he will undertake to say that a Bill will be introduced by the Government next Session to give effect to the recommendations contained in the Report of the Select Committee?

Lord NAAS, in reply, said, he thought it quite impossible at this time of the Session to proceed with so important a measure as the Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland) Bill; and he could not pledge the Government to introduce a Bill exactly in conformity with the recommendations of the Committee; but he could assure his hon. Friend that the subject would be carefully considered, and, if possible, they would legislate on it next Session.

THE SOCIETY OF ENGINEERS.

QUESTION.

Mr. HUGHES said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is the fact that the Board of Trade has reported against the granting of a Royal Charter of Incorporation to "The Society of Engineers;" and, if so, on what grounds has the Board of Trade so reported?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, the Board of Trade had not reported against the granting of a Charter, but—

> "That it was not expedient that the Society of Engineers should be incorporated by a Charter granted by Her Majesty under a designation so closely resembling that of the Institution of Civil Engineers."

He believed that there had been of late years, at any rate, no instance of a Royal Charter having been granted to more than one institution associated for the same objects in the same town, under names closely resembling each other. It was indeed manifest that such a practice would be highly inconvenient, and might lead to great confusion and misapprehension. He ought, perhaps, to add that this system of giving Royal Charters to private associations had long been felt to be extremely questionable, and that one of the objects of the Companies Act of 1862 was to substitute a general law for an exceptional privilege.

IRELAND—CASE OF RICHARD JENNINGS.—QUESTION.

Mr. BRADY said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Why the Government did not prosecute constable Richard Jennings, against whom informations were sworn by six persons charging him with endeavouring to dissuade Hugh M'Carten from giving evidence on the trial of Francis Cannon, who was charged, on the evidence of the said constable, with an indictable misdemeanour at the last Spring Assizes for the county of Leitrim, and acquitted by the Jury, who stopped the case with the sanction of the Judge; and whether Jennings is to continue in the Police Force, and whether it is advisable that, under existing circumstances, his father should continue to do duty in the Police Force of the county of Leitrim?

Lord NAAS, in reply, said, he would state briefly the facts of the case. On the 14th of August an outrage was committed near Moville, in the county Leitrim, by the maiming of a number of cattle belonging to different persons, the tails of such cattle having been cut off. Sub-constable Jenning stated to his superior officer he had reason to believe that this outrage had been perpetrated by a man named Cannon. A search was accordingly made in Cannon's house, and it was alleged that the number of cows' tails had been discovered in a loft of the said house, and the result was that Cannon was indicted for the offence, and subsequently tried and acquitted. The case was submitted to the Law Officer of the Crown, who decided that there was not sufficient evidence in his opinion against the sub-constable Jennings to put him on his trial for perjury; but it was competent for Canning's friends, who were persons of sufficient means, to institute such proceedings if they thought fit. They, however, declined to do so, and on the termination of the Assizes the Inspector General of the Constabulary had no other course to take but to restore Jennings to his former position, which he had since done.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir, as the time now approaches when it is probable the Reform Bill will be returned to us, it may be for the convenience of the House that I should ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he is prepared to state what course Her Majesty's Government propose to take with regard to the various Amendments which have been introduced into the Bill by the House of Lords?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I do not exactly understand the Question of the right hon. Gentleman. We have as yet received no official information as to what the other House determined upon with respect to this Bill. I apprehend that it will first of all be necessary for the Amendments upon the Bill made in the other House to be printed and placed in the hands of hon. Members, and then that I should give notice of the day on which they are to be considered. I believe that to be the usual course pursued under such circumstances. I do not know of any other. I do not see how I can inform the House before we come to consider the Lords' Amendments what course Her Majesty's Government intend to pursue with regard to this Bill. I shall follow the precedents we have to guide us in the matter.

Mr. GLADSTONE: My Question merely went to this extent—that as time was now pressing, and as the matter would have to be fully discussed, it would be convenient if the right hon. Gentleman would give us the earliest notice, without waiting for the printing of the Amendments, as to the course which the Government intend to take with regard to the principal Amendments introduced by the House of Lords into the Bill. I do not wish to press for an Answer immediately; but I have no doubt the right hon. Gentleman will endeavour to accommodate the House as far as possible by giving an Answer to the Question I have put to him.

PUBLIC BUSINESS.

Resolved, "That this House will meet To-morrow, at Two of the clock, subject to the Resolutions of the 1st day of July last."

SUPPLY.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

GREENWICH HOSPITAL.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. SEELY rose to move that the cost of management of Greenwich Hospital was too great, and ought to be reduced. The complaint which he had to make against the cost of management for Greenwich Hospital was not a new one; but one which had been made continually, but without, so far as he could perceive, any remedy being applied to it. The Royal Commission which was appointed to inquire into this subject in 1859 issued their Report in 1860, in which they stated that the number of pensioners could be increased from 1,600 to 2,300, and the number of children in the schools from 800 to 1,050, with a decrease in the cost of management of £25,000. After that, Sir Richard Bromley, one of the ablest officials, was instructed by the Admiralty to inquire into the subject, and he confirmed the Report of the Royal Commission that the cost of management was far too great. In 1864 the Duke of Somerset issued a Memorandum, in which he also admitted that the cost of management was far too great, and stated that he thought it was capable of being reduced £20,000 per annum, which would be only a small portion of the saving that would be effected by the change he proposed. The Board of Admiralty afterwards brought in a Bill, which received the sanction of that House, whereby the Board of Admiralty were allowed to appropriate between £170,000 and £180,000 belonging to the institution to the purchase of annuities for retiring officers consequent on the proposed reduction in the cost of the management. And on the 19th of June, 1863, the hon. Baronet the Member for Wakefield (Sir John Hay), who was a member of the Royal Commission, said that a reduction in the expenditure of nearly £25,000 per annum could be easily arranged by not filling up vacancies when they occurred. No reduction in the expenditure, however, had been effected in proportion to the expectations that had been held out, and his opinion was that the expenses of management were more costly now than they were before any change was made. By the 47th section of the Act of 1865 for the better regulation of Greenwich Hospital, and for the better appropriation of the funds thereof, an annual audit of the accounts was directed by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests to be presented to Parliament within a certain time therein specified, but as yet that provision had not been complied with. No account of the expenditure, however, had been laid upon the table. The current expenses of Greenwich Hospital had been paid out of the Consolidated Fund since the Act of Parliament came into operation on the 1st of October, 1865, and he apprehended that since that date nearly £200,000 had been paid out of the Consolidated Fund on behalf of this institution. But not a single penny of that sum could be recovered by the Consolidated Fund out of the income of the Hospital until the Commissioners of Audit had certified that the money was due. Another result of neglecting to lay the accounts on the table of the House was that, unless that were done, there would be no check over the power, conferred on the Admiralty by the Act, of transferring sums from the capital account to the income account of the Hospital, or *vice versâ.* Then he should like to be informed whether anything had been done towards carrying into effect the clauses of the Act in regard to the sale of the advowsons. The mode of audit prescribed by the statute was quite unobjectionable, but the right hon. Gentleman stated some months ago, in reply to a question put by him, that the Admiralty had neglected to have the accounts audited in the way prescribed, and that it was intended to bring in a Bill immediately to alter that form of audit, but as yet they had seen nothing of it. If, however, they did not intend to bring in such a Bill, it was their duty to carry out the provisions of the present Act, and audit the accounts as therein prescribed. He was at a loss to understand what objections there could be to the mode of audit; for his part, he could not imagine a better one, and, therefore, he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it was still intended to introduce a measure; also, whether he would lay upon the table the Correspondence which had taken place on this subject between the Exchequer and Audit Department and the Board of Admiralty, between the Exchequer and Audit Department and the Treasury, and between the Treasury and the Admiralty; and whether he had taken Counsel's Opinion on the subject, and, if so, whether there would be any objection to lay such Opinion on the table of the House? He would now quote some statistics respecting Greenwich Hospital. When the Royal Commissioners made their Report the cost of the Establishment for managing the Hospital was £56,011 per annum, and they proposed that the number of pensioners should be increased to 2,300, and the number of boys to 1,050, and that, instead of spending £56,011 annually in these Establishment charges, they should be reduced to £31,972. At the present time, however, there were only 370 men in the Hospital, and 800 boys in the school, and nevertheless the Establishment charges amounted to £41,301, to which sum there ought to be added £5,833, being the amount of income which he calculated the Admiralty would have received if they had not spent £175,000 on the purchase of annuities for retiring officers. In 1864, the Establishment charges, exclusive of the cost of the establishment for the schools, was £34,690. The Duke of Somerset had stated in the other House that if the proposed reduction of the men from 1,600 to 600 were carried out—the old Establishment was really calculated for 2,642 men, but only 1,600 were in—the Establishment charges would be only £14,538. At present, however, with only 370 men in the Hospital, they amounted to no less than £23,172, which would be raised to £29,005, if the £5,833 interest for loss of income invested to purchase annuities for discontinued officers were taken into account. At the time of the change these Establishment charges, calculated for 2,642 men, came to £13 2*s.* 6*d.* per man; according to the noble Duke's estimate for 600 men, they should now have been £24 5*s.* per man; but taking the number of men in the Hospital at the present time at 370, the actual cost per head was £80, and it would be as much as £48 6*s.* 8*d.* per head even if there were 600 men in the Hospital. Then it should be borne in mind that in certain items considerable saving had been effected. For instance, the noble Duke had calculated that £21,900 would be required for clothes, provisions, money allowances, &c.; but, in consequence of the reduction in the number of the men, £16,000 had been found sufficient. Again, according to the noble Duke £5,000 was to be allotted for gratuities to widows, but only £1,000 had been required. Thus, in these two items, there had been a saving of £9,900, but of this sum no less than £8,364 had been absorbed in the extra cost of management over and above what the noble Duke had stated would be necessary. He now wished to point out that for the management of 370 men and 800 boys the Admiralty required 15 clerks, at a cost of £3,693 a year, of which there were at the Admiralty three clerks, at a charge of £960; three writers, at a charge of £274; and a messenger, with a salary of £33. Before the change only 15 clerks were employed, at a cost of £3,935 per annum, for 1,600 men then in and 800 boys, and the Royal Commissioners stated that, if the number of pensioners was increased to 2,300, and boys to 1,050, the number of clerks required would not be more than 10, at a cost of £2,620. There were at the present moment, therefore, five clerks more than the number which the Commissioners stated were necessary for conducting an Establishment of 2,300 men, and the excess cost in this item was £1,073. But the most extraordinary charge of all was £1,100 per annum for a Controller, who was a solicitor—and £358 was paid also for his clerk — and who was allowed to retain his private practice. With regard to the duties of the Controller, they were certainly very singular. They were numerous, but not very important, and they might easily be borne by other parties on the Establishment. For instance, "keeping an account of the revenues" might be done by the steward; "keeping a register" might be transferred to the clerk, Mr. Gray Stewart. He had nothing to say against Mr. Lethbury. He was a solicitor, and an upright man, one whom he would not hesitate to employ in his private affairs; but the question was whether he was wanted for this particular office, at a cost to the Hospital of £1,100. Another part of the Controller's duty was to inspect the property of the Hospital, and report on its condition; but the Admiralty had a Director of Works, and why could not he, or somebody subordinate to him, inspect the property and report? Another of his duties was to keep books, preserve letters, and visit, inspect, and report on all the estate. But what benefit could there be in a solicitor of so considerable a practice in London going into the country to inspect property? It was neither more nor less than a farce.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. Member; but I think it my duty to point out to him what is the rule of the House with regard to this matter of detail. The rule is that on going into Committee of Supply, you cannot discuss the particular items of Votes which are set down to be discussed in the Committee. I have had some conversation with the hon. Member upon this point, and was aware that he was proposing to himself a very difficult task in designing to speak generally of the management of Greenwich Hospital without entering into the details. When we go into Committee, as there is a Vote to be moved for the expenses of Greenwich Hospital, every one of these items with which the hon. Member has dealt will have to be submitted for discussion, and it will then be in accordance with order to pursue the discussion which has been, as far as I have observed, continued irregularly up to the present time. It is my duty, therefore, to state that the course which the hon. Member has pursued is contrary to the rule of the House.

Mr. SEELY said, of course he must bow to the decision of the Chair, but he presumed that he could discuss the items of last year's Estimates in relation to Greenwich Hospital. The reason he introduced the subject on going into Committee of Supply was this: he wished to take a vote of the House upon the general question, and this he could not obtain in Committee, because the only Motion he could make on such an occasion would be in view of a reduction of the Vote, and that would be unfair to the officials, because the year had been already entered on. He would not dismiss a servant from his own establishment in an unceremonious way, and therefore would not ask the House to deal so with the Controller; but he felt bound to expose the state of affairs at Greenwich Hospital, the cost of management—he would even say the robbery—was so great. By the Estimates for 1866-7, he found that the Establishment of the Hospital had upon it a captain-superintendent at £800, and two lieutenants at £460 a year. These gentlemen were respectable men; but of what use were they? What had they to do with reference to the management of 370 aged men and 800 boys? The hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) had said in May, 1865, that the Bill under discussion proposed to replace a most expensive staff by a simple working staff, so as to save money for increasing out-pensioners; and that, if the rule were broken by one sinecure, it would be difficult to resist other similar appointments. Lord Clarence Paget, too, had said in the House in 1864, that all offices beyond what were necessary for the discipline of the place should be abolished; but was it necessary for discipline to have a captain-superintendent and two lieutenants? In addition to this, there were actually eighteen policemen at £1,280 a year to keep these 370 aged men and 800 boys in order. The city of Lincoln, which he had the honour to represent, contained 20,000 inhabitants, and was two miles long, yet it had no more than about twenty-four policemen. It was perfectly ridiculous. Then, the medical establishment for 1,600 pensioners and 800 boys had been set down by the Royal Commission as being £3,539, and last year the 370 men and 800 boys had actually cost £2,085, and this year was to be £3,424. And he desired to know how it was that Sir Edward Hilditch, formerly inspector-general, had been pensioned at the age of sixty, after four years' service, at about £1,000 a year? Comparing also the cost of the civil staff—exclusive, of course, of captain-superintendent, lieutenants, medical staff, chaplain, labourers, nurses, &c.—at the time when 2,300 men lived at the hospital, with the cost last year, he found that the cost was then £5,970, and last year £5,486, so that the civil staff for the greatly smaller number cost only £484 less. With regard to the school the Commissioners reported that the establishment of masters, &c., for 1,050 boys should cost £3,510, but in 1859 this item for the 800 boys cost £8,456, or £4,946 more than 1,050 should cost. Last year's Estimate would be found to exceed the £3,510 by £4,066. He contrasted the cost of management with the amount spent for the benefit of the men themselves and for the children. Last year the management of the Hospital cost £23,469, and the provisions, clothing, stores, medicines, &c., and money allowances to in-pensioners, £16,000. The cost for the management of the school was £10,249, and the cost of the maintenance of the school was £12,750, the total management for Hospital and school being £33,061, and the total maintenance being £28,911. He did not suppose it would be denied that the institution was founded for the benefit of seamen, their widows and children. That fact was evident from the Charter of 1694, and was corroborated by the opinion expressed in the Report of the Royal Commissioners. He thought, also, that it might be gathered, from what occurred in discussion in 1864 and 1865, that such was the opinion of the hon. Member for Pontefract and of the Duke of Somerset. If, therefore, any doubt existed on the point before 1865, none could exist now: and it must be admitted that officers of the Royal Navy ought not to receive appointments in the Hospital simply as a sort of sinecure. He anticipated that the only objection which the First Lord of the Admiralty could make to his Motion was that a Committee had been appointed to inquire into the subject, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman might ask the House to wait for that Report. Now, a Committee might be usefully appointed to investigate a difficult subject, but surely the question as to what ought to be the amount of management for 370 men and 800 boys needed not the investigation of a Committee. At all events if the House affirmed his Resolution, it would not prejudice the right hon. Gentleman's inquiries. He quite agreed in all that had been said about the heroism and the self-devotion of our seamen; but surely the best way of praising them would be to do them the act of justice which he now asked the House to perform.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the cost of management of Greenwich Hospital is too great, and ought to be reduced,"—(*Mr. Seely,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. CORRY said, it would be in the recollection of the House that when he entered upon the duties of the office he now held the Navy Estimates were under consideration, and there were other pressing matters at the Admiralty claiming his attention. As soon as some progress had been made with the Navy Estimates, and he had time to turn his attention to the subject of Greenwich Hospital, it certainly occurred to him that the charge for management was large. He felt it his duty to bring the subject to the notice of the Board, and he proposed the appointment of an Admiralty Committee to investigate all the facts of the case, and ascertain whether any reduction could be made without impairing the efficiency of the establishment. He made that proposal some considerable time before notice of the present Motion appeared on the Paper; but much delay had arisen from causes over which he had no control. It was thought desirable that the Committee should be as free as possible from Admiralty and Parliamentary influence; and the only Member serving on the Committee connected with the Admiralty was the Civil Lord (Mr. Du Cane), who undertook to act as Chairman. Owing to the difficulty experienced in procuring gentlemen with sufficient time at their disposal to serve upon the Committee, and whose opinions would carry with them weight and confidence, a considerable time elapsed before it could be appointed; and then it was found that the investigation would occupy a longer time than was at first supposed. For these reasons the Admiralty was not yet in possession of the Report of the Committee, although it had been very diligent in its labours. He could assure his hon. Friend that he was most anxious that the utmost economy, consistent with efficiency, should be practised with regard to the revenues of Greenwich Hospital, so as to render them as largely available as possible for granting pensions to seamen and marines; and he was glad to find from the closing sentences of his hon. Friend that it was probable he would not think it necessary to press his Motion to a division. He would now follow his hon. Friend through some of the principal points of his criticism. In respect to what had been said by his hon. Friend regarding the delay of the audit, the fact was, that the Admiralty had thought that some Amendments in its form might be introduced with the view to diminish the labour, and consequently the expense of preparing it; but the Treasury, to whom the point was referred, unfortunately did not concur in the proposed changes, and delay had thus ensued. At the present moment a conference was going on between the Audit Office and the Accountant General's Office on the subject, and further delay was therefore unavoidable. He was sorry that the account was not ready, but he had every reason to believe that he would very shortly be able to present it. He was not aware that there would be any objection to producing the Correspondence between the Exchequer and the Audit Office as to the interpretation of the clause of the Act under which the audit was prepared; but he was not in a position absolutely to bind himself to produce it. He could not agree with his hon. Friend that the charge of £5,833 a year, arising out of the compensation granted to certain persons in consequence of the change of system, could fairly be considered a charge against the present management. His hon. Friend next referred to the Establishment charges, which, he stated, amounted to £34,000, exclusive of the charge for the schools. The Estimate of the Duke of Somerset of the cost of the Establishment under the altered system, calculated upon a basis of 600 in-pensioners, amounted to only £14,000; and this estimate was founded upon the cost of Haslar Hospital. Now, in 1864-5 the cost of Haslar was £15,141, or, in round numbers, £1,000 more than the Estimate of the Duke of Somerset; and the Greenwich Estimate on account of Establishment charges and wages—including police—for the present year, was £20,447, or £5,306 more than the expense of Haslar in 1864-5. But the hon. Gentleman must remember that this Estimate was based on the supposition that there would be 500 in-pensioners, whereas there were now only 375, and, therefore, the expenditure would fall considerably short of the Estimate. Besides this, the difference between the two amounts was occasioned by a number of additional items being included in the Greenwich Vote, many of which, as in the case of Haslar, were provided for under other heads of expenditure. The captain-superintendent of Haslar Hospital was also the superintendent of the Royal Clarence Victualling Yard, and his salary was charged in the Vote for the latter Establishment. There was a difference of £60 in the pay of two lieutenants at Greenwich; an additional allowance of £100 to Mr. Jones, the steward, for cash duties which was not to be continued to his successor; a small increase of £37 to the staff-surgeon and medical storekeeper owing to increased pay, according to rank; a salary of £150 to the chaplain, by Order in Council of 1866, but as this was on account of duties analogous to those of a chaplain-general of the navy, it certainly ought to appear in the Navy and not in the Greenwich Estimates, and he would take care that it should be so in future. Then there was £902 for clerks, according to progressive length of service, and for one additional for the school, no similar clerk being required in Haslar; £880 for gas, which, in the case of Haslar, was provided for under a different Vote; £290 for two mates of victualling, not borne at Haslar, and who, if they were not thus provided for, would be entitled to pensions; £1,500 for washing, which at Haslar was performed by the Establishment, but at Greenwich by contract, and the Committee were now inquiring whether the systems in both places could not be assimilated; and lastly £488 being the increase in the pay of the assistant-surgeons under the late Order in Council. The items which he had thus detailed amounted to £5,207, or within £100 of the alleged excess of expenditure at Greenwich. The calculation for wages at Haslar Hospital in 1864-5, amounting to £7,773, was exclusive of police, who at that time were charged to Vote 8. But the Estimate of wages for Greenwich Hospital in the present year, £9,131, was inclusive of police, which accounted for the greater part of the difference of £1,358. To establish an accurate comparison it was necessary to add to the Haslar Estimate for 1864-5, £15,141 the exceptional items as in the case of Greenwich—namely, the charges not included in the Haslar Vote already detailed, £5,207; police charges, £1,234, raising the total to £21,682, while the gross total for Establishment and wages charged in the Greenwich Estimate for 1867-8 was only

£20,447, which would show a difference in favour of that Hospital of £1,235. The charge for Hospital clerks certainly was large; but additional expenditure had, of course, followed the increased amount of clerical labour indispensable to the production of accounts in the form which the House had latterly been desirous of obtaining. He was glad to find that his hon. Friend was now of opinion that the accounts were too voluminous and were capable of being much simplified. In regard to the expenses of the Controller, he had only to say that the Controller was appointed by the late Government; that he had some doubts whether the appointment was a wise one, and that the subject was under consideration. In reference to the police, it certainly appeared to him that eighteen policemen were more than would be required; and as the Chairman of the Committee seemed to be very much disposed to concur in that opinion, he hoped that some saving would be effected under this head. With respect to the medical staff, he thought that his hon. Friend had not put the case quite fairly, for it must be remembered that the inmates of Greenwich were now all old and infirm men, and it was the custom that each of them should be personally seen by the medical officer every day. His hon. Friend had said, and truly, that the cost of the schools was great; but, on the other hand, it must be borne in mind that the education given was of a high standard, and fitted the boys for good positions in life. The proposal had been made to assimilate the education to that which was given in the district union schools of the metropolis; but though a saving might thus be effected, he felt considerable doubt whether it would be a wise retrenchment; and, as regarded the expense of repairs, he could only say that the building was as large as ever, though the number of its inmates was less, and that the present Estimate was higher than it would have been in consequence of this being the year for the periodical painting of the building. In conclusion, while he admitted that the Greenwich Hospital Estimate was not satisfactory, he trusted that, after the explanations he had given, and the promise that the strictest economy compatible with efficiency would be observed, the hon. Gentleman would not press the Motion to a division.

Mr. CHILDERS said, he had on a former occasion during the present Session called attention to what he conceived was the excessive expenditure at Greenwich Hospital. He was therefore glad that a Committee had been appointed, and that considerable reductions would be effected. He had no doubt that under the able Chairmanship of the hon. Member for Essex (Mr. Du Cane) the whole circumstances of the case would be inquired into, and due regard would be had to economy. So far the debate had turned on the extravagant charge for the Establishment, compared with the Duke of Somerset's Estimate in 1864. The Estimate of the Duke of Somerset was no doubt a rough one; but it was only intended to be approximate. He estimated that the Establishment would cost £14,500; the expenditure on works, £9,300; and the clothing and provision for pensioners, £21,900, making a total of £45,700. When the Admiralty and the Treasury came to the final determination to deal with the subject a Committee was appointed, of which he was Chairman, Sir Richard Bromley and Mr. Hamilton being also members; and great pains were taken to go into the whole details of the future expenditure. Presuming that the number of men would be reduced to 600, they arrived at the conclusion that the salaries might be reduced to £8,920, contingencies to £3,005, and wages to £7,600—in all £18,920. The expenditure on the Works Department should be less than £6,000, so that the whole expenditure for the Establishment, exclusive of clothing, provisions, and pensions, would be £24,920, as against £24,138 estimated by the Duke of Somerset, and the total expenditure was £45,000 odd, within a few pounds of the Estimate of the noble Duke. With this concurrence of opinion as to what the Establishment charges should be, it was most desirable that the pruning knife should be used at once. For instance, he felt sure that the number of police, of nurses, and sick attendants, and even of superior officers, was out of all proportion. He could not believe that it was necessary to employ such a number of clerks or such a number of medical officers at a high salary. A very considerable reduction might be made in these respects, without in the least injuring the efficiency of the Establishment. He had some doubts about much economy in the school. It was true that the cost of the school exceeded the Estimate of the Commissioners; but it must be borne in mind that that Estimate was framed upon the idea that it was to be a mere workhouse school, while in fact, the standard of the education given at Greenwich was at present much higher. If the school was merely to be used as an auxiliary to the training ships, as a means of supplying men to the navy, it might be right to reduce the standard; but before adopting such a course the Admiralty must remember that the advantages of this school on its present footing had been viewed as a privilege to be claimed by sailors both in the Royal Navy and in the Mercantile Marine, and were not likely to be very highly estimated if it was reduced to the level of a mere workhouse school. But let him bring back the House to the more important part of this question. Some economies might still be effected, but let it be borne in mind that the main object of the Act of 1865 had been entirely secured. No less than £57,000 was now spent on out-pensions to sailors living with their friends, which had been wasted on a small number in a semi-monastic institution at Greenwich. And now the real question was, even supposing they could reduce the expenditure upon Greenwich Hospital from £45,000 to £35,000, was it worth while to expend such an amount to house a number of infirm men, many of whom would be much better with their families? He did not believe that they would ever be able to exclude from Greenwich the element of extravagance, and he suggested to the Admiralty that they might clear out of the Hospital all but 160 or 200 men, who were only fit to lie upon their backs in the infirmary, and that even these might advantageously be removed to Haslar or Plymouth, where there were several vacant wards. Thus in a few years another £40,000 a year or more might be devoted to out-pensions for a large number of old sailors. He thought, after the very satisfactory explanation which had been given by the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty, that the hon. Gentleman would do well not to press his Motion.

COLONEL SYKES referred to a Petition which he had presented some time since from 145 seamen of the port of Aberdeen, which set forth that before 1834 they had paid 6*d*. per month out of their pay for the support of Greenwich Hospital. The petitioners submitted that the surviving seamen who had formerly paid the "Greenwich sixpence," and also their surviving widows and direct heirs, had a fair claim on the accumulated funds which had been contributed by British merchant seamen to the funds of Greenwich Hospital.

MR. CANDLISH said, he considered that the funds of the Hospital were neither wisely nor economically administered. The medical staff last year cost £2,085, whilst this year the Estimate was £3,539; while the number of inmates was decreasing the charge for medical attendance was increasing. Permanent sickness in the Hospital attached to about 160. The medical attendance was not better than that usually given in the workhouses, where the cost of providing for 160 would not exced £500. The cost of management of the Hospital was £23,000, whilst the whole cost of maintenance did not exceed £16,000. The number of boys in the school was 800, and the cost of their maintenance £12,000, which, perhaps, was not higher than might be expected, whilst the charge for teaching was not less than £10,000 or £12,000, which was certainly extravagant. The total of the management charges was £32,700, whilst the maintenance charges were only £28,700. The hon. and gallant Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes) had called attention to the case of the claimants in that borough. There were about 400 similar claimants in Sunderland, most of whom were in a state of destitution and dependent on the country for their maintenance. The merchant seamen for a century and a quarter had contributed £20,000 a year to the maintenance of the Hospital, and if they had no legal claim on the Establishment, they most undoubtedly had a moral one. He now asked the Government to bring in an Act to establish and legalize the claims of the merchant seamen, who were scattered about the seaports of the country in penury, to that comfort for declining years to which they were so justly entitled. If the First Lord of the Admiralty would only do that he would be acting justly towards a most deserving class, and would entitle himself to their lasting gratitude.

MR. LIDDELL said, he was glad to hear that the Admiralty were directing their attention to the curtailing of this enormous expenditure. With regard to the schools in connection with Greenwich Hospital, they had cost the country £175,000 for building, and they were kept up at an annual cost to the Hospital for repairs and maintenance of £2,500. The school accommodation, however, was inadequate, and the Commissioners, when their attention was directed to that point, visited the Central London District Union Schools, and they found that these schools, which were sufficient to accommodate 1,200 children instead of 800, the number provided for at Greenwich, had much better accommodation, and had been built for less than half the cost. He wished to know whether the Greenwich schools were still insufficient for the children, whether the dormitories had been improved, and whether the playground had been extended as was recommended? He hoped the standard of education in the schools would not be lowered—if it were, that would be a great mistake. With regard to the claims of the merchant seamen, it should be remembered that the claims of the Royal Navy stood first, and that they could only provide for the merchant seamen by judicious economy. He wished to know what had been done with regard to the sale of advowsons belonging to the Hospital—whether any and what livings had been sold, and to whom?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, he would not enter into the general question, but with regard to the claims of the merchant seamen, which had been mentioned by the hon. Member for Sunderland, and respecting which a discussion had taken place on a former day, he should like to say a few words. The Greenwich 6*d*., as it was called, was half of a shilling, which was paid in former days by the merchant seamen. While 6*d*. was exacted from them for the Hospital, another 6*d*. was contributed as a sort of pension or assurance fund; the same men were, in most cases, interested in both funds. That fund was badly managed for a long time; the laws of life insurance were ill understood in those days, and the payments were made on different principles in different ports. One way or another the fund became practically insolvent, and in 1851 it was handed over to the Board of Trade; but it was so far insufficient for the pensions now paid, that in the Estimate for this year a sum of £52,040 was set down as payment by the State to merchant seamen in excess of the money received for the fund. Before the fund was wound up the loss to the country on that account would have amounted to upwards of £1,000,000. It should also be remembered that the children of merchant seamen were entitled to admission to the Greenwich Hospital Schools. It would be unfortunate that a large and valuable body of men like the merchant seamen, should consider that injustice was done to them, and it was therefore right that they should be made aware of this set-off on the other side.

Mr. Alderman LUSK, with reference to the expense involved by having charge of so much land—the expense of controllers and others—asked if it would not be better to sell the land and invest the money in the funds, where it would be no expense at all? He had looked into the cost of the City of London and other schools, and he felt bound to say that, as compared with them, the cost of the education given in Greenwich Hospital School was not excessive. He was grateful to the hon. Gentleman who brought forward this Motion, because the matter under discussion was one that really ought to be taken seriously into consideration. It was now admitted that a great deal of money had been expended in connection with this institution which ought not to have been laid out, and he trusted that considerations of economy would not be lost sight of by the Government in this matter.

Mr. DU CANE, in answer to the question put by the hon. Member for Newcastle, explained that the additional appointment of medical superintendent at the Hospital, was made on the recommendation of the Medical Director General of the Navy (Dr. Bryson), who said that, in his opinin, such an addition to the medical staff was absolutely necessary. With regard to the date of superannuation of the medical director general (Sir Edward Hilditch) it took place only one year before the time at which, under recent regulations, it might legitimately have occurred—when that officer was sixty-four years old, and not sixty, as had been erroneously stated. With regard to the question of his hon. Friend the Member for Northumberland as to the cost for repairs and maintenance at the schools, he thought that his hon. Friend had, in a great measure, given the answer to his own question. His hon. Friend stated that the schools cost originally £175,000 to build. How far a building of so elaborate and expensive a character was either suitable or necessary for the purpose to which it was applied was of course a matter for question. But the buildings having been so erected the House must see that an annual outlay was required for their repairs and maintenance far beyond the ordinary run of school-buildings. As regards the general question, every single point which had been mentioned in this discussion either had been, or would be, under the consideration of the Committee, of which he (Mr. Du Cane) was Chairman, and that Committee would be very glad if they found they could conscientiously recommend a considerable reduction in the Estimates. With regard to the sale of advowsons, no active steps had as yet been taken, the question having been referred to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for their advice, as to the best mode of proceeding with the sale. The Commissioners had recommended that they should be sold gradually, beginning with the most valuable one, the moiety of the proceeds of each sale being applied to increase the value of the poorest amongst the remainder. And with this gradual sale, he hoped they would be able very shortly to proceed. As to the question raised by the hon. Member for Finsbury, with respect to the desirability of parting with the landed estates of the Hospital altogether, and investing the proceeds in the funds, that was a point upon which many arguments might be urged both for and against. It was, in fact, a question of considerable difficulty, and one upon which no hasty or immediate decision ought to be arrived at. It was, however, one of those points which would come under the full consideration of their Committee, and upon which they were prepared to take ample evidence. As the Committee were, as yet, hardly half-way through their labours, he trusted the House would excuse him himself from expressing any premature opinion.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH said, the hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) was in favour of clearing the seamen and the expensive staff retained there out of the Hospital. If that course were adopted he wanted to know what would be done with the Hospital, which was a building of great national interest. He hoped the Hospital would never be altogether severed from the naval profession.

MR. SEELY, after the assurance of his right hon. Friend, would not trouble the House to divide, and accordingly begged to withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. HENWOOD'S SEA-GOING MONITORS.

QUESTIONS.

MR. HANBURY - TRACY said, that the noble Lord the Secretary to the Admiralty in his speech last March had made certain statements with regard to Mr. Henwood's plans which had given pain to that gentleman, and he therefore wished to give the noble Lord the opportunity of explaining or qualifying those statements in any particulars which might seem to him desirable. The hon. Member read some extracts from the speech referred to of Lord Henry Lennox, and in conclusion asked :—1, Whether, in making his statement on moving the Naval Estimates in March last, the noble Lord was not led into error when he alluded to Mr. Henwood's scheme for converting screw line-of-battle ships into sea-going Monitors; 2, Whether, in the case of the *Victoria,* the armour plates would not be less than 500 tons, and not, as he then stated, 1,055 tons ; 3, Whether it was not true that it had never been proposed by Mr. Henwood to fit small ships, such as the *London* and *Conqueror,* with three turrets, but with two only; 4, Whether the deck referred to in his statement was not the gun or monitor deck, over which the guns of the turret are fired, and which would, in all cases, be not less than 3 feet 6 inches above the load water line, the upper deck being 16 feet above the sea; 5, Whether he was not misinformed when he said that Mr. Henwood had no experience in designing or in building ships of war; and 6, Whether it was the intention of the Admiralty to give Mr. Henwood an opportunity of testing his scheme of conversion ?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, that by the courtesy of his hon. and gallant Friend he had been placed that day in possession of the various Questions which he had now addressed to him. He was happy to give his hon. and gallant Friend a very decided answer as to the first point. Shortly after his speech was delivered the *Engineer* drew a very vivacious, but not very complimentary picture of the statements he had made; and this induced him to refer for corroboration or otherwise to the professional officers who had supplied him with his data. These officers at once declared in writing their willingness to adhere to the figures which they had previously furnished. And, in support of this view, he might mention that Mr. Henwood had thought it right to modify the plans which were the subject of his official criticism, by sending in amended calculations professing to take some considerable amount of weight off the hulls of the ships he proposed to convert. His hon. and gallant Friend was probably not in the House when he made the statement with regard to the *Victoria*; but what he then said was in exact accordance with the fact—namely, that the heavy armour plates for the sides of the ship amounted to 501 tons, and the light plates to 554, making a total of 1,055 tons. As to the question of whether the smaller ships should be fitted with three turrets, or only with two, the terms of Mr. Henwood's proposal to the Admiralty were to convert a three-decker into a ship with four turrets, and a two-decker into a ship with two turrets. He sent in drawings or designs for the larger ship, but none for the smaller. It was an error to describe the *London* and the *Conqueror* as belonging to a small class of line-of-battle ships, for the *Conqueror's* tonnage was 3,270, and the tonnage of the small class of line-of-battle ships was only 2,650. With respect to the fourth question, he begged to state that he had referred to the gun deck, and he dissented from the hon. Gentleman's statement that the gun deck would in all cases be not less than 3 feet 6 inches above the load water line, for the calculation was that under the most favourable circumstances it would only be 2 feet 8 inches, and the height of the hurricane deck above the sea must depend on the height of the gun deck. With regard to the fifth question, he had to observe that he was still ignorant that Mr. Henwood, though an eminent shipbuilder, had ever designed or built large men-of-war. There was a war vessel for which Mr. Henwood took credit, and the disaster which happened to the *Affondatore* Mr. Henwood attributed to his plans being altered by the Italian authorities. As to the sixth question, whether the Admirality intended to give Mr. Henwood an opportunity of testing his scheme of conversion, he could only say that the Admiralty were most anxious to see Mr. Henwood mature his plans; but they were not prepared, so long as the drawings and calculations as to weight and displacement were erroneous in the opinion of the professional officers of the Admiralty, to hand over to Mr. Henwood a ship of a considerable number of tons to be dealt with as he pleased. Mr. Henwood's last design was under consideration.

CASE OF EDWARD GREENLAND.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH rose, pursuant to Notice, for the purpose of calling attention to the recent grant of a free pardon to Edward Greenland, late manager of the Leeds Banking Company, who was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for perjury, and to move for the Correspondence on the subject. He said the remission of Greenland's sentence had occasioned great surprise in Leeds and the neighbourhood. The main facts of the case were these—six months ago Greenland was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment on a charge of perjury. He had been manager of the Leeds Banking Company, which had failed two years and a-half ago, and the specified charge on which he was convicted was that of having falsified the returns it was his duty to make to the Board of Inland Revenue of the notes issued by the bank. Up to the time of its failure the bank occupied a high position; and its failure was due, not to the ordinary chances of commerce, but to reckless management. When the bank suspended payment its deficiency amounted to £500,000, and few events of the kind had caused such extensive ruin. Of 243 shareholders at the time of the failure, little more than fifty were now able to meet the calls made upon them; twenty-five had died, some from distress of mind, some by suicide; while some of the shareholders had lost their reason, and were now confined in lunatic asylums. After the failure the inhabitants of Leeds, feeling that the case was one which cast discredit on their town, applied to the Board of Inland Revenue for the purpose of ascertaining whether they intended to prosecute Greenland for the forgeries it was believed he had committed. The Board replied that they did not intend to prosecute; but that they would assist those who might undertake a prosecution. Some of the inhabitants undertook the duty at a heavy cost; and the presiding Judge expressed his surprise that the prosecution of the case had fallen on private persons. The Judge also said that had it not been for the advanced age and bodily infirmity of the prisoner he would have sentenced him to penal servitude. As soon as Greenland went to prison he was placed in the hospital for three months, but in consequence of a report received by the visiting justices he was removed to one of the cells. The visiting justices were, therefore, greatly astonished when they afterwards received intelligence that Greenland had obtained a free pardon. As far as he could understand, the solicitor of Greenland addressed a memorial to the Home Office, asking for a remission of the sentence on the ground of the prisoner's health, and on receipt of the memorial instructions were sent from the Home Office to the gaol directing that inquiries should be made respecting the state of Greenland's health. The concluding portion of the surgeon's certificate was as follows:—

> "Under these circumstances he was placed under careful supervision, and precautions were taken during the cold weather against a return of these affections. In consequence his health at first appeared to improve, the only evidence of declining health being a gradual though steady loss of weight, amounting now to twelve pounds, a point of considerable importance in the case of a man seventy-two years of age. Since he has been placed in closer confinement he has become more depressed in spirits, and his mind less able to bear up under the influence of his late reverses and present imprisonment."

He supposed no person in prison would be likely to improve in health; but he could not think that such a report from a surgeon was sufficient to justify a free pardon, particularly as the surgeon had thought Greenland so little ill that he had not recommended the visiting justices to place him in hospital. He thought it important to call attention to the case, because the facts, without explanation, might give rise to certain impressions which would have a most mischievous effect. Doubts would arise whether, in the administration of justice, distinctions were not made between different classes. It was difficult to believe that a poor man who had no solicitor would have received a remission of the greater part of his sentence, because he was in a state of health which, in the opinion of the surgeon, did not justify his removal to the hospital. He therefore asked for some explanations on the subject from the right hon. Gentleman. If it were contrary to the usual practice to produce the Papers connected with the case, he should not press that part of his Motion.

MR. BAINES, in seconding the Motion, expressed his concurrence in the statement of facts submitted by the noble Lord who had brought the matter before the House, and stated with reference to the failure of the Leeds Banking Company, that it had been attended by some of the most frightful consequences that had ever been known to result from a similar catastrophe. Many deaths had taken place, and hundreds of families had been reduced from a state of prosperity to absolute destitution. It was believed that all this was owing to a long course of reckless extravagance, and even criminal proceedings on the part of Greenland the manager. But it was not for this long course of misconduct that he was tried and convicted; it was for perjury he was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment. Two memorials had been presented. The first he had been requested by his solicitor, a very respectable man, to present to the right hon. Gentleman, and he had done so. There was an end of it, so far as he was concerned. The second memorial was not presented through him. The solicitor came to London and requested an interview with the Home Secretary. He then stated that since the former memorial had been presented the case of Greenland as to health had become much worse—in fact he had been shocked with the rapid deterioration in his appearance and condition. The first memorial only asked for removal from the cell to the hospital. The second went much further, and stated that if life or reason were to be preserved the sentence of imprisonment must be abridged. The next he heard of the case was that the right hon. Gentleman had found it consistent with his duty, under all the circumstances, to grant a free pardon. He would only further say that, as he thought the case liable to the inferences mentioned by the noble Lord, he hoped the whole Papers would be laid before the House. At the same time he must be allowed to add that not the slightest imputation was meant to be thrown on the conduct, least of all on the motives, of the right hon. Gentleman.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Correspondence on the subject of the recent grant of a free pardon to Edward Greenland (late manager of the Leeds Banking Company), who was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for perjury,"—*(Lord Frederick Cavendish,)*

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he did not think that any great advantage could be derived from discussions of that description before any inquiries had been made or any explanations had been given. He would not enter into any examination of the offences with which Greenland had been charged; but he should observe that the specific accusation on which he had been convicted was one of perjury. In a Petition signed by the Chairman of the Leeds Chamber of Commerce it was stated that the offence of which Greenland had been accused was insignificant as compared with the greater crimes of which all Leeds knew that he had been guilty; that was to say, the petitioners attributed to Greenland not only perjury, but an acquaintance with the forgeries which had contributed to the ruin of the bank. But no evidence of any of those additional crimes had come before him (Mr. Gathorne Hardy); and on looking over the report of the trial he perceived that the jury while finding the prisoner guilty, recommended him to mercy, on account of his extreme age and the loose manner in which the business of the bank generally appeared to have been conducted. Mr. Richardson, whom he had not at the time known to have been the solicitor to Greenland, had presented to him a memorial praying for a remission of the sentence on the ground of the declining health of the prisoner; and that application was accompanied by a report from the surgeon of the gaol, which, as it seemed to him (Mr. Gathorne Hardy), was of a more serious character than the noble Lord appeared to imagine. On receiving that statement he thought it his duty to consult the Judge who tried the prisoner, and he recommended that if the prisoner's illness should continue it would be right to remit part of his sentence. A Minute to that effect was made on the Papers for the remission of part of the sentence. Subsequently he saw Mr. Hamilton Richardson, with whom he had been previously acquainted. Mr. Richardson confirmed the statements in the memorial, and spoke of the great change which had taken place in the appearance and condition of Greenland. Coupling that with what had been stated by the Judge—that if the prisoner's health was not improved part of his sentence might be remitted—he did not think it his duty to try how much more the prisoner, a man seventy-two years of age, could bear, and he did not think that he exceeded his duty in permitting him to be discharged altogether. In these cases he could only act from the best of his judgment, and under the circumstances he had taken upon himself to remit the whole of the sentence. Taking into consideration the recommendation to mercy by the jury and the illness of the prisoner, he did not think he had acted improperly in permitting this old man, dishonoured as he was, and for ever prevented as he would be from regaining his former position in society, to go at large.

Mr. MORRISON said, he thought it was desirable that questions of this kind should be brought forward, if it were only for the purpose of strengthening the hands of the Home Secretary for the time being from the importunities of those criminals who might happen to be in a wealthy condition of life. After the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman, he confessed he did not see how the right hon. Gentleman could have done otherwise than he did; but he must remind him that though the crime of which Greenland was convicted was an act of perjury, yet this had been committed month by month for twenty years together. As he was residing in the West Riding at the time, he recollected the feeling of indignation which was expressed there at the light sentence Greenland received. It was true he was then an old man, over seventy years of age, but it was to be recollected that when he began his career of perjury he was a hale, hearty man of fifty. The Leeds Chamber of Commerce had, very much to its credit, taken upon itself all the expense and unpopularity of the prosecution—for, strange to say, it was actually said they were prosecuting an old man—and it was so important that there should be no suspicion as to the motives which had actuated the Government that he felt glad the matter had been brought forward, and that the Home Secretary was able to give the explanation he had done; but he could not help thinking that if Mr. Greenland had not had an able solicitor like Mr. Richardson, and if he had not possessed wealthy and influential friends, he would have been left to serve out the whole of his lenient sentence, instead of undergoing a sentence of only six months.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he should be happy to show the noble Lord the Papers, but it would be contrary to the usual practice to produce them publicly.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE DECLARATION OF PARIS.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. J. STUART MILL rose to call the attention of the House to the Declaration of Paris of 1856, so far as it relates to the right of seizing enemies' goods in neutral vessels. The hon. Gentleman said:

I rise, Sir, to ask the attention of the House to a subject more germane to the business of a Committee of Supply than most of those which the Motion to go into Committee gives occasion for bringing before the House. The immense burthen of our naval and military expenditure would of itself give ample reason for reconsidering the position in which this country has been placed by the abandonment of its maritime rights eleven years ago. Of these eleven nearly ten have been years of profound peace, in which international commerce, which we had always believed to be our truest guarantee against war, has increased to an extent previously unexampled, while the doctrines and practice of Free Trade have been spreading through the different countries of Europe, and those Protectionist theories which have so often made commerce a provocative to war instead of a deterrent from it, have lost their hold on all the leading minds of the Continent. Yet during this period we have been engaged, not, as might have been expected, in diminishing, but in enormously increasing our naval and military establishments, until our total expenses exceed by about £20,000,000 a year, not what economists like Mr. Hume used to maintain that they ought to be, but what they actually have been in the life of the present generation. Why has this happened? What has been our inducement for maintaining those "bloated armaments?" To protect ourselves against the bloated armaments of our European neighbours. Other powers—as much, perhaps, for internal as for external purposes—are keeping up gigantic and ruinous military establishments, the existence of which we justly feel to be a danger to us. But why is it a danger? What obliges us, an insular people, to measure our necessities by the wild extravagances of the military rulers of the Continent?—extravagances which, let us do as we will, we cannot compete with; for if our wealth is equal to the effort, the numbers of our population are not. Why, then, do we find ourselves engaging deeper and deeper in this mad rivalry? Because we have put away the natural weapon of a maritime nation—because we have abandoned the right, recognized by International Law, and legitimated, as much as the consent of nations can legitimate anything, of warring against the commerce of our enemies. We have made this sacrifice, receiving a merely nominal equivalent. We have given up our main defence; but the other Powers who are parties to the transaction have not given up theirs; they have divested themselves not of their special means of warfare, but of ours; they have, with a good grace, consented not to use the weapons in which they are inferior, but to confine themselves to those in which the advantage is on their side. The greatest naval Power after ourselves has been far too wise to join in so unequal a compact. Unless by resuming our natural and indispensable weapon we place ourselves again on an equality with our possible enemies, we shall be burthened with these enormous establishments and these onerous budgets for a permanency, and, in spite of it all, we shall be for ever in danger, for ever in alarm, cowed before any Power or combination of Powers capable of invading any part of our widely-spread possessions. We shall be condemned to see what we have seen, and worse than we have yet seen, great international iniquities perpetrated before our eyes, and our expressions of deprecation, even of reprobation, passed over with civil, or scarcely civil, contempt; until our most patriotic advisers feel obliged to recommend to us, as the only rule for our conduct, that which despots prescribe to their subjects, "Hold your peace: keep your moral disapprobation within your own breasts; for as you cannot back it by the only argument which the wicked and the oppressor can feel, you only bring yourselves and your just indignation into contempt." Thus it will be while we abstain from that which once made a war with England a formidable thing even to the united strength of all Europe. Sir, I ventnre to call the renunciation of the right of seizing enemy's property at sea a national blunder. Happily it is not an irretrievable one. The Declaration of 1856 is not a treaty. It has never been ratified. The authority on which it was entered into was but the private letter of a Minister. It is not a permanent engagement between nations; it is but a joint declaration of present intention; binding on us, I admit, until we formally withdraw from it; for a nation is bound by all things done in its name, unless by a national act it disowns them. Why did not the Parliament and the people of the country protest at the time? Some of them did; among the rest several of the most important Members of Her Majesty's present Government. The bulk of the Liberal party acquiesced, silently or approvingly:

and therein, I confess, we showed less knowledge of the subject, less understanding of the situation, than the Conservative Leaders. There is much to be said in excuse for us. Nearly the whole world shared our error. The world was fresh from the recent triumph of Free Trade—fresh from the Great Exhibition of 1851, which was to unite all nations, and inaugurate the universal substitution of commerce for war. The first enthusiastic days of Peace Congresses had scarcely past; the short episode of the Crimean War had not shaken the belief that great European wars were drawing to a close. We were mistaken; "but the light that led us astray was light from Heaven." We have since had opportunities of learning a sadder wisdom. We had not then seen wars of conquest and annexation renewed on a great scale, and fresh wars of the kind continually impending over Europe; we had not seen the Continental Powers outvying one another in converting all the flower of their youth into standing armies, ready at any moment to draw the sword, not in defence, but in aggression. We had not seen what is, to my mind, a still more warning sight. Some twenty years ago a great French thinker, by way of showing how alien a thing war is to the modern spirit, remarked that though destruction is incomparably the easiest of the works to which human ingenity applies itself, the science and art of destruction had remained greatly in arrear of the arts of production, and might almost be said to have been passed over by the inventive genius of later generations. What would this philosopher see now? He would see inventive genius, with all the lights of modern science and all the resources of modern industry, girding itself to the work of destruction as its principal task, and bringing forth every year more and more terrific engines for blasting hosts of human beings into atoms together with the defences by which they vainly seek to shelter themselves. While this work is going on all round us, is there nothing for us to do but to exhaust our invention and our finances in striving to provide ourselves with engines still more destructive?—engines which other nations will instantly adopt when their superiority has been proved, unless they in the meanwhile contrive for themselves others yet more murderous. Sir, we have a better resource; to shake off the chains which we have forged for ourselves, and resume that natural weapon which has been the main bulwark of our power and safety in past national emergencies, and without which neither ironclads nor fortified harbours will suffice for our security in those which may be yet to come. Sir, great almost beyond calculation as are the British interests dependent on this issue, it is on no narrow grounds of merely British patriotism that I now raise it. I should be ashamed to claim anything for my country which I believed to be a damage and an injury to the common interests of civilization and of mankind. I will not even urge, though the feelings of the *élite* of Europe would bear me out if I did, that the safety, and even the power of England, are valuable to the freedom of the world, and therefore to the greatest and most permanent interests of every civilized people. No, Sir, my argument shall not have even a tinge of nationality about it. It is on the broadest cosmopolitan and humanitarian principles that I rest the case. I maintain it to be for the general interest of the world, if there is to be fighting, that every Power should fight with its natural weapons and with its best strength, that so there may be the greatest possible division of force, and no one Power may be able to bestride the world, nor any two or three Powers to divide it among them. Above all it is for the interest of the world that the naval Powers should not be weakened; for whatever is taken from them is given to the great military Powers, and it is from these alone that the freedom and independence of nations has anything to fear. Naval power is as essentially defensive as military is aggressive. It is by armies, not by fleets, that wars of conquest can be carried on; and naval Powers, both in ancient and in modern times, have ever been the cradle and the home of liberty. Take away the naval Powers of the world at this moment, and where would be the main defence of the minor European States? Two or three military monarchies could, in a few years, parcel out all Europe, and everything else on this side of the Atlantic, among them; and after they had done so, would probably desolate the earth by fighting for a re-division. Happily the naval Powers exist, and long may they exist; but short will be the duration of their existence if they disarm themselves of their most powerful weapon; if they leave the entire navies of their enemies free to convey troops to their shores, being no longer required to protect the enemy's commerce;

if they, who can be invaded, but who cannot successfully invade, abandon the chief means they possess of doing their enemies substantial damage, and wearying them of the war. There is another consideration of vital importance to the subject. Those who approve of the Declaration of Paris mostly think that we ought to go still further; that private property at sea (except contraband of war) should be exempt from seizure in all cases; not only in the ships of neutrals, but in those of the belligerent nations. This doctrine was maintained with ability and earnestness in this House during the last Session of Parliament, and it will probably be brought forward again; for there is great force in the arguments on which it rests. Suppose that we were at war with any Power which is a party to the Declaration of Paris. If our cargoes would be safe in neutral bottoms, but unsafe in our own, then if the war was of any duration, our whole export and import trade would pass to the neutral flags: most of our merchant shipping would be thrown out of employment, and would be sold to neutral countries, as happened to so much of the shipping of the United States from the pressure of two or three, it might almost be said of a single, cruizer. Our sailors would naturally follow our ships, and it is by no means certain that we should regain them even after the war was over. Where would then be your Naval Reserve? Where your means of recruiting the Royal Navy? A protracted war on such terms must end in national disaster. It will thus become an actual necessity for us to take the second step, and obtain the exemption of all private property at sea from the contingencies of war. But are we sure that we shall be able to do so? Our own consent is not all that is required. Will other Powers, having got us at this disadvantage, consent to relieve us from it? And if they would, what a spectacle should we then behold! Nations at war with nations, but their merchants and shipowners at peace; our own merchants driving a roaring trade with the enemies whose resources we were endeavouring to cripple, and contributing, perhaps, a great part of their revenue. Some persons think that this would be a great improvement—that it would be a gain to humanity if war were confined to what they call a duel between Governments. A strange gain to humanity, if the merchants, manufacturers, and agriculturists of the world lost nothing by a state of war, and had no pecuniary interest in preventing it, except the increase of their taxes—a motive which never yet kept a prosperous people out of war—a burthen which such a people is often but too ready to take upon itself for mere excitement, much more from the smallest motive of self-assertion or desire of aggrandizement. How war is to be humanized by shooting at men's bodies instead of taking their property I confess surprises me. The result would be, that as long as the taxpayers were willing, or could be compelled by their Governments, to pay the cost of the game, nations would go on massacring one another until the carnage was stopped by sheer impossibility of getting any more soldiers to enlist, or of enforcing a conscription. That would be the amount of gain to humanity. These fine notions of making war by deputy may go down for awhile, so long as a nation fancies itself safe from invasion; but let an enemy once touch our shores, and I think we should regret that we had not, by making war on his imports and exports, kept him at a distance from our hearths—that we had not preferred to defend ourselves by our cruizers rather than by our Rifle Volunteers. Many who do not like to recede from the Declaration of Paris are quite aware of its dangers; but they think that the evil is irreparably done, and that we cannot withdraw from it, for fear of embroiling ourselves with France and America. Sir, if the Declaration of Paris has brought us to such a pass that we can neither stand still nor move, our national independence is as good as gone; our being yoked to the car of some great military potentate is a mere question of time. But this apprehended danger from France and America seems to me to have little reality in it. France, though a great military, is also a naval Power, and is historically identified almost as much as ourselves with what is called the right of search. She has always asserted it for herself, except when she has waived it during a particular war by express engagement with some particular country. The first Napoleon, it is true, while carrying the war against British commerce to extremities never before practised or justified, thought it suited his purpose of the moment to declaim pompously against what he called our tyranny of the seas. But the interest of France in this matter is greatly changed. The immunity of neutral bottoms could be of service to her, if at all, only if her enemy were England or the United States, and even then the benefit would not be without alloy; but if the calamity should occur of a war between France and any other great Power, it is more likely that her antagonist would be either Germany or Russia, and against either of these the right of seizure would be so important to France—would be so powerful a weapon in her hands—that she could not dispense with it for herself. The noble Lord the Foreign Secretary must think so; for, in the important Correspondence which has gained for him the distinguished honour of averting an European war, the noble Lord urged upon the Prussian Government the certain extinction of the maritime commerce of Germany, in case of a war with France, exactly as if the Declaration of Paris had never existed. As for America, she is not even a party to the Declaration of Paris; and I greatly doubt if she ever will be. She is herself one of the great Powers of the sea, and, in case of war, the destruction of her enemy's commerce will be her most potent weapon. Many are misled by vague and inaccurate notions of the American war of 1812. It is asserted far too positively that the war was provoked by our stoppage of the neutral navigation. People forget that the United States had a far more serious quarrel with us, through our unjustifiable pretension to impress American citizens on board American ships when they were, or even were falsely said to be, natives of any British possession—a pretension which we did not even renounce at the Peace, but which it is earnestly to be hoped we shall never revive; if we were wise, we should even come forward unasked and surrender it. Such a grievance is quite sufficient to account for the war, even had there been no other subject of quarrel. But there was another, equally independent of the right now under consideration—our paper blockades; which were a new practice, not authorized, as the right of search was so fully authorized, by the law and practice of nations. I believe it will be found, by examining the diplomatic correspondence of the time, that our differences with America about the right of search were capable of being made up, and would almost certainly have been made up, but for those additional grievances. Before I conclude, I am obliged to speak of a notion which I am afraid is rather common among us, but which I am almost ashamed to mention—that, dangerous as is the position we should be placed in by adhering to the Declaration of Paris, it is of no practical consequence, because, if war comes, the Declaration is sure to be treated as waste paper. Sir, I should be indeed humiliated in my feelings as an Englishman, if I thought that these were the maxims by which my countrymen were content to guide themselves, or on which they would allow their rulers to act. No, Sir, let us either disown this obligation or fulfil it. Let us disclaim it like honest men in the face of the world, openly and on principle, and not hypocritically profess one doctrine up to the very moment when our immediate interest would be promoted by exchanging it for another. If England should choose that moment for announcing a change of opinion, she would justify the most prejudiced of her foreign revilers in the accusations which they are never tired of bringing against her of national selfishness and perfidy. It is not when the emergency has come, but before it comes, that we have to form our resolution on this most momentous subject: and not only to form our resolution, but to declare it. And I implore every hon. Member, and especially those who have now, or may have hereafter, a share in the direction of public affairs, to consider these things well before they commit themselves any deeper than they may be already committed, to persistence in a course to which they are so likely to repent that they ever, even by their silence, allowed themselves to be committed at all.

MR. NORWOOD said, though he did not take so exalted a view as the hon. Member who had brought this question forward with so much ability, he agreed with him that the Declaration had placed us in a position of great difficulty. They conld not stand where they were. They must either recede to what they were before the Treaty of 1856, or they must take a step in advance, and declare all merchandize, except contraband of war, free from seizure on the high seas. As a shipowner, he considered it would be wise, humane, and in the especial interest of this country to adopt the latter. He agreed with the hon. Member that if we were at war with a great maritime nation a great portion of our trade would pass into neutral hands. Merchants would not dare to ship in British vessels, and the result would be that we should either lose our carrying trade or place our vessels under a foreign flag, by a direct sale or by some of the subterfuges usually resorted to in such cases. It was impossible to protect a commerce so extensive as ours. The hon. Gentleman had not given sufficient weight to the great change which had taken place in the mode of conducting our foreign trade within the last few years. There was a time when it was possible for our vessels to assemble under the protection of a convoy; but that was no longer possible, and, if attempted, it would utterly fail. When we so unwisely in 1856 objected to the amendment in the law of nations, and America agreed to the principle that a neutral flag should cover an enemy's property if we would exempt all the merchandize from capture, we made a great mistake. It would be of little advantage reverting to the old law, because England of all nations in the world had such an immense amount of foreign trade in every sea, and consequently would be more exposed to injury from capture than any other country. No doubt, we might do a considerable amount of injury to other nations; but, certainly, not anything like the injury which we should receive. He reminded the House that the introduction of railways throughout the Continent had placed the carrying trade, so far as they were concerned, on a wholly different footing. If we were unfortunately at war with France, we might drive her navy from the seas, and blockade her ports, yet, by means of her railway communications, she would be able to obtain from those countries which surrounded her the luxuries and comforts of life, and even obtain such articles from this country as she required. There was a notable instance in the Russian War of the extent to which land carriage was resorted to. We sent a powerful fleet into the Baltic and blockaded the ports, but we could not cripple her trade. A system was organized of transferring produce through Prussia overland—there being at that time no railways connecting Russia with the rest of the Continent—by means of horses and carts and relays of men, and in that manner they actually received from us and from other Continental countries a supply of necessaries and luxuries sufficient to meet their wants. If that was the case when there were no railways, what would be the consequence now there was a complete system of railway communication between Russia and the rest of the Continent? So far from war being shortened by the capture of private property at sea, he was of opinion that, by causing great irritation in the national mind, it was more likely to prolong it. Viewing the question merely from a mercantile point of view, he considered that England had greater interest than any other nation in agreeing that in time of war all property not actually contraband of war should be exempt from capture at sea.

Lord STANLEY: I regret that this question, which is undoubtedly one of European interest and importance, should have been brought forward, not only at a late period of the Session, which, however, is from no fault of the hon. Member for Westminster, but also at a time when the public mind is occupied by other affairs, because the hon. Member's statement, able and lucid as it is, will not receive, either here or out of doors, that attention which it deserves. If I were to criticize some parts of the speech of the hon. Gentleman —which it is not my wish to do—I might say that I do not think that he has done good service to the cause he undertakes to defend, when he says that, if England had not deprived herself of the use of this weapon, we might have intervened with more effect in various disturbances in which foreign Powers have been or may be engaged. The power to intervene effectually is a temptation to do so; and, if the Declaration of 1856 has prevented us from mixing ourselves up with Continental complications with which we had nothing to do, all I can say is that that is one of the best arguments I have yet heard in its defence. And the hon. Member was, for a moment, forgetful of the circumstances when he said that the arrangement was accepted by Parliament, and especially by the Liberal party, at a time when not much attention was attached to this question, because it was thought that the days of wars were over, and that universal peace had begun; for, although in 1851 and 1852, and perhaps even as late as 1853, a singular illusion of that kind had taken possession of the minds of even sensible men as the result of the Great Exhibition, that illusion was quite dispelled by the sanguinary struggle of the next year; and the Declaration did not precede, but followed, the Crimean war. I may note also, in passing, that I do not admit the inference which the hon. Member draws from the passage in the blue book published on the subject of Luxemburg. The hon. Member contends that I have shown that I look upon this

Declaration as worthless, because in the Luxemburg Correspondence I pointed out the possibility of Prussian trade being destroyed by the superior naval force of the French Empire. But I said nothing of neutrals; I spoke of Prussian trade carried on by Prussians; that trade is very considerable, and it would have been sacrificed on the breaking out of war. With regard to the subject generally, I entirely agree with the hon. Member in laying down the principle that it will not do to go on with a Declaration of this kind if we do not mean to act upon it. You are bound either to repudiate it at once, or to act on it when the occasion arises. But I do not think that any man, either in this House or out of it, has contended that the course of allowing it to stand, and yet determining not to act on it, is that which we ought to follow. The utmost that has been said tending in that direction, and for which there is, perhaps, some justification, is that the rules which are applicable to ordinary war may come to be disregarded in extreme cases. As to what may be done in such extreme cases, I certainly decline to predict; where the existence of great nations has been concerned I apprehend that ever since the world began diplomatic engagements have been esteemed very lightly. The necessities of self-defence override all compacts. That is a state of things which we must allow for; but such cases are not to be regarded as types of any ordinary war such as we are likely to see. Still, having regard to such wars as we may expect as probable, or even possible, I think we ought not to maintain this engagement unless we are prepared to act upon it. I agree to the assertion that this Declaration has very materially altered the position of neutrals and belligerents in future wars; and that the British Government, in assenting to it, divested itself of a weapon which on some former occasions has proved very powerful; I do not say it has proved so on all occasions, because the circumstances of each case have been different. There are some further considerations which, without expressing any opinion on the abstract principle agreed on eleven years ago, we are bound to bear in mind. One of these, and perhaps, the chief consideration, is the position in which we, under the old system, placed ourselves as regarded all neutral Powers, the tendency of which was that the extreme rights we claimed to seize enemy's goods in neutral ships necessarily led to our turning all neutrals into enemies. It may, no doubt, be argued, on the other hand, that whereas formerly neutrals had the strongest possible inducement to terminate a war by which they were sufferers; now that interest has disappeared, and they are gainers rather than otherwise, inasmuch as they lose nothing, while they get the carrying trade which the belligerents cannot carry on. But when you come to look at the question closely, I apprehend that the advantage is one rather in theory than in practice. In point of fact, trade is so universal and capital is so diffused that the inconveniences which arise to neutrals from a state of war between two great Powers in proximity to their territories are so great that when war breaks out there is generally a very sincere desire on the part of the neighbouring communities and Governments to bring it to an end as soon as possible. There is one incidental advantage arising to society in general out of the present state of things, though I am bound to say I do not think it was contemplated when the Declaration was framed. The trade of the countries going to war, for the time only, but still for the time, passes into neutral hands; in other words, both the combatants suffer heavy loss, both are heavily fined, so to speak, for their breach of the peace, and the fine goes for the benefit of those who have contrived to remain on good terms. But the main question, I think, to consider is this, whether a war could now be carried on under what I call the old system, without provoking such reprobation from the neutral States—who will be always more numerous and probably more powerful than the belligerents themselves—as would in the end drag those neutral States into the quarrel, and thus render the struggle general? That is not a new danger; it has occurred again and again at former periods of our history. It is not necessary that I should do more on that head than refer to the Armed Neutrality of 1780, and to the attempt which was made to renew it at the beginning of the present century. With the increase of international communication, and with the increase of trade following upon it, the tendency of neutrals to assert their claims and to vindicate their rights is one which must increase rather than diminish. However, I for one, am not interested in denying that the question, as it arose, and as it was decided, in 1856, was one open to much argument and to very grave doubt. But we stand in a different position now. The question is not what we ought to have done eleven years ago. I do not think it is possible to deny that we have bound ourselves to a certain extent by this compact, to which nearly all the maritime Powers have acceded, except Spain and the United States. The engagement was observed and acted upon in the Italian war of 1859, and in the subsequent war which took place between Prussia and Denmark. The war last year did not raise the question, partly because both the combatants agreed to respect private property at sea, and partly because, in fact, the war was confined to operations upon land. In all these cases we have been neutrals, and, so far, gainers, by the arrangement that exists, and I think it follows from the argument of the hon. Member for Westminster that it would be hardly suitable or fair for us, who have thus accepted the position of neutrals, and as such acquired the profit of that position, to decline to hold ourselves bound to that engagement if in our turn we should become engaged in war. Having so far reaped the advantages, we are bound to endure the corresponding disadvantages. Again, this circumstance must not be overlooked, that if one part of that Declaration is done away the whole of it disappears. I understand that a good deal of stress was laid on that point in the negotiations—namely, that the several points of that Declaration should be considered as one and indivisible. Now, the minor States have adhered to that Declaration, abandoning the right of privateering, which for those who do not possess navies of their own was, in fact, the only weapon of naval warfare which they could use. If, therefore, the House were to consider that in point of policy the Declaration of 1856 could not be defended, we should then be bound to reflect whether by repudiating our share in that Declaration we should not be reviving certainly, though indirectly, that very practice of privateering which everybody condemns, and by which we probably should be greater losers than anybody else. But I am not arguing that point now as a matter of advantage; I think we have to look at it as a matter of good faith and consistency. We have given a pledge, not merely to the Powers who signed with us, but to the whole civilized world. We have urgently and continuously invited other States to join in that Declaration; we have done so with very considerable success, and it would be hardly intelligible or in accordance with our position to turn suddenly round and change our policy. I think we are bound morally to maintain this compact while those with whom we entered into it maintain it. At any rate, we are so far bound to it that it is impossible to recede from it without the most ample and solemn notice, and without notice of such a duration that no inconvenience could possibly arise from its being acted upon. I admit that it is not an easy matter to decide how far any Government is authorized or enabled to contract an engagement which is perpetually binding. That is a question very often raised on various subjects, and it is one, perhaps, which does not admit of an absolute and general reply. But we must remember that this Declaration has not been an act of the Executive alone. It is quite true that it has not been embodied in a formal treaty; it is quite true that what is done in diplomatic affairs—rightly or wrongly, I will not say, but according to the Constitution of this country—is done on the responsibility of the Executive; but the matter has again and again been brought under the notice of both Houses of Parliament. It was brought before Parliament in some cases by persons for whose authority I have the highest respect, and who undoubtedly had mastered the subject and commanded the attention of those whom they addressed, but on each of those occasions Parliament refused to interfere; it refused to sanction any modification of the terms of the Declaration, and by the silence which it preserved it practically gave its adhesion to that measure. I think, therefore, we are bound constitutionally to assume that public opinion has accepted that arrangement, and that the Legislature is pledged as well as the Executive. I have avoided entirely going into the question of policy. I want the House simply to see how the matter stands at the present day, and for the same reason I shall equally avoid going into that very large and difficult, yet most important, question raised by the hon. Member who immediately preceded me—the question of altogether exempting private property from seizure at sea. I do not think this would be a convenient time for discussing that question, which is undoubtedly one of very grave moment, and which has engaged public attention already on more than one occasion.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, he

quite agreed with what had fallen from the noble Lord, that it would not be convenient to renew, on the present occasion, discussions which had taken place more than once as to the total renunciation of the right to attack the private property of enemies in case of war. He hoped that when they were invited to discuss that question they would have a distinct and explicit notice of it. He had not been persuaded by anything which he had heard on the present occasion of the propriety of making so great a change. The Declaration of Paris was founded upon separate grounds. Each question must be argued upon its own merits, and the one did not necessarily involve the other. It might or might not be right on the merits of the case to change. He had more than once expressed his reasons why he thought it was not, but he dismissed the notion that because they abided by the Declaration of Paris that was any reason why they should renounce any power they now had of prosecuting a war with vigour against an enemy. The considerations which affected neutrals were one thing, those which affected enemies were another. If we receded from that power it must be because we were convinced, which we certainly had not yet been, that such a power was not to us an important and available instrument for carrying on a war. He quite agreed with the hon. Member for Westminster that when we were at war—a very great calamity, indeed, and one to be avoided by all just and honourable means—we must enter earnestly into the war. The notion of a mercantile peace, of exempting the commercial interest from the calamities of war, was one which might have some seduction for the mercantile interest, but which, when we were at war, we must renounce. Then all classes must throw in their stake together, all must bear the common burdens, and it would sap the very life-blood of the nation if we were for a moment to admit that the trade of the country could remain at peace whilst the nation itself was involved in hostilities. He was fully convinced from the results of experience, that the mercantile community was as patriotic as any other body, and as little inclined to demand exemption from sacrifices, though in times of peace they might sometimes lend too willing an ear to suggestions of this kind. He confessed that he looked with very great dislike upon any argument which depended on technical distinctions between the different forms of national engagements. No doubt there was substance in such distinctions' when they were well understood and universally recognized, as involving particular consequences, because all nations entering into engagements with a view to those consequences, prepared themselves for the events which these recognized distinctions might bring about. But he could not think that the mode in which this Declaration was entered into was adopted with a view of entitling any of the parties, of their own will and pleasure, to recede from it. He did not say that it was diplomatically impossible, but he should be most unwilling to contemplate as likely to be necessary a departure by this country from an engagement entered into so solemnly; and to mitigate any alarm which might be felt as to the consequences of that Declaration, he would mention two or three things which had occurred to him in the course of this discussion, as tending to show that it had not introduced so great a difference as some people supposed. Before that Declaration the effect of war was in kind, although perhaps not in degree, very much the same as it might be expected to be since. Neutral vessels did successfully and extensively carry the trade of belligerents, and although no doubt the power of taking enemies' goods out of neutral ships was to a certain extent a check upon the practice, yet, considering how many vessels escaped without search, and what precautions were taken to disguise the ownership of goods, the check was very insignificant compared with the extent to which the practice was carried on. At the same time, the occasions on which the right of search was exercised led to those collisions with neutral Powers, and to that ill feeling on their part to which the noble Lord had referred; and it might well be considered doubtful whether any advantage which was given by the right of seizure was sufficient to counterbalance the irritation produced, and the tendency which that irritation had to make enemies of neutrals. In the case of the Russian war we voluntarily renounced the right, and it was under the influence of the experience of that war, in carrying on which we found that we were not crippled by that renunciation, that we concurred in the Declaration of Paris. The effect of the changes referred to by the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood), which had been brought about by the use of steam in navigation, and by the increase of railways on the Continent, had, he thought, been very much exaggerated, and was, at all events, totally independent of the operation of the Declaration of Paris. The success of the ravages of the *Alabama* had nothing to do with the operation of the Declaration of Paris, in the first place, because that Declaration had not been concurred in by the United States; and, secondly, because in their war with the Confederate States the United States voluntarily announced to other Powers that they intended to act upon its principles, by which, however, they were not prejudicially affected, because the blockade of the Southern coasts was so complete that, in point of fact, the Confederates carried on no legitimate and ordinary trade in neutral vessels, but they did carry on a great contraband trade which it was necessary to interfere with, and which they would have been entitled to stop, if they had been parties to the Declaration of Paris, just as much as if the Declaration of Paris had never been made. If it was the fact that the introduction of steam had made it impossible for Powers like England and the United States to protect their own commerce during war—which he took leave to doubt —that was a matter entirely unconnected with the right to capture enemies' goods in neutral ships, and would rather tend to show that maritime power could no longer be brought to operate effectively against commerce at sea so as to make the difference between the maritime strength of one country and another very material, inasmuch as, according to this argument, the smallest Power could, without remedy, destroy the commerce of the greatest. At all events, that was not a consequence of the Declaration of Paris; and the same remark applied to any effects which might follow from the extension of railways on the Continent. The only effect of that Declaration was, that whereas there was before a great tendency for the trade of belligerents to seek safety by means of neutral assistance, its security, in the use of those means, was now more absolute and complete. But all arrangements of that nature would be merely temporary, and at the conclusion of a war things would return to their natural condition. He would not trouble the House further, but he was anxious to protest against the idea that because we had concurred in the Declaration of Paris, and might not, except under the pressure of great urgency and after full notice, be disposed to recede from it, therefore it followed that we should renounce other rights of value and importance upon which we might have to rely in carrying on future wars.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, the hon. and learned Gentleman told them that very little had been changed by the Declaration of Paris; he apprehended, however, that the effect of it would be that, supposing this country was at war with a State such as Portugal, the consequence must be that the rate of insurance would be raised on commerce taken in English bottoms, and that, consequently, merchants, patriotic or otherwise, would ship in foreign bottoms so as not to have to pay a high rate of insurance. He hoped the noble Lord at the head of the Foreign Office would not hold the policy of the late Government, who were determined to do nothing but take a step backwards; but that he would recollect that all other nations were willing to come to an agreement on the question if England assented to it.

MR. DARBY GRIFFITH confessed that he was unable to follow the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary in the distinction which he appeared to draw between an ordinary war and one of the highest importance, involving the very existence of a nation.

IRELAND—HABEAS CORPUS SUSPENSION ACT.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. WHALLEY rose to call attention to the long-continued suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and to move—

> "That it is the opinion of this House that it is the duty of the Government to investigate thoroughly the causes of the disaffection still existing throughout those parts of Ireland where the bulk of the population profess the Roman Catholic religion; and especially to investigate the nature of the doctrines taught at the Royal College of Maynooth and other Roman Catholic seminaries, supported by public grants, with a view to ascertain whether such doctrines are to any, and what, extent the causes of such disaffection to the laws, institutions, and Government of this country."

The hon. Member said it would be in the recollection of the House that on Friday week last the hon. and learned Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen) brought forward the subject of the state of Ireland, and observed that disaffection still continued there, and that unless a remedy were applied, emigration would go on, and the disaffection increase. The hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Maguire) said the disaffection would not only increase, but go to the root of the Empire and affect the army and the navy and every department of the State. That debate was a very important one. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the Government could not conceal from themselves what was taking place.

Mr. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Gentleman that he was precluded by the rules of debate from referring, as he proposed to do, to what had taken place in that House on a former occasion during the present Session.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he would then refer to what had occurred in the other House of Parliament. Earl Russell—["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. Member referring to what has taken place during the present Session?

Mr. WHALLEY: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must then inform the hon. Gentleman that he is entirely out of Order.

Mr. WHALLEY: In the other House, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that, at all events, the speakers on the occasion of the debate upon the Motion brought forward by the hon. Member for Clare had attributed the Irish disaffection to the causes to which he had alluded, and in the course of that debate the hon. Member for Cashel—["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: Surely, the hon. Member must be aware that detailed references to a former debate, such as those the hon. Gentleman is now making, are entirely out of Order.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that notwithstanding what had been done for Ireland the state of that country was as unsatisfactory as ever, and they were told that nothing could do her good except the settlement of the three questions of the Land tenure, the Established Church, and denominational education. He thought that he was, therefore, justified in asking the House to express its opinion that a thorough inquiry should be made into the causes of the existing disaffection, which was not only not yielding to the remedies applied to it, but, as he believed, increasing everywhere in strength. In regard to the second part of his Motion, it was true that an inquiry did take place into the management of Maynooth in the year 1854, that the Report, which was upon the shelves of the Library of the House, was the greatest insult to the Queen and the House that could be imagined, as hon. Members must admit when he informed them that the Report, after being drawn up in England, was sent to Rome for correction and approval, and was returned with columns of interpolations extremely conspicuous, for they were all written in red ink. He asked for an inquiry now, with some degree of confidence, from the fact that from that quarter all their troubles came in Ireland. Those were the views of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer some thirty years ago, when he wrote his patriotic Runnymede letters. He would not introduce these things to the House if he did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman had an object and purpose in writing them. [Mr. Osborne: You have read them before.] He would not read them if he did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman used the words he did for a purpose which reflected the highest honour upon him. These letters pointed out the fatal consequences which it was alleged might be expected from the alliance between the Whig party and Mr. O'Connell and his friends. He would now call attention to some passages contained in the *Letters addressed to the People of England*, thirty years ago, by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. In one letter the right hon. Gentleman stated that the country was sinking beneath a power before which the proudest conquerors had quailed —namely, the power of a foreign priesthood. That was the fact which he (Mr. Whalley) had always asserted. The hon. Member for Cashel (Mr. O'Beirne) stated the other evening that it had been arranged amongst the Gentlemen from Ireland that they would not reply to him; but if they did not think fit to reply to him, they ought at least to allow him to be heard. [Mr. Osborne: Give us something new.] He had endeavoured laboriously from time to time to bring before the House many matters of importance but had been prevented by clamour from being heard. He would now continue his quotations from the letters. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that the Papacy was independent of the Pope, and that the object of the Papacy was to ride rough-shod over England. He (Mr. Whalley) had frequently uttered similar sentiments; and Dr. Manning had stated the other day that the same intention still existed. The letters went on to say that to do justice to Ireland they were called upon to do injustice to England, and to assist the cause of Papal supremacy, and added—

> "Had Parliament been aware that they were extending the power of the priesthood under the pretence of emancipating a people, the miserable dilemma of modern politics would never have occurred."

He also found this passage—

> "The people of England recoil with disgust from such dangerous balderdash."

He (Mr. Whalley) was afraid of being seduced into reading too many extracts. It was a mere synopsis of the history of the world that the Romish priesthood claimed equality for the purpose of obtaining supremacy. They could not exist in a country like Ireland without, to the utmost extent, making their power antagonistic to the rest of the Empire, and the fulcrum by which the object of elevating their Church was to be obtained. He hoped the Government would turn their attention to this matter, and have an inquiry instituted into the doctrines and teaching of the Roman Catholic priesthood in the Colleges supported by the State. To show the importance of the investigation he would state what resulted from the present mode of dealing with these matters. A most abominable book, containing most horrible things, had recently been circulated throughout the country. On the occasion of the discussion of the question of nunneries, which was introduced by the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), he stated that the result of indifference to these matters was, that people in different parts of the country would be roused to indignation by seeing such prisons, and that they would pull the places down. On that occasion he (Mr. Whalley) stated that he could foresee greater danger than the destruction of nunneries—namely, the circulation of the abominable book which he held in his hand.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the name of the book?

MR. OSBORNE: *Runnymede.*

MR. WHALLEY: *The Confessional Unmasked.* One of the sheriffs of the City of London was under the Gallery at the time, and he was so amazed to see what the House of Commons had come to, that he went home, and within a week, by the aid of a society, had 10,000 copies of the book printed and a copy sent to every Member of both Houses of Parliament. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would lend the weight of his authority to institute an investigation into the nature of the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic priesthood.

MR. SPEAKER asked if any Member seconded the Motion; and, there being no response, he intimated that it found no seconder.

MR. WHALLEY observed that he did not make a Motion, but only called attention to the subject.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £128,635, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Advances for Greenwich Hospital and School, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1868."

MR. NORWOOD rose, according to Notice, to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, what progress had been made towards appropriating a wing of the Hospital to the purposes of the *Dreadnought* Hospital ship? The hon. Gentleman said that in 1864 the Committee of the *Dreadnought* found that the ship was insufficient for their purpose; and, moreover, that large hulk caused great inconvenience to the navigation of the Thames. The Committee therefore felt it to be absolutely necessary that they should obtain a local habitation on land, and they took some steps for the purchase of a site on which they hoped to be able to build a hospital. It had since occurred to them, however, that, owing to the recent changes in the constitution of Greenwich Hospital, it was reasonable for them to apply to the Government for a portion of that large building. A deputation had accordingly waited on Lord Derby on the subject in the spring, and his Lordship in the most frank and ready manner acquiesced in the application then made. When Lord Derby acceded to their request, the President of the Board of Trade and the First Lord of the Admiralty were present; and it was understood that the expense of adapting the portion of Greenwich Hospital assigned to them for their purpose should be defrayed by the authorities of the *Dreadnought.* The portion of the Hospital which the Committee of the

Dreadnought were anxious to obtain was the Queen Anne's quarter; but when they communicated with the Admiralty on the subject, the Admiralty met them with the statement that it doubted very much whether the Queen Anne's quarter would be the one most desirable for their purpose; that some other portion of the Hospital would be preferable, and that a committee of medical men should decide which was the most suitable portion. That question had been on the *tapis* from the commencement of March up to the present time, and he was sorry to say it was not yet decided. He could not understand the difficulty which the Board of Admiralty raised on the subject. Greenwich Hospital was now nearly empty; and, as the Committee of the *Dreadnought* were to bear the expense of converting the part of the Hospital which might be assigned to them, he thought they ought to be allowed to select it for themselves. They wished to have the Queen Anne's quarter; but the Admiralty said that Queen Mary's quarter would be better for their purposes. Now, the Queen Anne's quarter was the one abutting upon the Thames; it had stairs from the River into the Hospital, so that accident cases, of which there were many on the River, could easily be taken into the Hospital; and it was also capable of being separated from the rest of the Hospital at a very small expense. Looking upon the Mercantile Marine as the nursery of the Royal Navy, remembering also how their sixpences had gone towards that institution, and considering likewise that Greenwich Hospital was not now occupied for other purposes, he thought there existed a strong claim on the part of the Committee of the *Dreadnought* to the portion of the Hospital to which he had referred. The hon. Member concluded by asking for explanations on that subject from the Secretary to the Admiralty.

Mr. AYRTON said, he had brought that subject before the House when the late Board of Admiralty introduced their measure for the reform of Greenwich Hospital, and they then promised to take it into their consideration, and as far as possible to meet the wishes of the Committee of Management of the *Dreadnought* Hospital. Since then that body and the Board of Admiralty had been in constant communication in regard to the carrying out of the pledge given by the late Board; but it was much to be regretted that up to this time neither of the parties had arrived at a satisfactory adjustment. It was, perhaps, very natural that the Board of Admiralty should wish to relegate the authorities of the *Dreadnought* into the back part of the Hospital, instead of handing over to them the very front wing, which was the most conspicuous as well as the most agreeable part of the building; but it was unfortunate in a case like that, in which the interests of our crippled and maimed seamen were more concerned than anything else, that they should be left in a difficulty while a long contention was going on between the governing body of the *Dreadnought* and the Admiralty. It was clear that some day or other the Government would wish to appropriate Greenwich Hospital to some useful purpose. Such a building could hardly be left in a great degree untenanted; because, even after the authorities of the *Dreadnought* had obtained one part of it or another, the greater portion of it would still remain deserted. There was a building which had been used in connection with Greenwich Hospital, but which was entirely independent of it, and which had been erected expressly for the sick. He meant the infirmary, situate at the side of the high road leading to the landing-place at Greenwich, and he thought it would be much better, as an agreement could not be come to respecting the appropriation of the Queen Mary's or Queen Anne's wing, to consider the expediency of appropriating to the *Dreadnought* Hospital that infirmary, which possessed every convenience for such a purpose. For the sick persons now in the infirmary abundant accommodation could be provided in the body of Greenwich Hospital. That arrangement would be better than either of the other arrangements now proposed; and he thought it was most undesirable, where funds were not superabundant, that they should be wasted in contention or in the erection of unnecessary buildings. He trusted that the Admiralty, if they could not meet the views of the Governors of the *Dreadnought,* would consider the expediency of taking their own sick out of the infirmary, putting them in one of the wings of the Hospital, and giving up the infirmary to the Governors of the *Dreadnought.*

Mr. CHILDERS trusted that the Government would take the course he had recommended of clearing Greenwich Hospital altogether, retaining in other naval hospitals the few who had no friends to go to, and were on their backs, and giving pensions to the rest, who would be much happier in their own homes if they received enough to live upon. In this way the Hospital proper would be cleared at once; and only the infirmary occupied. He hoped that when the infirmary was also cleared, the suggestion of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets would be adopted. That was an arrangement which would take some little time, but the *Dreadnought* authorities would be undoubtedly glad to wait if in the end the infirmary buildings were at their disposal. That would leave the four large blocks of Greenwich Hospital entirely separate from the infirmary to be dealt with as a whole. In answer to a Question which had been put to him at an earlier period by the hon. Member for Devizes (Mr. Darby Griffith), he might say that several proposals have been made for the occupation of Greenwich Hospital. The four great buildings might be devoted in part to the extension of the school; and the establishment of a girl's school had been strongly urged, almost as a claim, on behalf of the seamen. He did not say that this would be a desirable arrangement, but there was another arrangement for which the Hospital was admirably adapted. Every one knew that the Admiralty and the War Office were at their wits' end to know how to get surgeons, the increased pay offered to them having failed to obtain the additional number required. Some better measures must therefore be taken to obtain the large number of medical men required for the army and navy. He would suggest to the authorities that if they wanted a steady supply of young medical men for the army and navy, they must tap the spring higher up, and establish a Medical College in which young men could be trained as surgeons for the two services. If it were found necessary to establish such a college, Greenwich Hospital would be the best place for it. If, however, it were occupied in some other way, a large expense would have to be incurred in building such a college either in London or elsewhere. He hoped that this would be well considered before the Hospital was appropriated to any other purpose.

SIR CHARLES BRIGHT said, he saw very strong objections to the course proposed by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets. He had no doubt that neither of the two wings was at all fit for an infirmary. Queen Mary's wing might be converted at a great expense, but, after all, it would be a most imperfect hospital, and the majority of medical and scientific testimony went to prove that Queen Anne's wing would be most unsuitable in regard to space, ventilation, and light.

LORD HENRY LENNOX begged to say that the hon. Member for Hull had correctly described the negotiations which had taken place between the authorities of the *Dreadnought* and the Government with regard to the appropriation of a portion of the hospital to the purposes of the *Dreadnought*. The House was aware that the Government offered the authorities of the *Dreadnought* to hand over to them Queen Mary's wing and a portion of Queen Anne's wing for the accommodation of the officers. The authorities of the *Dreadnought* did not quite approve that offer, and they preferred to have Queen Anne's quarter. Hereupon a medium course was taken. A conference was appointed, entirely free from either an Admiralty, official, or political character, by the result of which the *Dreadnought* authorities agreed to abide. The conference was composed of the Director General of the Medical Department of the Navy, Mr. Alderman Salomons, and Sir Charles Bright, the Members for Greenwich, Colonel Clark, Director of Works to the Admiralty; several medical gentlemen of great eminence, the consulting physicians and surgeons of the *Dreadnought* Hospital, and, by the particular desire of the *Dreadnought* governors Mr. Tatham the consulting surgeon of St. George's Hospital. They reported unanimously that neither the Queen Mary's nor Queen Anne's quarter were suitable for the purposes of the *Dreadnought* Hospital, that they could not be made applicable without considerable expense; but that if one of the two was to be adopted, Queen Mary's was better adapted than Queen Anne's for the *Dreadnought* Hospital. Thus the *Dreadnought* authorities having challenged the decision of the conference found that it unanimously reported that neither quarter was available, and that the one they fancied was the least suitable for them. The hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, and the hon. Member for Pontefract had alluded to certain changes which would have the effect of emptying the present infirmary and sending the patients down to Haslar. Sometimes, however, Haslar Hospital was quite full, and, in time of war, it would be always full. As an inquiry was pending into the question of Greenwich Hospital, he would say no more than that the suggestions of hon. Members should receive due consideration in the Committee. Until that Committee had reported the Admiralty would, of course, give no pledge that any one of the changes pressed upon them that evening should be adopted.

Mr. CANDLISH wished to know why it was that an inspector general of hospitals, with a salary of £821 had been appointed for the first time since the superannuation of the previous inspector general, after the Act of 1849? The cost of the medical staff had increased from £2,000 last year to £3,500, without any increase whatever in the number of inmates of the Establishment. He also wished to know why eighteen policemen were employed at the Hospital, when, as he believed, a couple of policemen would be ample for all the purposes of the Establishment?

Mr. Alderman LUSK asked what all the various people employed in and about the Hospital could find to do. There was a captain-superintendent, two lieutenants, a deputy inspector general of the hospital, four assistant-surgeons, steward, chief mate, and others to look after some 300 patients. He also wished to know how the item of £80 for clothing for policemen arose; and how it was that eighty-eight nurses were employed for 350 old people, not all bedridden? He suggested that the Vote might very well be reduced by the sum of £5,000.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, it should be borne in mind that the managers of the *Dreadnought* were prepared at their own expense to convert the block of Greenwich Hospital, which they considered most appropriate for their purpose, so as to make it suitable for the reception of their patients. The managers were aware that there were some difficulties in giving them the block which they desired; but, at the same time, they were firmly of opinion that Queen Anne's quarter was the only one suitable, and that Queen Mary's quarter could not be made so, whatever expense might be expended upon it. Medical officers had, moreover, testified that Queen Anne's quarter was the only one that would answer the purpose, and if the Government would grant that quarter they were perfectly willing to incur any expense in its alteration.

Mr. CORRY said, the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish) had adverted to the appointment, by the present Government, of a medical inspector general to Greenwich Hospital. In answer to the remarks of the hon. Gentleman he had to state that that appointment was made in compliance with the requirements of an Order in Council, dated the 16th of February, 1866, which was before the present Government came into office. The existing Board of Admiralty had merely carried out the intentions of their predecessors. The hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Alderman Lusk) had alluded to the question of the police in connection with the Hospital. He (Mr. Corry) had at a former period of the evening admitted that the police force was larger than was required, and he was in hopes that some reduction would be effected. The hon. Member for Cashel (Mr. O'Beirne) had touched upon the question of what quarter of the Hospital should be appropriated for the purposes of the *Dreadnought* Hospital. That matter had occupied the attention both of the public and the Government for some time past. When he entered upon the duties of his present office, he found that the subject of the desirability of giving one of the quarters to the managers of the *Dreadnought* had been under the notice of his right hon. Friend the late First Lord of the Admiralty, and present Secretary for War, and that the official gentlemen to whom the matter was referred had advised the Admiralty to give Queen Mary's quarter for the purposes required. Upon intimation to this effect being made to the managers of the *Dreadnought*, a letter was written to the Admiralty in reply, containing the testimony of the consulting surgeon of the *Dreadnought*, to the effect that that quarter was completely unfitted for the purposes to which the managers of the *Dreadnought* proposed to devote it. The Admiralty, upon receiving this information, requested the Privy Council to appoint Mr. Simon, their medical officer, to investigate the matter; but as he could not spare the necessary time the inquiry was handed over to two other medical gentlemen, who were perfectly competent to undertake it. These gentlemen reported to the Admiralty, giving their decided preference for Queen Mary's quarter. The Admiralty then offered the use of this quarter, together with such adjoining portions of Queen Anne's as might be necessary for officer's quarters. Subsequently a conference took place between the Admiralty and the *Dreadnought* authorities. The Admiralty, in the course of their inquiries found that the demand of the managers of the *Dreadnought* was unsupported by a single medical officer, and that, with the exception of two medical gentlemen connected with that ship, they had all reported in favour of Queen Mary's quarter. Under these circumstances the Admiralty could hardly have done otherwise than adhere to their decision, and place Queen Mary's quarter at the disposal of the authorities of the *Dreadnought*.

Mr. NORWOOD wished to say in explanation that he was not aware that the Committee that reported on Friday last were unanimous. He had understood that there was a division among them, one body ranging themselves on one side and one on the other.

Mr. WHALLEY agreed with the hon. Member for Finsbury that £41,000 of the revenues of Greenwich Hospital, which were invested in lands, caused a vast expenditure in management, and thought that it would be better to convert the estates into money.

Mr. DU CANE said, he had explained before that the question whether the estates of Greenwich Hospital should be sold was one which come under the consideration of the Committe now sitting to inquire into the whole subject of management. He had also said that the question was one of considerable difficulty, because when it was gone fully into by the Royal Commission of 1859 they reported that it was one of those subjects upon which a great deal might he said on both sides. If the whole landed and house property belonging to Greenwich Hospital was sold, and the proceeds of the sale invested in the funds or other good securities, they might get rid of the trouble and expense of management; but, on the other hand, they would lose any advantage which might arise in future years to the revenues of the Hospital, from a gradually improving property, which that of the Hospital undoubtedly was at the present time, and, according to good authorities on the subject, was likely so to continue. The Committee now sitting on the management of the Hospital had only met a few times, and being fully alive to the difficulty of the question, had naturally carefully avoided coming to any hasty decision upon the subject. With regard to the question put by the hon. Member for Finsbury as to the number of nurses and sick attendants employed in the Hospital, he had to explain that he believed the average of such nurses to each pensioner was one in five as compared with one one in seven at Haslar and other naval hospitals. But this larger proportion was to be accounted for by the fact that the whole of Greenwich Hospital might now be regarded as an infirmary. There were no pensioners there who might not be looked upon as very infirm, and, in many cases, thoroughly imbecile and helpless; and besides he was given to understand that at Greenwich the nurses and attendants on the sick assisted in cleaning out the wards and doing other duties which were not required to be done by the same class of persons in other hospitals, but were performed partly by the convalescents, and partly by labourers appointed for the express purpose. With respect to the number of police employed, that was a question which would meet with full consideration. He admitted that the number at first sight appeared to be excessive and called for inquiry; but this conideration should not be overlooked—that whereas at most military and naval hospitals there was no admittance except on business, and the police had only one entrance to guard, Greenwich Hospital consisted of a large range of buildings, with several entrances, almost the whole of which were open to the inspection of the public during the day time, and not only on Sundays and holydays, but also on the week-days throughout the greater part of the year; there was a great influx of visitors, so that a greater number of police was required than at Haslar and other naval hospitals.

Mr. CHILDERS said, with respect to the inspector general of Greenwich Hospital, it was quite true that the late Government had it in contemplation to appoint such an officer when the Establishment contained upwards of 600 inmates; but they did not fill up the appointment. The question therefore very properly arose why, when the number of inmates had so largely decreased, the Admiralty had appointed this officer? With regard to the sale of the Hospital lands, the Government might consider whether or not it was desirable to get rid of that property, and invest the proceeds in the funds. There would be no necessity, however, to take the Three per Cents for investment; there were other funds mentioned in the Act which would produce a very satisfactory income. But, before selling the land they ought to be satisfied that they would get buyers. When a portion of the lands was sold some time since, there were but few buyers; and the result was, as the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. Liddell) knew, that the greater part of the lands fell into the hands of one man. The late Sir James Graham said he never regretted anything so much as the sale of those lands.

Mr. LIDDELL said, that, when the lands referred to were sold, there was no want of competition ; there was, however, no valuation beforehand. In the sale of land in these days it was usual to have a prospective valuation, which secured a higher price for the land. As there appeared to be a strong feeling in the minds of some hon. Members in favour of a sale of the Hospital lands, he would ask them to look at both sides of the question. Land in England was limited in quantity ; but the demand for it was perfectly unlimited, and would go on increasing ; but a time of war, when land rose in value, was precisely the period at which funded property fell. When once you invested in the public stocks you depended on a property of fluctuating value. But land would, no doubt, maintain a fixed value. Mr. Grey, a land valuer of great authority in the North of England, gave it as his opinion that land would advance in value, and, with good and efficient management, was better property than the funds. Such an opinion deserved consideration from the Government before they threw all this land into the market.

Mr. CANDLISH called attention to the increase in the expenses of the medical staff, and moved the reduction of the Vote by £821, the salary of the inspector general of hospitals.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £821, for the Salary of Inspector General of Hospitals, be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Mr. Candlish.*)

Mr. CORRY stated that the appointment had been made on the recommendation of the Inspector General of the Navy, and under the authority of an Order in Council of the date of 16th of February, 1866 ; but he would undertake that that point should be referred to the Committee which was considering the whole of the Greenwich Hospital question, and that the appointment should be rescinded if it should be found unnecessary.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that these were mere ordinary naval appointments, and the inspector general had no rights or privileges beyond those enjoyed by the inspector general at Haslar or Plymouth. He thought the appointment was ill-advised ; but the Admiralty had authorized an efficient Committee to inquire thoroughly into the matter.

Mr. SEELY said, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would lay on the table the reasons which induced the Admiralty to make this appointment.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he hoped it would be understood that no claim for compensation was to be created in case the office should be abolished. It was a common practice with public Boards to pension off one official, and then to appoint another in his place at the same salary.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that no claim for compensation could arise in that case.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £259,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1868, for Public Education in Ireland, under the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland."

Lord NAAS said, he wished, with the indulgence of the Committee, to make a few observations on a subject of the greatest possible importance. He only regretted that he was called upon to do so at so late an hour (Eleven o'clock), but he hoped the Committee would extend to him its indulgence while he endeavoured to lay before it, as briefly as he could, the present state of National education in Ireland, while he, at the same time, offered a few general remarks upon the subject. All who took an interest in this great question must feel gratified, on perusing the Report which had been lately issued, to see that the system still retained its vitality, and was extending its position of usefulness. He found that on the 31st of December, 1865, there were 6,372 National schools in operation in Ireland—the number of children on the roll being 922,000. In December, 1866, there were 6,453 schools, and the number of children enrolled was 910,000, showing a small diminution as compared with the preceding year, still not a large one considering the decrease in the population. The average daily attendance for the year was 316,000. As compared with 1865, there was an increase of 81 in the number of schools in operation in 1866. The attendance was of a more fluctuating character than it had previously been. The Returns showed a decrease of 1·2 per cent in the number of children enrolled, and of 1·5 per cent in the number in average daily attendance. Considering the general circumstances of the country, we might congratulate ourselves that there was not a greater falling off in the number of children at school, and upon the progressive increase that had taken place for a number of years. Taking decennial periods, the Returns showed extraordinary rapidity in the extension of the National system in Ireland. In 1836 there were 1,100 schools, attended by 153,000 children; in 1846 there were 3,600 schools, attended by 456,000 children; in 1856 there were 5,245 schools, attended by 560,000 children; and in 1866 there were 6,400 schools, attended by 910,000. It was well to remember the enormous proportion of the cost of the system which was borne by the Parliamentary Vote and the comparative smallness of the sum derived from local sources. In fact, it might be said that the cost of the system was defrayed almost entirely out of the Vote of that House. Excluding workhouse, prison, and asylum schools, the amount contributed locally to the salaries of teachers was £52,000, and the total amount received by the teaching staff was £309,000. Therefore, 17 per cent of the total sum was raised locally, while 83 per cent was thrown upon the Vote of that House. Still very considerable sums had been subscribed for, and great exertions made by private individuals, in the building of new schools and for the residences of schoolmasters. There was one circumstance which would have great interest for the Committee. We had often heard of there being great objection to the system on the part of a considerable body of the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland. Now, however, a large number of National schools were under the direct patronage and management of the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. The total number of patrons was 2,344, and of these 1,132, or nearly one-half, were Roman Catholic clergymen; and of the 6,000 schools, excluding workhouse and gaol schools, 4,000 were actually under the patronage of the Roman Catholic clergy. Thus it appeared that, however great and weighty might have been the objections urged against the system, these objections did not deter the Roman Catholic clergy from taking an active part in the management of the education given. Of the 159 schools added to the list in the course of last year, 94 were under the direct patronage and management of Roman Catholic priests, and the list showed seventy-one new patrons among the Roman Catholic clergy. On the whole, there did not appear to be any falling off in the interest which the Roman Catholic clergy had for so many years shown in the system. Of all the difficulties connected with the system, none had exceeded that arising from the objections to mixed schools —that is, schools in which children of different religious persuasions are taught together; and if it had been possible to teach in one school children of one religions persuasion only, many objections that had been taken to the system would have entirely disappeared. There were now 3,720 mixed schools, and 2,630 unmixed schools, and in the mixed schools the minority was often small. In Munster, there were 546 schools taught by Roman Catholics, and there were only 3 per cent of Protestants in them; but even the smallness of that minority should not prevent their considering the great importance of the question, and the difficulty which would arise if the schools were made purely denominational schools and this minority were to a certain extent deprived of education. In Ulster, where the population was equally divided, there were also a great number of mixed schools; and 25 per cent of Roman Catholics were taught in Protestant schools. Therefore, although the smallest minority in the mixed schools was to be found in the province of Munster, yet a very large proportion of the education given was of a mixed character. He would not show what was the general effect of the education given by the National system upon the general population of the country. It was difficult to say, from the number of children actually upon the rolls, what was the exact amount of the education given; but by a very careful investigation made in 1861, in connection with the Census Returns, it was ascertained that on the 17th of May there were 443,000 children at poor schools, 304,000 at the National schools, and 139,000 at other schools; so that two-thirds of the children were educated at National schools, and one-third at other schools—Church education, Christian Brothers' Orphanages, and private schools. The number of children on the rolls in December, 1866, was returned by the Commissioners of National Education at 910,000. By the Census of 1861 it was ascertained that 73 per cent of the whole number on the books of all the schools attended more than six weeks in the year, so that it was fair to suppose that during last year 664,300 children attended National schools for more than six weeks in the year. Therefore, taking the proportion of the other schools in the same manner, he found that the attendance was 318,000, making a total of 983,000 attending school during that period. That gives a very fair view of the system of primary education given by these institutions in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Bruce) had said that an attendance of one-sixth of the population was a proportion which was only to be found in the most favourably situated districts of England; but, as the population of Ireland was now taken at 5,500,000, an attendance of 983,000 children exceeded that proportion by no less than 50,000. That of itself would, he thought, be sufficient to prove the great success and the great usefulness of the National system of education in Ireland; for though, as the Committee would see from the figures he had laid before them, it did not pretend to a monopoly of the education of the country, its effect upon other institutions had been exceedingly good, inasmuch as it had led to a feeling of rivalry which had been attended by very beneficial results. He hoped the short statement that he had made would put the Committee in possession of the general character of the National system in Ireland in regard to primary education. The results of that system had been much greater than its most sanguine supporters could have anticipated some years ago. He would, before going further, refer to some of the objections which had been urged against the system, but as the subject had been so often discussed in that House it would only be necessary to refer to a few of the most prominent. For many years, no doubt, the National system of education was seriously objected to by a large and influential portion of the population of Ireland. The Committee would doubtless recollect that many of the clergy and the members of the Established Church urged objections on the ground that they could not conscientiously support any system of education in which the daily use of the Scriptures was not enforced in the case of every child attending the school. Some years ago, in consequence of some changes made by the Board of Commissioners of National Education, the late Archbishop Whately and Mr. Blackburne, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, retired from that Board. As time wore on, there was hardly a year in which some objections were not taken in some quarter to the system. Although, in the early days of the system, the great body of the Roman Catholic population and their clergy expressed themselves most favourably towards it, yet that support was gradually withdrawn until about eight or nine years ago formal and serious objections were announced by the Roman Catholic Prelates in Ireland, and, in a letter which they addressed to Lord Carlisle in 1859, they stated their objections in the following strong terms:—

> "Deeply impressed with a conviction of those dangers which must increase in proportion as education is placed beyond the rightful control of the Church, the Catholic Bishops deem it a solemn duty to convey to Her Majesty's Government the expression of the growing anxiety which naturally fills their minds on finding their authority so completely disowned in the various schemes for educating the Irish people which have been put in operation for several years."

They then continued, after referring to their objections, at length—

> "They, therefore, respectfully but earnestly request such a participation in Educational Grants for the separate instruction of Catholic children as the numbers and fidelity of the Catholic people, as well as their contributions to sustain the burdens of the State, amply entitle them."

That was the first opposition put forward by the Roman Catholic Clergy. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford (Mr. Cardwell), who at that time filled the office which he (Lord Naas) now had the honour of holding, in replying to that letter in November, 1859, after saying that Her Majesty's Government desired in the first instance to express, in the plainest terms, their steadfast adherence to the principles on which the National system of education had been erected, proceeded to say—

> "They have been repeatedly and deliberately considered in Parliament, and constitute the recognized conditions on which education in Ireland receives assistance from the State. Her Majesty's Government observe with regret that some of the demands preferred in the Memorial are wholly incompatible with the maintenance of these principles. If those demands were conceded, the National system would be overthrown; and a system of sectarian education substituted for it calculated to revive social divisions in Ireland, and to stimulate feelings which it is the object of every just and liberal Government to allay."

That letter was written with great ability, and put in the strongest manner possible the objections which were to be urged against the proposal of the Bishops. A long rejoinder on the part of the Bishops followed, dated March, 1861, and for several years afterwards no active part seemed to have been taken by the Roman Catholic clergy. It was true that several Motions were made in that House, and the question was discussed, but no very active symptoms of opposition were made on the part of the Prelates who signed the Memorial of 1859. In January of last year, however, a most important document was addressed to the Government by the Roman Catholic Prelates, in which they not only reiterated, but considerably amplified their former objections. They said—

> "The schools under the National Board divide themselves into two classes—the ordinary National schools and the model schools; and, again, the ordinary schools may be sub-divided into such as are attended by pupils of one religious denomination only, and those attended by children of different denominations, the former exclusively Catholic or Protestant, the latter mixed. First, then, as to schools exclusively Catholic or Protestant, be they vested or non-vested, a change of great importance ought to be made, and can be made, without any difficulty. It is simply to remove all restrictions upon religious instruction, to permit the fulness of distinctive religious teaching to enter into the course of daily secular education, with full liberty for the performance of religious exercises and the use of religious emblems, and to recognize the right of the lawful pastors of the children in such schools to have access to them, to regulate the whole business of religious instruction in them, and to remove objectionable books, if any."

They went on to say—

> "Were the proposed change adopted, not only would the great majority of the schools now in connection with the Board assume a religious character, but many Catholic schools of nuns, monks, and others, could be taken into connection with the Board, which schools are now excluded from all participation in the Grants of money for Education, because their conductors will not accept aid from the Board on condition of observing the rules restricting the liberty of religious instruction. Under the proposed change, in exclusively Catholic schools the teachers should be Catholic; the books treating of religious, moral, or historical matters, Catholic; the inspectors Catholic, and if objectionable, subject to the veto of the Catholic Bishop in the diocese in which their duties would lie."

With regard to the mixed schools their proposal was—

> "To fix the time for religious instruction at the end of school hours, strictly requiring that it should not commence for the majority of the pupils, or any of them, till after the departure of every one of the minority professing a different creed, and, in any case of proved interference with the faith of any belonging to the minority, to strike the school off the list of schools entitled to aid from the Board."

Then, with regard to the model schools which formed an important portion of the system, they said—

> "But one thing can be done with these schools—to do away with them altogether. Nothing else will satisfy the Catholic bishops, clergy, and people. A regard to public economy, too, calls for their suppression."

The demand, therefore, that they made was really and entirely to revolutionize the whole system of education. That letter was dated the 14th of January, 1866, and on the 30th of January the right hon. Baronet the Member for Morpeth (Sir George Grey), then the Secretary of State for the Home Department, wrote as follows:—

> "I enclose a copy of the Memorial and of the answer given to it on the part of Her Majesty's Government by Mr. Cardwell, who then held the office of Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. To the opinions expressed in that answer Her Majesty's Government adhere, and they would regard with sincere regret any step tending to the overthrow of a system of education which they believe to be well adapted to the peculiar circumstances of Ireland, and to have been the means of conferring very great advantages on that country. . . . Her Majesty's Government, however, think it right that this memorial should be communicated to the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, and that they should be invited to offer their observations upon it. Their attention should be particularly directed to the statements contained in the Memorial as to the model schools."

The whole matter stood in that position at the beginning of last year. It appeared, as far as he could gather from those documents, that the late Government had then made up their minds to leave the system as it was, or that, at least, there was no intention on their part to propose any considerable change. But on the 19th of June his right hon. Friend (Mr. Chichester Fortescue) addressed to the Commissioners a communication which he thought must be taken as to a certain extent an answer to the demands of the Roman Catholic Bishops, and which stated the steps Government consented to take in order to comply as far as possible with those demands. His right hon. Friend, in the proposal which he made in that communication, appeared to direct his attention principally to the training of teachers, and to an alteration which he proposed to make by the composition of certain model schools which were intended to be established by him. His right hon. Friend stated—which he believed to be to a great extent the case—that there was a considerable want of trained teachers for the poor schools throughout the country. He said that out of 7,472 teachers, 4,309 were untrained; so that more than one-half of the teachers giving instruction in the National schools of Ireland had not received sufficient training. He therefore proposed, as a further stimulant to private enterprize, to establish model schools under local management. But the model schools thus proposed were of an essentially different character from any before established under the National system. To each was to be connected a domestic establishment, containing boarding-house accommodation for fifteen resident pupils. The day schools in connection with the model schools were to be conducted in the ordinary manner, except as regarded a point to which he should hereafter call attention. It was intended—indeed, this was not denied—that the new model schools should be essentially of a denominational character ; that the teachers in each school should, as far as possible, be members of one religious persuasion, and that they should be educated as such. It was also intended that the normal establishment in Dublin, where teachers were trained, should be altered to a considerable extent. Heretofore, in that normal establishment, all the teachers, no matter what the religious denomination to which they belonged, resided together ; but it was proposed, in the plan of his right hon. Friend, that there should be a denominational separation ; that the Protestant teachers should live in one house, and the Roman Catholic teachers in another house. This brought him to another portion of the proposal, which thoroughly and entirely stamped the whole plan as one of a denominational character. It was proposed that chaplains should be appointed not only to the normal establishment in Dublin, but to the new district model schools throughout the country ; and it was quite clear that the duty of those chaplains was not to be restricted to the teachers who came to be trained, because they were to have an allowance of £1 for each teacher, and of 10*s*. for each pupil. It appeared to him therefore that the proposal was nothing more or less than to establish a new sort of model schools altogether, which should be entirely denominational,and entirely novel as regarded the existing system of National education in Ireland. They were to be founded with a particular object—that of meeting so far as possible the objections taken by the Roman Catholic clergy to the system of mixed education in that country. Well, he found that in consequence of the letter of his right hon. Friend, the Commissioners met several times. They adopted the scheme in the main, and submitted to the Government an Estimate amounting to £19,000, and requested the Government to bring it before Parliament, with the view of getting the funds necessary for giving effect to his right hon. Friend's plan. He had, however, to state that the Board was very much divided in opinion. Of the nineteen Commissioners the opinions of only twelve were known, and of these seven were in favour of the proposition and five were against it. A great deal of discussion on the subject had taken place both in the National Board and also out of doors. There could be no doubt that the proposal had met with a great deal of objection and opposition on the part of a large portion of the population of Ireland. The Presbyterian body, almost to a man, had offered to it the most decided opposition. The Elementary Education Committee of the General Assembly state—

> "Their decided conviction that if these changes, made and threatened, are permitted to be carried out the destruction of the present system of united education in Ireland is inevitable."

The Belfast Presbytery expressed itself in a similar manner. The late Bishop of Derry, the only ecclesiastic of the Established Church who was at that time a Member of the Board, expressed himself publicly, and in letters to him, as decidedly opposed to the plan. It appeared, then, that whether the proposed alteration were good or whether it were bad it was likely to have been a fertile source of discussion and disunion among the best supporters of the National system of education in Ireland; and he did not find that it had been received with any particular enthusiasm on the part of the Roman Catholic body. While it was received with great dislike by one party it was viewed with coldness and evident want of favour by the other party. He thought the Committee must feel it would almost impossible that teachers trained on such a system as that which his right hon. Friend proposed should go forth with any friendly feeling towards a mixed system of education. Again, if the proposed plan were adopted, he wanted to know how it would be possible to maintain the model schools. The Commissioners, speaking of the latter, thus descibed them—

> "The chief objects of model schools are to promote united education, to exhibit the most approved methods of literary and scientific instruction to the surrounding schools, and to train young persons for the office of teacher."

It was quite clear that if the proposal of his right hon. Friend were adopted those new model schools would be established as rival institutions to the old ones. In fact, among the existing schools conducted on the national system there was a considerable amount of rivalry ; but, if those new schools were established, he was afraid we should find them set up in towns as avowed rivals of the old model schools, and that the supporters of the former would do all in their power to withdraw children from the latter. He must express his opinion that such a state of things would be very undesirable. For these reasons they had not thought it right to take on themselves the responsibility of proposing to Parliament the Estimate for carrying this plan into operation. Another Estimate had been submitted to them so lately as the 19th of June by the Commissioners, which had a different object — proposing that they should ask Parliament for a Vote of £1,200 for encouraging the study of the classics and modern languages in the National schools in Ireland. Now, so far as he was concerned, he was, to a certain extent, favourable to the plan; and, in the North of Ireland, he believed that there were many schools where these things might be conveniently learned; but he must remind the Committee that in taking such a step they would be departing a good deal from the principle of primary education, and making it more of an intermediate system. Therefore, without further consideration, they had also declined to adopt that suggestion. They were disinclined to submit to Parliament this year any of those new suggestions which had been made to them. Now, he thought he had said enough to show the Committee, that taking a general view of the state of affairs, it was not at all satisfactory. Great alterations had been made in the rules from time to time. No doubt some of them had been improvements and conduced to the better working of the system; but by these constant changes a spirit of opposition to a great extent was excited, and the result had been that from various quarters every year changes of an important character were constantly being pressed on their notice. These changes when made were always criticized by one party or another—in the most unfriendly manner, and generally in proportion as they most benefited their rivals. There seemed little hope that this system of National education would be accepted by the whole country at large; and he thought it most unfortunate that a subject on which, most of all, there ought to be friendly feeling among the people, should have been the fertile source of dissension, often of party strife and acrimonious discussion. He thought that a very great evil, and on the part of the Government he was unwilling to accept the responsibility of inviting Parliament to make any great change in the system without more accurate information than they at present possessed. Looking back to the whole history of this matter and the great importance of the question, it was the intention of the Government to make one effort to terminate these unfortunate dissensions. They intended to issue a Royal Commission during the recess to inquire into the whole system of primary education in Ireland. Although the system had existed for a great many years, since 1823 there really never had been any positive inquiry into the working of the whole system on the spot. There had been no inquiry since that by the House of Lords in 1854, which terminated its labours without presenting any Report. It was the intention of the Government to endeavour as far as in them lay to constitute the Commission in the fairest possible way. They would endeavour to obtain the services of men who had given great attention to the whole subject of education both in this country and in Ireland, and as far as possible all classes and parties should be fairly represented on the Commission. He could not help thinking that great good might come out of it; and no time would be lost, because the opinions of the Commission would be laid on the table of the House early next Session. They proposed to refer to the consideration of the Commission, matters of the weightiest and most important character. They proposed to refer to them, first, the long-vexed question whether it would be possible, with regard to the safety of the system, to relax the rules under which religious education was given; secondly, the question of the model school system, its expense as compared with its results, its want of success in attracting a large number of scholars, and how far it could be advanced towards a system of intermediate education; thirdly, the alleged want of trained teachers in the non-vested schools, and how the deficiency could be supplied. This objection—the want of trained teachers—was strongly urged by the right hon. Gentleman, and the question might fairly be settled by inquiry. If it turned out, as he believed it would, that a great many teachers in the National schools were not so proficient in ordinary knowledge as they ought to be, it would be a subject for consideration how they might provide more efficient teachers, and devise measures to draw them in greater numbers to the training schools. There was another question of very great importance which could not be decided satisfactorily without some inquiry. He believed it would be of the greatest advantage to the National system of education in Ireland if some system of payment by results could be introduced. Great objection was taken to that, because it was believed that it would have the effect of diminishing the remuneration now enjoyed by some of the teachers in the schools. He regretted that a great number of those teachers were now inadequately paid ; and in considering the adoption of any system of payment by results it should be also considered whether it should not be a supplemental payment added to their present salaries, because he would not like that the whole salary should depend upon the result of the teaching. Another very important point had reference to the constitution of the Board. He admitted that the present Board was composed of very eminent men, although he had the misfortune to differ in politics from every one of them ; but nobody could read the minutes of the Board and their proceedings without seeing that their attendance was very irregular. The most important questions were decided very often in the absence of the most distinguished members, and those who had attended a discussion one day were absent when the matter came on for decision the next. It was, therefore, matter for consideration whether some alteration should not be made in the constitution of the Board, perhaps by reducing the number of its Members, so as to secure the attendance of those who were intrusted with the great responsibility of managing this great system, and that they devoted a great portion of their time to the subject. Another point which would be inquired into was the position of the large number of schools unconnected with the National Board. One-third of all the children receiving primary education were in such schools, and it was a matter for serious consideration whether the benefits of inspection at all events could not be extended to them. In considering this subject regard ought to be had to the wishes and opinions of the great majority of the Irish people, and he believed it would not be difficult to make such changes as would attract a great deal of additional support to the National system. In this country there were persons who contended that secular instruction only should be provided by the State ; but in Ireland he believed that people of all denominations desired that religious instruction should form a large portion of the education given in these schools, and the time had come when an effort should be made to harmonize this great system with the feelings of both the Protestant and Roman Catholic population. While concurring, however, in the principle that religion should form part of all the education given by the State, he did not desire to see the secular instruction subject to ecclesiastical control. This would be contrary to the spirit of the age, and he believed no portion of the laity would wish to give ecclesiastics of any denomination a control over the secular teaching of the people. In the appointment of the Commission the Government had only one object—to endeavour to harmonize the wishes and feelings of the Irish people with this great system of education ; and he believed that by judicious inquiry, and by careful but not sweeping alterations, it was possible to make it what, with all its excellences and usefulness, it had never yet been—namely, a truely national system.

Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE said, he had listened with much interest, but with some disappointment, to the speech of his noble Friend. One of the recommendations made by the Board of National Commissioners, but not adopted by the Government, was the introduction of higher teaching, including a certain amount of instruction in the classics and in modern languages, into some of the National schools. A Memorial, presented to the Commissioners from Ulster, had pointed out that the effect of the establishment of admirable National schools had been to shut up a great many private schools where a classical education used to be imparted, and, as there was no prospect of such schools being again started in face of the rivalry of the State schools, it deserved consideration whether some of the best of the latter might not be allowed to employ teachers capable of giving instruction in the classics and modern languages. Children receiving such instruction would, of course, pay a higher fee ; but he would pronounce no opinion as to whether the State should vote the additional salaries of such teachers. The example of Scotland was encouraging. Many of the Scotch parish schools had long imparted a higher education to the children of the upper classes, and this had had a very beneficial effect on the advancement of Scotchmen in their own country, as well as all over the world. He agreed with much that had fallen from his noble Friend as to the ordinary primary schools under the National system. He believed these schools had had a very beneficial effect. The great majority of them were now, however, constituted upon a system differing in some important respects from that sketched out by the founders of the system, for there were 4,771 non-vested schools, while the schools vested in the National Commissioners, or in local Trustees, according to the original design, numbered only about 1,150. He believed non-vested schools were admirably adapted to the circumstances of the country. They were schools in which the patron and manager, who was in most cases a clergyman, had the right of giving religious instruction in his own creed to the children of his own Church, who usually formed the majority, while they were freely open to all comers as far as secular instruction was concerned, the rights of the minority being carefully protected. They were, in fact, denominational schools with a stringent conscience clause, adapted to a country where the difficulty was not the mixture of children belonging to different Protestant sects, but of Protestants and Roman Catholics. He believed they were working with great success, and the National Commissioners had recently introduced an important improvement by laying down a rule that no child should receive religious instruction from a teacher of another creed, unless in the very exceptional case of a parent deliberately requesting the teacher by a written document to give such instruction. That was a change calculated to give increased confidence to large classes in Ireland, and he rejoiced to find that it had been adopted by the Commissioners. It would be in the recollection of many hon. Members that in May last year a Motion was made by his hon. Friend the Member for Longford (Major O'Reilly), who called upon the Government to make three important changes in the system of National education. In the first place, the hon. Member called upon them to remove the restrictions imposed on religious instruction in those schools in which at any particular time all the children should be of the same religious denomination. The hon. Member next asked for a better protection for the religion of the minority in mixed schools as a security against proselytism, and this object had been attained by the rule to which he had just referred. In the third place, the hon. Member dwelt very strongly in his speech on the objections raised against the training and model schools. It was his duty, on the part of the Government, to resist the first part of the Motion, in the second part of which, however, he entirely agreed. Then, with respect to the third part, he admitted last year the extremely unsatisfactory condition of the training and model schools, which had not the hold they ought to possess on the Roman Catholic population, and that it was the duty of the Government to consider carefully whether some change could not be made in those schools. That admission was made in May, and he noticed the date particularly because his noble Friend seemed to imply that the changes proposed in his letter to the National Board last year had been put off to an unnecessarily late period. However, that might be, he might remark that from the time when he became Chief Secretary in the previous autumn his attention had been very seriously directed to the training and model schools, and upon the Motion of the hon. Member for Longford, he had given a pledge to the House which induced the hon. Member to withdraw that Motion. Of course, therefore, it was his duty to take care to fulfil the pledge, and he accordingly before resigning office made a communication to the National Board. The majority of the National Commissioners adopted those proposals and laid before the Government a plan for carrying them into effect. He was still of opinion that a most important distinction ought to be drawn between the condition and prospects of the primary and of the training and model schools. In 1861 there were 319 teachers in training schools, and of these 237 were Roman Catholics, whereas in 1866 the total number of teachers was 285, of whom only 137 were Roman Catholics. If such a decrease were allowed to go on, there was a prospect of the training schools becoming unavailable for the Roman Catholic body in Ireland. Then, again, it was found that of the 7,472 head and assistant teachers, 4,309, or considerably more than one-half, had not received any regular training at all. For the National Schools 700 new teachers were required yearly, of whom only 400 were prepared in the central training school. As to the model schools it was found that in 1856 the Roman Catholic children attending them were in the proportion of 68 per cent, while in 1866 the percentage of Roman Catholics had fallen from 68 to 24 per cent, while in some of the schools—as, for instance, at Derry and Sligo—there was practically no attendance of Roman Catholics at all. This being the state of the case, the late Government thought it their duty to propose some change which would render these schools more generally useful and conciliate the confidence and goodwill of the Roman Catholic body in Ireland. He was aware that an objection was commonly raised that the decrease of the attendance at the schools was due to the influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood, but he maintained that this was in reality no answer at all. He protested against the attempts so constantly made in Ireland to separate the Roman Catholics from their ecclesiastical Government. It was necessary to take and act upon the facts as they were, including, of course, the influence of the priesthood among a Roman Catholic people. Well, the first proposal of the late Government, in order to make the existing model schools, and especially the great training establishment in Dublin, more acceptable to the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, was that chaplains of different religious denominations should be attached to those schools. Notwithstanding the efforts made to induce clergymen of different denominations to attend the schools to give religious instruction and look after the morals of their children, he knew of only one model school in the whole of Ireland where a Roman Catholic clergman attended for that purpose. The late Government also made the proposal referred to by his noble Friend, with reference to the boarding of teachers, giving teachers in training the option of boarding together in certified boarding-houses instead of within the school walls. Another change proposed was to encourage private enterprize in non-vested model schools in suitable places throughout the country, with a view to give larger scope for local authority, and more freedom as regards the religious character of the schools than could be maintained in the present model schools while under the exclusive control of the National Commissioners. His noble Friend had said that such schools would be totally different from all other schools; they would certainly be different from existing model schools, but not from the majority of ordinary schools, and there was no reason why the non-vested schools should not have their representatives among the model schools. It might be said that such schools, being connected with a particular denomination, would not be sufficiently open to pupils and pupil-teachers; but, admitting that they would not attract members of other denominations as much as members of the one with which the school would be connected, he asked whether the present National schools bore the character of unattractiveness? And were there no National schools connected more closely with one denomination than another? It was notorious that there were numerous schools connected with particular Churches, which, although open to all comers, and never disturbing the religious faith of the scholars, were not likely to be resorted to by children differing in sect from those managing the schools. Thus there were, of course, convent schools giving most valuable teaching to the poor; but he did not speak of those only, nor only of schools under the patronage of Roman Catholic priests. He included those under the management of clergymen of the Established Church and of Presbyterian ministers, some of the latter being closely attached to Presbyterian chapels. Yet if these denominational schools had not been encouraged, there would have been no National system now in existence; at all events, if their number were subtracted from the total given by the noble Lord the result would be very different from his statement. Those in general, then, were the changes the late Government proposed last year in the hope that they would have led to conciliation; they were accepted by the majority of the Commissioners and by many of the best friends of Irish education; it was to be regretted that the present Government had not accepted them also. His noble Friend had said that a great outcry had been raised against them, and that it came almost exclusively from the Presbyterians; but those charges could have done no possible harm to Presbyterian interests, and the objections certainly had the appearance of arising not from the belief that the proposals threatened harm to the Presbyterians, but because they were concessions to the Roman Catholics. But as these questions were again to be inquired into by a Commission he would not further discuss them. He, however, must express the opinion that all the facts were sufficiently in the hands of the Government, and that, if his noble Friend wanted information, he could easily obtain it from the National Commissioners. Indeed the questions to be decided by the Commission seemed to be rather points of policy than fact, and points far more fit for the consideration of a Cabinet than a Comission. But as the labours of the Commission would end before Parliament re-assembled—[Lord NAAS: Hear]—legislation, he presumed, would not be delayed by referring the question as intended. He had understood his noble Friend to shadow forth changes of a denominational kind as the probable result of the Commissioners' labours. But the noble Lord had condemned the proposal of last year because it had some tendency to introduce changes of that kind, so that there appeared to be some inconsistency between the commencement and the end of the noble Lord's speech. It would be of the greatest possible importance to the success and value of the inquiry that the Commissioners by whom it was to be conducted should be properly and carefully chosen. It would be useless, he knew, to offer any opposition to the appointment of the Commission, although he regarded it as an erroneous step on the part of the Government to delegate to such a body duties which they could and ought to perform themselves. He therefore confined himself to the expression of a hope that the inquiry would lead to the real improvement of Irish education.

MR. LEFROY admitted, that success to a certain extent had attended the operations of the National Board. It would be most unnatural if, after the expenditure of enormous sums of money, some progress were not made and some advantages conferred by that institution. But he could not allow the observation of his noble Friend (the Chief Secretary for Ireland) to pass unnoticed, "that on the whole the national system had worked satifactorily." Strong objections were entertained to that system by the Roman Catholic clergy, and were expressed very determinedly in letters addressed to Sir George Grey by the Roman Catholic Bishops. On the other hand the principle which governed the action of the National Board was conscientiously opposed by the Protestant clergy, and as long as an Established Church was suffered to exist in that country the opinions of its members were surely entitled to some weight. Members on all sides of the House, however they might differ in other respects, agreed in this, that education, to be useful in Ireland, must be founded on religion; it must not be mere secular education divested of religion. Various systems had been tried in Ireland unsuccessfully, and by many it was now supposed that nothing but the denominational system remained. But on that point he shared the opinion expressed by a late distinguished Archbishop of the Established Chuch, that he could not approve of giving to the heads of either religious denomination in the country the total care of the education of the children. An admirable speech was reported in that morning's paper as having been made by Earl Russell at a school in the country, in the course of which he told some anecdotes of great crimes having been committed by children who, upon being examined as to how they had been brought up, proved never to have heard of the Scriptures. His Lordship said it was much to be wished that all children could be brought up without sectarian feeling, but instructed in the Bible and in the preaching of the Apostles. Such teaching had his cordial approval; he wished it were general. There was one system capable of adoption to which he confessed that he was unable to see any objection, in a country, at least, where, differing as to forms of religion, they were yet unanimous in holding that religion should be the foundation of education. That system contemplated that grants should be made for progress in secular education alone, and that the religious teaching of the children should be left to the clergy of the several denominations. He thought also the Board ought to be wholly altered, and should consist of a responsible Board of paid members. Inspections ought to be held and Returns made, and the grants apportioned to the progress of the secular education. The religious teaching might safely be left to the clergy at either side, or to the responsible patrons. It was only through the adoption of some such system as this that great progress could be hoped for. Mere intellectual improvement, without grounding in the principles of morality and the truths of Scripture, he regarded as unprofitable and even dangerous; men so trained might become great scourges to the country. He could not see the necessity for a Royal Commission, and he regretted that the Government had not taken a different course.

MR. OSBORNE, at that hour of the morning (One o'clock), and in the thin state of the House, would not attempt to enter on the religious question; but, having watched the National system in Ireland, and being himself connected with several schools, he believed that the system was a total failure. The sum asked for in the Vote, though large, he, for one, should never grudge for the purposes of education in Ireland. He thought it was incumbent on the House of Commons, however, to see how that sum was disposed of, and what was the quality of the education which was supplied. His noble Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland had begun his speech by giving a very satisfactory account of the working of the present system. He stated that one-sixth of the population of the country were at school on a certain day in May. It nevertheless appeared from the last Census that 59 per cent of the population could neither read nor write. How, under those circumstances, could it be fairly said that the system of education in Ireland was satisfactory in its results? His experience convinced him that the system was far more showy than practical in its consequences. It was a system which it grieved him to be obliged to admit was far in advance of the national prosperity of the country, and which was not in accordance with the habits of an agricultural population. Indeed, he believed that much of the discontent which was prevalent in Ireland, and of the emigration from its shores, was promoted by the sort of education which was supplied to the people. And what was the nature of that education? Hon. Members had heard one right hon. Gentleman who had filled the office of Chief Secretary holding out the prospect that there would be another Vote for the purpose of teaching the population of Ireland the classics and French. An agricultural population classics and French! Again the Committee, if they turned to page 27 of the present Vote, would find that there was a sum of £2,000 over and above the grant made to the teachers of those agricultural labourers set down for the teaching of drawing, singing, and navigation. The effect of all that was that a gross imposition was practised on that House and the public. A stranger from this country visited the model schools in Ireland, and certain questions were put to the pupils, and they sung hymns, and the visitor returned home with the idea that the Irish National system of education was perfect. He should like, however, to ask whether any man who made any progress in those model schools ever remained in the country? The fact was that he went elsewhere. And what sort of men were the teachers? It was true that some of them were not adequately paid; but he had some knowledge of them, and he could state that many of them had been infected by Fenian principles. The system of education in Ireland, he might add, was not in accordance with that which was understood to be primary education. As it at present stood it unfitted those who received it for their duties as agricultural labourers, and drove them away from Ireland. He felt confident that some day or other a stricter scrutiny must be applied to the disposition of the Vote to which the Committee was asked to assent. He would next briefly advert to what he looked upon as a very curious point in connection with the subject. There was an Albert agricultural training department in Ireland for the maintenance of agricultural pupils and teachers, the grant for which was £1,280. He found that there were at that school fifty-six agricultural pupils, but he had never seen any one who had been brought up there become a bailiff or a steward on a gentleman's farm. There was a loss on the school of, he believed, £1,250, and that was the way in which the Albert training department was conducted. Nobody could travel through Ireland and see those model schools without admiring their architecture. £28,500 was spent upon them, but what, he should like to know, was the use of them? He was as favourable to education as any man in that House. He could not, however, understand the expenditure of such large sums in education as was now done among a population which must depend upon the spade. As to the proposal which had been made by his noble Friend the Chief Secretary for the issue of a Commission, he could only say that he had no great faith in the result of their labours. Everybody knew the whole of the facts connected with Irish education as matters stood, and the Commission would simply compile a large blue book just as had been done by the Devon Commission, which had collected together more information with respect to Ireland than perhaps any other body of men. To give satisfaction to both parties in Ireland on the subject of education he believed to be impossible. He had the highest respect for the honesty and ability of his noble Friend the Chief Secretary; but he must entreat him not to insist upon teaching the classics and French, drawing, singing, and navigation; and to legislate upon the question without having recourse to a Commission.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir John Gray.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the subject was one of great importance, and that he did not feel surprised hon. Members from Ireland were anxious to discuss it at some length. He must at the same time remind them that the 6th of August had arrived, and that there was such a ceremony as the closing of the Session still to be gone through. He hoped, therefore, that if he assented to the proposal for reporting Progress, hon. Gentlemen would exercise their influence with their friends not to obstruct going into Supply another night; it being absolutely necessary to get through the Votes before the Appropriation Bill could be brought in.

Motion *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock;

Committee also report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

COMPANIES ACT (1862) AMENDMENT BILL—[Bill 221.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Hunt.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, the hon. and learned Member for Richmond had on a former occasion objected to the measure on the ground that it did not sufficiently protect the rights of creditors, and he was bound to say that the Bill, as originally drafted, had gone somewhat beyond the Resolutions of the Committee. Amendments had since then been prepared to obviate that objection. Nothing was further from the intention of the framers of the measure than to diminish the rights or remedies of creditors, and he thanked the hon. and learned Member for his assistance. The hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets also had clauses to propose, and if the Bill were now read the second time it would be the best course to go into Committee upon it *pro formâ* to-morrow, in order that it might be reprinted as amended and placed in the hands of Members with a view to its being discussed, if possible, on Thursday.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Stephen Cave.*)

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER said, the proposed Amendments would, he believed, carry into effect the recommendations of the Select Committee, and he had no objection to the course now suggested.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow,* at Two of the clock.

House adjourned at half after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, August 6, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Report*—On Construction of the House; on Parliamentary Deposits [Second Report].

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Public Health (Scotland)* (306); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (307).

Second Reading—Metropolis Subways * (279); Militia Pay *; Indemnity * (274); Bank Post Bills (Ireland) * (275); Customs Revenue * (284); Inland Revenue * (287); Dominica Loan * (288).

Committee—Poor Law Board, &c.* (303); Barrack Lane, Windsor (Rights of Way) * (295); Weights and Measures (Dublin) * (266); Dublin Metropolitan Police * (267); District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland) * (272).

Report—Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) * (294); Weights and Measures (Dublin) * (266); Dublin Metropolitan Police * (267).

Third Reading—Representation of the People (293); Galashiels Jurisdiction * (260); Royal Military Canal * (269), and *passed;* Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication) (278), *negatived;* Customs Duties (Isle of Man) * (270); Agricultural Gangs * (283), and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication) * (278).

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—(Nos. 227, 232, 293.)

(*The Earl of Derby.*)

THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^a."—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

Lord RAVENSWORTH said, that on this the last stage of the Bill, he would ask their Lordships' indulgence, while he drew their attention to three points on which he wished to offer a few remarks. First of all he wished to record his unaltered and unalterable conviction that the proposed lodger franchise was too low. That opinion was unaffected by the understanding arrived at on the subject in the House of Commons, the consideration of which had induced their Lordships yesterday to consent to the somewhat humiliating proceeding of reversing their own decision, which had been affirmed by a considerable majority. He did not pretend to complain of that proceeding, because, as the noble Earl at the head of the Government had shown, there might not be a sufficient difference between the figure inserted on the Motion of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns) and that contained in the Bill to justify them in running the risk of a conflict between the two Houses on the matter. That might be the case, but it did not move him from his unalterable conviction that the figure first inserted in the Bill was too low. Their Lordships must remember that the lodger franchise formed no part of the principle of this measure. The principle of the Bill was to confer the electoral franchise on householders bearing the burdens of the rates. The lodger franchise was simply a graft on the original stock of the measure, and one which he greatly feared would be found to produce anything but wholesome fruit. Taking the estimate of the noble Earl at the head of the Government that every man who received the wages of labour was supposed to devote one-sixth of his earnings to the cost of his lodgment, every man who paid 4*s.* a week in the metropolis and other places for his lodgings, or, in other words, every man receiving 24*s.* a week as wages of his labour, would under this Bill have the electoral franchise. No calculations respecting any district of the metropolis had been given to their Lordships by the First Lord of the Treasury or any other noble Lord which might guide them towards forming any correct view of the numbers who would be enfranchised by that provision. That those numbers, however, would be very considerable — considerable enough to turn the scale in every contested election in the metropolitan districts—there could be little or no doubt. But they were told that it was unsafe to meddle with the figure of the lodger franchise proposed in the Bill —that it had been adopted in order to confer the suffrage on the honest, industrious artizan, who earned his daily bread by the sweat of his brow. He had listened with great attention to the able and interesting speech delivered by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Shaftesbury), who knew more of the condition of the artizan class in the metropolis—and, indeed, anywhere else—than perhaps any other Member of that House. He concurred in the description given by that noble Earl of the honesty and integrity of these men as individuals, and speaking of them as individuals, there were no men whom he would sooner trust with the privilege of the franchise than those artizans to whom the noble Earl referred; but he must nevertheless say that he had an objection, in the present social state of this country, to conferring that privilege on those men as a class; and that objection was founded on a plain and intelligible reason, which at the risk of unpopularity he would state to their Lordships. These men were not free agents; they were not their own masters; they had not the power, even if they had the will, of acting independently, or of freeing themselves from the thraldom of that tyranny which they had themselves constituted—or rather which the officers whom they had elected to preside over their trades unions had constituted—and which fettered them in all the conduct of their lives. Believing, that as a class, in their present state of social existence, these men were not able to exercise a free and independent vote uninfluenced by terror, intimidation, or coercion, he said that, without wishing to exclude them positively from the franchise, he did not think it would be even for their own advantage that they should possess it until they had the means of freely exercising it. Let him not be misunderstood or misrepresented. After the revelations which had been made of the influence of these trades' union societies, and of the power of their managers not merely to dictate to the members of these unions how they should vote, but to compel them to do wicked deeds, the instigators and abettors of which deserved hanging ten times over, and to receive the penalty due to their crimes, was it possible for their Lordships to believe that, at contested elections, if any circumstance arose which excited any general feeling as to wages, the price of provisions, or any other question connected with their social economy, that those men would not be acted upon and absolutely debarred from exercising their own intelligence and recording their votes accordingly? It was on that account that he believed the artizan class, as a class, would, under present circumstances, be better without the franchise than with it. If in consequence of the fearful disclosures to which he had adverted, the Government of this country, of whatever party it was composed, thought fit to bring in a new law to regulate the proceedings of those trade societies, and give protection to those who lived under them, then, indeed, he should withdraw his objections to investing the artizan class, as a class, with the franchise. And when he said that, let it not be supposed that these men themselves at this moment were insensible to the coercion to which they were subject. Endeavours were being made by working men and artizans themselves in this kingdom to institute societies, whether Conservative or constitutional societies, for protecting the laws and institutions of the country. He had himself only within the last few days accepted the office of president to an association of that kind which the working-men of Newcastle-on-Tyne had formed spontaneously, without any external influence whatever. The second point on which he wished to say a very few words, had reference to the right of representation conferred by that Bill on the University of London, and which by the Scotch Reform Bill would also be conferred on the Scotch Universities. One University alone in the whole kingdom would be left out of this list — namely, the University of Durham. And here, in passing, he must be allowed to say that he had been somewhat surprised at the proposition which the Government had at first made that the University of Durham should be united with so incongruous a body as the University of London. He thought it would be better that the University of Durham should remain without Parliamentary representation, than that such an ill-assorted union as that should take place. The noble Earl on the cross-Benches (Earl Grey) had presented a Petition to their Lordships from the University of Durham, very numerously signed by the Professors, students, and graduates, praying for the representation of that institution in Parliament. In that Petition it was stated that that institution was founded by Act of Parliament in 1832, and received a Royal Charter in 1837, investing it with all the rights and privileges appertaining to a University, including the power of conferring degrees in arts, theology, medicine, and other branches of knowledge. Since then it had conferred degrees and academic distinctions upon upwards of 600 persons. It would be able at present to form a constituency of 300, and its numbers were increasing. He did not say that it ought at once to be formed into a Parliamentary constituency; but considering the great and increasing population of the two large counties of Durham and Northumberland, and considering also the increasing wealth and population of Newcastle-on-Tyne, where the University of Durham had established a school of medicine, they must anticipate that at no distant date the growing importance of that University would give it a strong claim to representation in Parliament. The third and last point to which he would call their Lordships' attention was one of very considerable importance — namely, the representation of minorities, which it was proposed to give to boroughs and counties returning three Members, and commonly known as "three-cornered" constituencies. The rights of minorities to a share in Parliamentary representation had now been acknowledged for a considerable period. They were first brought into prominence by the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) in his Reform Bill of 1854, when that noble Earl was a Member of the Ministry of Lord Aberdeen. This subject had since engaged the attention of the political philosophers, and was now likely to be brought into practical operation by the acceptance of the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cairns). If the other House consented to this new mode of taking votes — which, however, seemed likely to be strenuously contested—a valuable principle would be established in our electoral system, and the minorities, which had hitherto been abandoned to sullen discontent, would at last have a chance of exercising their fair share of influence. The Liberal minority of Liverpool would no longer groan under a Conservative representation, and the Conservative minority of Manchester would no longer fret under their practical disfranchisement. Four considerable boroughs had now been added to the former list of seven three-cornered constituencies. He, for one, was not deterred from accepting this change by the novelty of the scheme, because when they were about to confer such popular privileges it was only right and fitting that they should turn their eyes to some means by which the minority might receive a voice in Parliament, and by means of which they might be guarded against too extensive an application of popular influence. It was proposed to give to the county of Durham—which already rejoiced in a pretty numerous Parliamentary representation, inasmuch as it returned ten Members to Parliament — two for each division of the county, and six for the different boroughs —three additional Members, one each for the boroughs of Darlington, Stockton, and Hartlepool. It might be worthy of consideration whether these three boroughs should not be grouped into one constituency, returning three Members, and being thus brought under the new rule of the three-cornered constituencies. Of the ten Members for Durham, eight were returned by the Liberal electors, and two only by the Conservatives—one for the southern division of the county and one for Durham city. That was but a sorry representation of the minority, which gave a proportion of four to one on one side of politics. Again, the great and wealthy town of Newcastle-on-Tyne had during the last twenty-five years returned none but Liberal Members; while Gateshead, which was only separated from it by the Tyne, had never returned a Conservative Member. If the two constituencies were united, numbering together a population of not less than 150,000, there would be some chance of the representation of the minority. He thought that a similar principle of grouping might be applied to the grouping of Sunderland and South Shields. Did their Lordships think that there was not a considerable Conservative minority both in the county of Durham and the great town of Newcastle-on-Tyne, which fretted under the present distribution of political power? The same principle might be applied in the grouping of Morpeth and Berwick-on-Tweed, whereby the minority might have a chance of being represented in those towns. Changes such as these, modifying the existing conditions of Parliamentary representation, even if not included in the present Bill, may be fairly entitled to consideration at some future period.

Lord REDESDALE: My Lords, as I was precluded from any fair opportunity of making any observations in Committee through being placed in the Chair, I wish to say a few words before the Bill is finally passed. This is a Bill of so much importance that I cannot let the opportunity pass without entering my protest on one or two points. I wish especially to allude to the Amendment brought forward by the noble Earl (Earl Grey) for the partial disfranchisement of seats in the House of Commons, and also to the Amendment brought forward by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Lyveden) for the total disfranchisement of the smaller boroughs. I think that when the House of Commons sends us up a Bill relating to the constitution of their own body, and determines what boroughs shall be disfranchised, and how the seats thus obtained shall be distributed, it is not within the proper jurisdiction of this House—seeing that it is a matter within the special cognizance of the other House —to determine on the disfranchisement of any constituency returning Members to Parliament. If that proposition had been carried it would have been setting a most fatal precedent for the action of the other House in any matter affecting the privileges of your Lordships' House. The only other point to which I will allude is the motive which induced the proposal of this Bill, and which was that by the change proposed it might be made a measure of finality. I am all for finality on this subject; but finality does not depend so much upon what is in the Bill as on the conduct of the Leaders of the great political parties in the country. If those Leaders are determined to accept the measure as final, it will be made final. But if they are determined to make it a pretext for political agitation, it will not be final. I believe the measure was brought forward by the Government with the view of settling the question, which they thought could not be settled in any other manner; and, if it were settled, as I trust it will be, something would be gained. But if this question is always to be taken up as a ground for agitation, and the field of a contest in which political power is to be gained, the greatest possible mischief will ensue, and the country will be kept in a state prejudicial to all its best interests. The main objection urged on the other side is that the measure is rather too liberal than otherwise. It certainly has not failed on account of want of liberality. Why, then, should not the Bill be accepted? and why should questions be raised which can lead only to discontent in the country, which can produce no practical good, and which, if persevered in, must lead to very serious consequences? There are many proper ways in which those not in power may seek to attain power. They may show themselves the most fitting men to obtain the confidence of the country upon questions both foreign and domestic; but I do hope that when this Bill becomes the future Constitution of the country they will not make the constitution of the House of Commons the perpetual battle-field of party politics, but that they will allow what has occurred to rest quietly in the grave of political oblivion, and will accept the Bill as a full, complete, and final settlement of this question.

EARL FORTESCUE said, he could not understand how the noble Lord could believe in the permanence of those portions of the Bill dealing with compound-householders, and with the re-distribution of seats. It seemed to him that the Bill unsettled everything, and was likely to settle nothing. While rampantly Radical as regarded the franchise, the measure made a futile attempt at Conservatism as regarded the distribution of seats; and it perpetuated anomalies which had hitherto been tolerated only on account of the higher class of voters in whom the franchise was chiefly vested. He would ask on what pretext of justice or expediency could the franchise, so liberally given to householders in towns, be denied to the population inhabiting the counties? He could not conceive any system to be satisfactory until a new arrangement of the boroughs was adopted, extending the smaller boroughs over the rural districts until they met, so that every ratepaying householder and £10 lodger should have a vote. The rural population were nearly as well educated as the inhabitants of towns, and were more moral and less criminal. They were, therefore, equally entitled to the suffrage. In this way only could justice be done to the rural population of the country. Unless some such step was taken, there would be a strenuous demand on the part of the unrepresented in the counties for electoral districts; otherwise they would be placing the whole power of the country in the hands of the most dangerous and, at the same time, the most ignorant classes of the community.

LORD LYVEDEN: I feel bound to protest against the novel and extraordinary doctrine laid down by the noble Chairman of Committees, that this House has no right to interfere in proposing the disfranchisement of boroughs. If any rule existed, of course neither my noble Friend (Earl Grey) nor myself would have brought forward our Amendments; but it seems to me perfectly competent for your Lordships not only to discuss any portion of this Bill, but even to introduce a Bill yourselves for the disfranchisement of small boroughs, an object for whose consideration your Lordships are more unbiassed than the Commons. If the noble Lord's doctrine be correct, it is highly desirable that the noble Earl at the head of the Government, or some noble Lord of high authority, should inform us what is within the compass of your Lordships' consideration and what is not. If the noble Lord simply means that it is inexpedient for us to propose a scheme of disfranchisement, that is obviously a matter of individual opinion. With regard to the observations addressed by the noble Lord to the Leaders of the party on this side of the House, and his admonition to them not to make the Representation of the People a matter of party discussion, that clearly lies within their own discretion. We do not need any lecture from the noble Lord to tell us what we ought and what we ought not to do. Whether we re-open the question or not, depend upon it the country will do it. No doubt, for fifteen years, this question has been made too much a party plaything, and the result is that many of your Lordships are now voting for a Bill of which you do not approve. The noble Lord at the head of the Government took up the question for the advantage of his party, and if any other party think it for their advantage to take it up hereafter, I cannot see why they should be precluded from doing so. Moreover, I undertake to say that probably not a year—certainly not two or three years—will elapse before the re-distribution of seats is again made a paramount question among the public. It is impossible that the continuance of these small boroughs can be long tolerated. With regard to this Bill, I believe most of your Lordships would wish to say "Not-Content" to it; but it is out of your power to do so. If your Lordships were called upon to lay your hands upon your hearts, as you are upon State trials, and say, Upon your honour, "Content" or "Not-Content," I do not believe there would be many who would support the Bill. To household suffrage, I do not object, for I think it is as good a qualification as, under the circumstances, could be proposed; but I object to the way in which this Bill has been settled. I think the manner in which the House of Commons were invited to mould the Bill as they chose is a most dangerous and democratic precedent, and one prejudicial to the Executive Government and demoralizing to the House of Commons. I think, too, that the Government have done a great deal to disparage this House in public estimation by their course with reference to the lodger franchise. When the Amendment, raising the figure to £15 was proposed, the noble Earl (the Earl of Malmesbury) eagerly accepted it; but last night the Prime Minister, seeing that the alteration could not possibly be adopted by the other House, came down and advised your Lordships to revoke your decision; thus placing us in the uncomfortable position of accepting a proposal which we had refused a few days before by a very large majority. I only rose, however to express my solemn protest against the doctrine of the noble Lord (Lord Redesdale).

LORD REDESDALE: I do not think the noble Lord quite understood what I said. I did not say that this House had no power to propose a measure of disfranchisement, or that there was any order against it; but that I thought it an unconstitutional exercise of power in this House to propose the disfranchisement of any portion of the other House. Suppose there had been no question of a Reform Bill, but merely the Reports of the Commissioners on the corrupt boroughs, and the House of Commons had not thought fit to take any steps on those Reports, but had allowed writs to be issued, would it in that case have been proper for this House to have brought in a Bill for the disfranchisement of any of those boroughs? The noble Lord (Lord Lyveden) thinks it would; but I think otherwise. I should hold it to be an unconstitutional interference of one House with the privileges of the other. That one House may proceed to the disfranchisement of a portion of the other is a doctrine which may lead to dangerous consequences.

LORD DENMAN thought he might congratulate their Lordships on having made so little alteration in the Bill. With regard to the competency of their Lordships to deal with measures of disfranchisement, he would remind them of a case in which the two Houses differed. On the 19th of March, 1821, the House of Commons on the third reading of the Grampound Disfranchisement Bill, the noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell) said—

> "At first he had proposed the elective franchise at Leeds to be exercised by those who paid scot and lot; then, conceiving that there might be some Members indisposed to agree to so extensive a suffrage, he had proposed to confine it to housekeepers of £5 a year; and, seeing the House still indisposed to go to that extent, he had further restricted it to £10 a year. After that, he was extremely sorry to find that an hon. Gentleman thought it right to raise the qualification to £20 a year. That, in his opinion, deprived the Bill of its popular character. His original object was, to bring within the circle of the Constitution a large mass of the unrepresented people, and induce them to think that they had representatives sitting in that House. So feeling, he could no longer take charge of the Bill. At the same time, he was unwilling to lose the Bill altogether, and should vote against the Amendment."—[2 *Hansard*, iv. 1338-9.]

That Amendment was to alter the franchise to persons paying scot and lot in the proposed borough of Leeds, and Lord Milton who proposed that Amendment was supported by Lord Althorpe, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Scarlett, (afterwards Lord Abinger), by his own noble Relative, and other Constitutional Members of Parliament, sixty-six in all. Lord Milton considered that it would be better to adhere to the Constitutional practice and to say that the borough should be a scot and lot borough than to make any fanciful deviations under the notion of forming a good representation. This was the Amendment which the noble Earl on the front Opposition Bench then opposed, and he would remind the noble Earl that in the Penhryn Disfranchisement Bill, about six years later, he (Earl Russell) proposed a £20 franchise. Let them not talk then any more of inconsistencies, but be thankful for the measure which had been submitted to them. He would now quote a few words made use of by a noble Lord (Lord Milton) being in Committee on the Grampound Disfranchisement Bill. So much had been said about the "residuum" that he could not help recalling to their Lordships' minds the views of that old-fashioned politician, Lord Milton. He said—

> "As to the distinction of respectable classes, as distinguished from the inferior orders, he protested against the use of the term. One class of society might be poorer or more unfortunate than another; but the poorest man in the realm, if he were honest, sober, and industrious, was just as respectable as the most exalted."—[2 *Hansard*, iv. 1069.]

For his part he had no gloomy forebodings with regard to this Bill. He believed that the country generally was indebted to the Government of the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby), who, in the course which they had taken, had exposed themselves to a degree of obloquy to which he would not have subjected himself for any amount of gratitude that might be expected, and he hoped that future constituencies would not follow the example set by the Borough of Preston—which, instead of returning the noble

Earl now at the head of Her Majesty's Government, chose Mr. Hunt—but would recollect those who had had the greatest difficulty in carrying this important measure.

EARL RUSSELL: My Lords, I do not rise to speak on the question whether this Bill should be read a third time, because I think all your Lordships must understand that it is a matter of necessity that this Bill should be now read a third time. For my own part, whatever fault I find in portions of the Bill, I do trust that it may be so treated in the other House of Parliament that your Lordships and the other House may agree to the measure, and that, without going the length of the noble Baron the Chairman of Committees (Lord Redesdale), it may lead, for a time at least, to a settlement of this question. It is a great evil not merely that there should be agitation, but that there should be schemes constantly set afloat and discussed affecting the most vital parts of our Constitution, and thereby endangering the existence of those vital parts. That is in itself an evil; and I trust that, whatever may be the course of this question, it may lead to a settlement at least for some time to come. With regard to the measure itself, I have some observations to make. As to the franchise, I will not now raise any controversy. It is not the franchise that I thought best calculated to form a body of electors fit to return Members to Parliament. But I do not wish to revive any controversy on that point at this moment. Both Houses of Parliament have concurred in that franchise, and I certainly desire that it may operate beneficially. What I fear is that there will be more corruption, more treating, more bribery than have hitherto been known; because the franchise, being extended to a very ignorant class, who have no political opinions whatever, they are more open to the temptations which men of wealth may offer, in order to become Members of the other House of Parliament, than persons who are better qualified to form an opinion on public events, and therefore better fitted to choose their representatives. But I must say, at the same time, that, while I think this franchise may do some mischief, I have no belief whatever in the dangers apprehended by my noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) and some of the most able Members of this House, who are best acquainted with the working classes. Great questions, after all, depend not merely upon the electors and those who are elected to the other House of Parliament, or on the votes of that House, but rather on the temper and disposition of the people of this country. Now, my belief is that the people of this country are thoroughly atached to their Constitution, and that they would not be induced by any propositions which might be made, however inviting they might appear, in whatever beautiful colours they might be dressed, to part with the authority of the Crown, or of the two Houses of Parliament. I believe the people are attached to all parts of the Constitution, and, therefore, although we may hear of many mistaken elections, I do not myself apprehend that the Constitution is in any danger whatever from the Bill. And when I say that mistaken elections may be made, I mean such elections as I remember long ago, and one of which concerned the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby) himself. The noble Earl became a member of Lord Grey's Government, he was placed in a most important post, and went down to be re-elected for a borough in which the franchise was vested in all householders who had resided, I think, six months in the borough.

THE EARL OF DERBY: All inhabitants. It was universal suffrage.

EARL RUSSELL: Universal suffrage—I did not know it went quite so far. But the result of that election was that the noble Earl, a most competent representative, having recently become a Member of the Reform Ministry of Lord Grey, and whose talents and eloquence were sure to be of the greatest service to the Government, was rejected, and a man known as "Orator Hunt" was returned, than whom a more empty demagogue never appeared in the House of Commons. Well, that is the sort of election which I think may take place in some cases. But I feel sure that that the great body of the people will correct any such mistakes, and that suitable persons will be intrusted with the control of the legislation of this country. And now I will say a few words on the subject of re-distribution. The noble Lord (Lord Redesdale) says that it should be taken as an absolutely permanent settlement. But let me remind the noble Lord that it does not depend on the Leaders of parties, but upon public opinion and the feeling of the country whether that settlement should be considered permanent. I do not think that the question of distribution, if carried merely so far as my noble Friend (Lord

Lyveden) the other evening proposed to carry it by the abolition of the boroughs under 5,000, would be likely to disturb the country, or that such an agitation would take place with respect to the scheme as would shake the whole structure and constitution of the House of Commons. I do not apprehend any dangerous consequences from an agitation of that kind; and therefore, while with regard to the franchise I trust the settlement may be permanent, I do not think, with regard to re-distribution, that there will be any such dangerous agitation as would inflict a serious blow upon the well-working of the Constitution of this country. That is the point to be looked to. We may depend upon it, however we may refine, we can make no better Constitution than that which now exists, and we should rather try to improve it, and improve our laws from time to time, than indulge in fancies which may only lead us to worse. But there are questions which the noble Earl himself (the Earl of Derby) has raised, but has not solved, as to his reasons for bringing this measure before us. The noble Earl told us that it was impossible that he should consent again to be made a stop-gap, or to propose a measure in which he should be outbid by the Opposition, and that, therefore he felt that he must introduce something which was likely to be carried. Now, it struck me at the time, and it strikes me now in a very painful manner, that the noble Earl never went beyond the statement that himself and his party could not succeed except by a measure of this kind. He never told us that he and the Leaders of his party were satisfied that this was a measure for the public good, which, in respect of the franchise and in respect of the re-distribution of seats, would, he was convinced, work work well for the good of the country, and for the permanence of the Constitution. The noble Earl never told us that he had satisfied himself upon these points. Now, I have stated to your Lordships that I have not much apprehension on the subject. But I own it strikes me with a very painful feeling that the party opposite, of which the noble Earl is the Leader, should for many years have maintained that going below £10 was a dangerous measure; that they could not assent to the proposal in the Bill of 1866, because the franchise was about to be degraded; and that all of a sudden they should produce a measure not only going below £10, but far below it, in a democratic direction, against which they had so long and so frequently protested. It strikes me that that is a course incompatible with a belief in the sincerity of the men who have proposed this measure; and accordingly a noble Earl a Member of this House (the Earl of Carnarvon), a noble Lord a Member of the other House (Viscount Cranborne), and a gallant General, likewise a Member of that House (General Peel), left the Ministry, showing that they had said what they believed, and that they still believed what they in former years had said. I think these members of the Government acted in a manner highly honourable to them; I think they have done much to redeem the character of public men in both Houses of Parliament; and that they were sincere when they objected to us that we were carrying a measure that was dangerous in a democratic direction. But there we were, trying to pass in the other House of Parliament a measure as to which we were perpetually told, "You are going too far; you are going to too great lengths in the direction of democracy," when, in reality, the objection was that we were not going far enough, and those who told us that we were going too far, themselves thought that the measure to be carried ought to go further. The noble Earl was successful in these tactics. But they were tactics which, so far as I am aware, were never before practised by any party, and I hope that they never will be practised again.

On Question, *agreed to.*

Bill read 3^a accordingly.

Lord CAMPBELL said: My Lords, according to the forms of the House it is only now that I can move the clause of which I have given notice; and any observations I may hazard on the Bill itself will be a preface to discussion of the question I wish to raise this evening. Without denying that some political advantages may be derived from such a Bill as we are passing, it cannot be denied that it is calculated to aggravate corruption where it now exists, and to form it where it has been absent. It threatens to occasion vast difficulties in the parochial system of the country. In 309 boroughs the middle classes are disfranchised by it. It takes away five-and-twenty seats, which were open to the generality of candidates, and transfers them to places only open to proprietors connected with them, and whose fortunes are large enough to influence twelve-pounders. In boroughs it establishes a suffrage which cannot very well descend, and in counties one which is not likely to be permanent. Under these circumstances, if any generally-felt defect of the Reform Act could be removed at the same time, good would have been bought however high the cost, evil would be mixed however striking its preponderance. The experience of many General Elections has shown that the Act of 1832, although well contrived for many of its purposes, fails entirely in one—namely, that of bringing into Parliament all those who from acquired reputation, in the judgment of the House of Commons and the country, ought to be there. The failure is explained in this manner. The Act of 1832 has led to innumerable contests where none formerly existed. The chances, therefore, of exclusion by local accidents and influences are much greater than they used to be when contests where exceptional. Before that epoch each party had so many nomination boroughs to dispose of that any one of Parliamentary importance excluded at a General Election was very soon restored. Mr. Burke, after being the Leader of the Opposition, by his enlightened conduct on American affairs, lost the confidence of Bristol, but came in immediately for a less considerable borough. To-night we have heard from the noble Earl the head of the late Government, an allusion to the circumstances under which the noble Earl the First Lord of the Treasury lost his seat for Preston before the change of the old system. But he was not, I think, for any time excluded from the Legislature. Since 1833, contests being more frequent and the restoring power being curtailed, such men as Mr. Grote, Sir William Molesworth, Mr. Bright, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Milner Gibson in the Democratic party; the late Lord Carlisle, Lord Macaulay, Mr. Bernal among the Whigs; Mr. Gladstone among the followers of Sir Robert Peel; Sir Edward Lytton in the ranks of the Conservatives have been excluded; some for one, some for two Sessions, some during whole Parliaments, not by the public voice but by the accidental turn of separate elections. The State has been entirely without the power to recall them. The anomalous and indefensible position has arisen that while a population of 30,000,000 might agree that such and such a person ought to be in the representative assembly, they have been without a shadow of ability to give effect to their desire; and yet, the power which baffled their desire might be that of half-a-dozen voters in a very limited constituency. But these half-dozen voters should not be regarded as having arrived at an exclusion which the whole United Kingdom was incapable of remedying. In nine cases out of ten their object would have been not to keep a given public man out of the Legislature, but simply to gain a triumph for the party they espoused and for the colours they adopted. In one case of Parliamentary exclusion, that of Mr. Gladstone in 1846, the effect was to contradict the very principle of our system. During the whole time Mr. Gladstone remained at the head of the Colonial Office he was without a seat, and the department ceased to have that responsibility which arises from direct intercourse between the Minister and the assembly. The principle of the United States, where Secretaries of State are not admissible to Congress, was forced upon this country by its incapacity and helplessness to overcome the verdict of a borough. In another case a bright career was suddenly arrested. Lord Macaulay gave up his situation in the Cabinet and never afterwards resumed it, because having given his support to the endowment of Maynooth he lost the confidence of the ultra-Protestant majority in Edinburgh. In a third case the House of Commons was deprived of its incomparable Chairman of Committees, the late Mr. Bernal, who, although a candidate more qualified could hardly be conceived, lost Rochester in 1852, because the hostile party was the strongest. So great was the difficulty of replacing him that Mr. Wilson Patten, already charged with the management of private Bills, was compelled to undertake a double burden, to which the strength of any man would be unequal. Hardly a General Election has occurred since 1833 without inflicting on the public losses of this nature. Under the present Bill contests are more likely to increase than to diminish. The number of remarkable exclusions, therefore, is more likely to increase than to diminish. The power of replacing losses will sink to a lower ebb in proportion as the smaller boroughs vanish wholly from our system. It is not, therefore, an improper moment for endeavouring to establish in the State that which it so evidently wants—namely, some effective means of giving force to the opinion of the country after General Elections as to distinguished statesmen whom the General Election has not succeeded in returning. On a subject of the kind the public must act through some known organization in which its will may be supposed to be embodied. The Privy Council would be too much separated from the body of the people; the Government would be too much identified with party to suffice for such a function. The representative assembly would alone be qualified to act for, and attain the purpose of, the country from which it has emerged. But such a power could scarcely be confided to the naked action of the Parliamentary majority, who might of course subordinate it to the impulses of faction. The Standing Order would pronounce upon the method, of which the result would be that both parties after General Elections might recall those of whom they had been casually deprived, and whose return an overwhelming number of electors throughout the kingdom would have sanctioned. According to the immemorial and inviolable usages of Parliament, all Members must sit ostensibly for definite constituencies. Unless they did so they could not be an object of reply or of remark in Parliamentary discussion. With a view to the maintainance of established forms, legal fictions have been always genial to our system. As the power of appointing Members to enjoy a nominal connection with these vacant boroughs, could only be exerted by adding, for the moment, to the number of the House of Commons, there would be a strong reluctance to exert it. It could only come into activity when public wants required, and public sympathy upheld it; and if in the House of Commons a power of this kind could not be easily initiated, it might be very well accepted from the initiative of your Lordships.

It is possible, perhaps, that the same end may be obtained, the same want extinguished, by a sounder method. I have no prejudice in favour of the specific course I have endeavoured to describe; my strong impression is, that no one can bring a project to maturity without official aid to warn and to enlighten him. But innovation as far as possible reduced to ancient forms can hardly be an object of contempt or of reproach, when in order to correct an evil which is not sheltered by antiquity, some kind of innovation is altogether indispensable. But those who criticize the method I propose, at least, are bound to shew that by some older or simpler or better way the public after General Elections may recall the genius of which localities have happened to deprive it; and the community at large restore to Parliament the minds whose action it requires and whose obscurity it deprecates; whose action is essential to its safety, or whose obscurity is inconsistent with its glory.

Moved, after Clause 12, to insert the following Clause:—

"And whereas it is expedient that after every General Election some Power shall exist of finding Seats for Persons accidentally excluded from the Legislature and whose Service in Parliament would be important to the Country: be it enacted, that from Time to Time the House of Commons, according to the Method their Standing Orders shall determine, may nominate One Member for each or any of the aforesaid Boroughs, who shall sit and serve during the Remainder of the Parliament in which he has been nominated."—(*The Lord Stratheden.*

The Earl of DERBY: My Lords, we have read that under the Jewish dispensation there were certain cities set apart to which the manslayer might fly and be secure from the consequences of his act; but I must confess that the proposal made by the noble Baron opposite to form, as it were, electoral cities of refuge for the unhappy rejected candidates at a General Election has, to my mind, at all events, the merit of singularity and of novelty. I never heard of such a proposition as that made by the noble Lord to set aside a certain number of boroughs in this country, disfranchised in consequence of their previous delinquencies, as *refugia peccatorum*, to which every person who cannot find a seat in the usual constitutional way can resort in the hope of obtaining one. Nor is the *modus operandi* less singular. The notion which the noble Baron appears to have of the representative system is one of the most extraordinary character, because he proposes that, by the action of the House of Commons, and without any interference on the part of constituencies, a certain number of Members may be chosen by the House itself, who will nominally represent constituencies which will have no word to say in their election. So far as the practical operation of the scheme, I may notice in passing that there are seven seats obtained by the disfranchisement of the four places referred to, and I do not know what the noble Lord proposes to do with the other three; but all the seven seats are appropriated by the Act about to be passed; all the seats obtainable by the disfranchisement of these boroughs are already assigned to boroughs, which I do not suppose will be willing to give up their claim to representation in order to gratify a crotchet of the noble Baron. Observe what a scene of confusion there would be after a General Election if the proposal of the noble Baron were adopted—even supposing there were still the seats to dispose of. After a General Election, I suppose, in all probability, there are, at least, a hundred gentlemen who are "accidentally excluded" from the House of Commons, who could not obtain a majority in any one of the counties or the boroughs, and whose services in Parliament, in their own opinion, would be important to the country. Therefore, immediately after a General Election, there would be a hundred gentlemen each desiring to obtain one of the four seats thus at the disposal of the House of Commons. Another election would have to take place by the Members of the House of Commons, who would have before them a hundred candidates, would have to decide upon their respective merits, and would have to enter upon debates and divisions to ascertain whether any of the hundred "accidentally excluded" from the House were persons whose services might be important to the country. I cannot conceive a system which could lead to a greater amount of confusion and difficulty, and create a greater amount of party feeling, and which, at the same time, would be likely to be less successful in its operation. I have already said that the seats are not vacant, and it is proposed to take only four of the seven that were at liberty for disappointed candidates; but the noble Lord does not say that the House of Commons must elect four. He leaves it to the House of Commons to say whether they will or not; and how many there are whose services are so important to the country that they ought to be admitted to Parliament. It would be a waste of words to enter upon any discussion of a scheme so absolutely impracticable, one so entirely at variance wfth all the principles of our representative system, and one which is so incapable of being brought into practical operation, even if we had at our disposal the seats appropriated by the Act you are about to pass.

Lord CAMPBELL said, that the noble Earl, in order to disparage, had made his proposed change the object of gross misrepresentation. He (Lord Campbell) had not suggested any transfer of seats or any form of re-distribution. The question he had mooted was—whether the House of Commons should have the power of adding to its number, by such a method as its Standing Order might determine, not more than four Members, who, to preserve its forms, could sit for nominal constituencies? It was impossible, he well knew, that their Lordships should form a serious opinion on that question after the elaborate derision with which the noble Earl had treated it. But he (Lord Campbell) should appeal with confidence at some future time from the witticisms of the noble Earl to the judgement and the sense of the community.

Clause *negatived.*

The Earl of HARROWBY wished to call attention to a small point which he had been requested to urge upon their Lordships, and which had been made the subject of the Memorial presented by the inhabitants of Kensington. The Memorial prayed that their Lordships would be pleased to assign the title of "Kensington" instead of that of "Chelsea" to the new metropolitan borough which the Bill created. The value of property under Shedule A in Kensington was £750,000 a year, whilst that of Chelsea was only £316,000. Under Schedule D the value of property rated was £440,000 in Kensington and £205,000 in Chelsea. The value of the property rated to the poor was in Kensington £672,000 and in Chelsea only £245,000. The acreage in the former place was 2,200 against 665 in the latter. The number of inhabited houses in Kensington was 48,000 and in Chelsea only 6,500. On those grounds the memorialists thought that the name of the new borough ought to be Kensington instead of Chelsea.

The Earl of DERBY said, he had been requested to receive a deputation from Kensington on this very important question. He replied that he should be happy to do so after the Bill had been read a second time, and before the Schedules came under their consideration. As their Lordships were aware, he was attacked with illness and obliged to remain in bed immediately after the second reading, and therefore could not receive the deputation as he had promised to do. He must, however, say that he could not attach any great importance to the question raised in the memorial. If the question were to be decided by numerical proportions the inhabitants of Kensington had no doubt made out a good case. Kensington, in point of the value of property, the number of its inhabitants, and in other respects, was perhaps more important than Chelsea. He believed that the reason for the introduction of the name of Chelsea as the title of the new borough was because it had been contemplated in previous Bills to give representation to a new borough under that name. For his own part it appeared to him to be of no great importance whether the borough were called Chelsea or Kensington. If the noble Earl thought it worth his while to move that the name of "Kensington" be substituted for that of "Chelsea," in order that the House of Commons might have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon the point, he (the Earl of Derby) should offer no objection; but he repeated he did not consider the matter of sufficient importance to justify the raising of the question at that moment.

The Earl of HARROWBY then moved the substitution of the word "Kensington" for "Chelsea."

Lord DENMAN said, the names of "Kensington and Fulham" might appear before "Chelsea" as the respective polling-places.

The Earl of DERBY said, that upon reflection it would perhaps be better to leave the word unaltered, as the adoption of the Amendment proposed by the noble Earl would render several other alterations in the Bill necessary. He therefore trusted that the noble Earl would not press the point.

The Earl of HARROWBY withdrew his Amendment.

On Question, That the Bill do pass?

The Earl of DERBY: Upon the Motion that the Bill do pass, I take the opportunity, my Lords, of expressing on my own part and on behalf of the Government our grateful acknowledgement of the very temperate, fair, and candid manner in which your Lordships have dealt with this question. I have now had the honour of holding a seat in one or the other House of Parliament for five-and-forty years, and during that space of time I do not recollect another instance of a measure of such vast importance, and involving such great and extensive changes, passing through Parliament with so little display of party spirit, or so little of acerbity and acrimony, as have marked the progress of the Bill to which your Lordships have just given your assent. For my own part, my Lords, I can only express a hope that in conducting this measure I have not deviated from the line of fair, candid, and temperate discussion, and that I have not exhibited any undue warmth, or let fall a single syllable that can offend or wound the feelings of any of your Lordships. I have felt strongly the necessity and the importance of passing this Bill—first of all because, after being accepted by the House of Commons, its rejection by your Lordships would have been fraught with imminent peril; and next, because I indulged a hope—which I am glad to see has been shared by noble Lords opposite — that in the adoption of this Bill we may find the means of putting a stop to the continued agitation of a question which, as long as it remained unsettled, only stood in the way of all useful legislation. No doubt we are making a great experiment and "taking a leap in the dark," but I have the greatest confidence in the sound sense of my fellow-countrymen, and I entertain a strong hope that the extended franchise which we are now conferring upon them will be the means of placing the institutions of this country on a firmer basis, and that the passing of this measure will tend to increase the loyalty and contentment of a great portion of Her Majesty's subjects.

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

PROTEST

Against the Third Reading of the Representation of the People Bill.

DISSENTIENT:

"1. Because the Bill, creating in almost every City and Borough in *England* a new Constituency more numerous than that which exists, impairs, where it does not destroy, the Power of the present Electors, and substitutes for it that of a new Body inferior to them in Property and Education.

"2. Because the Confidence justly placed in Constituencies of approved Worth cannot reasonably be transferred to such Men now first entrusted with electoral Power; and it is to be feared that when Labour makes Laws for Capital, Poverty for Property, Legislation, no longer directed by educated Intelligence, will impair the individual Freedom of Action and the Security of Possession which have been the Foundations of our Prosperity and Wealth.

"3. Because it more nearly concerns the Public Welfare that Representatives should be well chosen than that Constituencies should be numerous; and the larger Constituencies have rarely been fortunate in the Choice of their Representatives, or persistent in retaining them when they proved worthy of Support.

"4. Because a Seat in the House of Commons, more difficult in Attainment than heretofore, less secure in Possession, and not exempt from Humiliation while occupied, will cease to be an Object of the same Ambition to that high Class of Gentlemen by whose patriotic Spirit and statesmanlike Wisdom the Liberties of the People were secured and the Greatness of the Country has been achieved.

"5. Because the House of Commons, composed of inferior Men, dependant upon the fickle Feelings of the Masses they represent, will not afford to any Ministers a fair and consistent Support; and successive Governments, permanently weak, limited in the Choice of Men to fill the great Offices of State to the few who may have the best Hopes of Re-election, compelled to feel their Way by Measures of a tentative Character, not fully approved even by themselves, will exist from Day to Day by Concessions, lose all Respect for themselves, but not before they have lost that of others, and at length retire with the Conviction that the theoretical Perfection of Constituencies is incompatible with the successful Conduct of the Affairs of the Country in Parliament.

"Ellenborough.

"Selkirk."

RAILWAYS (GUARDS' AND PASSENGERS' COMMUNICATION) BILL—(No. 278.)

(*The Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

The Earl of LUCAN moved an Amendment that it be read a third time that day three months. He entirely approved the object of the Bill, but he impugned the decision of the Select Committee to which the matter had been referred. It seemed to him that the Bill was not calculated in the slightest degree to effect the object for which it was intended. There was, however, a mode of attaining that object without any of the objections he entertained to the present measure. The Committee had examined the Managers of all the principal railways having termini in London, except the Manager of the London, Chatham, and Dover line. Five Managers had been examined, and every one of the five was adverse to the Bill — more especially on the ground of expense. Captain Tyler had also been examined, and he was adverse to it. Not one word had been said by any one of those six witnesses which should have induced the Committee to sanction the Bill. The Managers complained that it would put the railway companies to an expense of not less than £500,000, and that after that expenditure the plan provided under the Bill would be found so ill-conceived that probably another £500,000 would have to be expended before the object in view was attained — if indeed it could be attained at all. They might suspect that evidence; but it must be admitted that the objection was fair. The Managers did not object to a large expenditure for a system of communication between passengers and guard, if such system were made uniform and compulsory. They were perfectly ready to adopt any system approved by the Board of Trade, if the responsibility of the system were to rest with the Government. But to be effective the system laid down must be uniform and compulsory. There were eight lines between London and Perth, and he believed not fewer than 100 throughout the country. How, then, was it possible to effect the desired object if there were to be different systems on different lines? He believed that object might easily be effected by a Committee of the Board of Trade, or of two or three scientific men. Besides the witnesses to whom he had referred, three or four others had been examined by the Committee. They were patentees, and very naturally they recommended their own plans of communication; but they did not recommend this Bill. He must confess that in his opinion communication between passengers and guard was not of that essential importance which it was generally considered to be. He thought it would be wise to adopt it, because there were timid persons who believed there was danger, and it would be quite right to remove these apprehensions. But in reality there was very little danger.

An Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months.")—(*The Earl of Lucan.*)

The Earl of KIMBERLEY said, the noble and gallant Earl was quite correct in stating that the Railway Managers who had been examined before the Committee had expressed opinions unfavourable to the provisions of the Bill; but their objection was more on the score of expense than to the adoption of a system of communication between passengers and guards and guards and drivers. There was one of them, however, the Manager of the South Eastern Railway, who informed the Committee that a system of communication between the guards and the passengers had actually been established on that line, and that it seemed to work well. It was but fair, however, to add that that gentleman had said that he was doubtful as to whether the question was ripe for legislation, and that there would be some difficulty in adapting the system to all railways. Another Manager—he believed the Manager of the Midland Railway—had also pointed out that a scheme of communication had been in operation on that line between the guard and the driver, and there was no reason why the scheme should not work successfully if it were extended to the passengers. All those who travelled much by railway were, he thought, of opinion that some means of communication between the passengers and the guard should be established. It was only that morning that he had read a letter in *The Times* from Mr. Broadhurst, who mentioned that an accident had occurred a few days ago on the North Staffordshire line, and that many lives would in all probability have been lost but that the train happened to be going slowly, and that a pointsman saw the frantic signals of the passengers in time to enable the driver to stop the train. Of course, it was expedient that if a system of communication such as that provided by the Bill were set on foot it should be uniform, and he could not see why the various railway companies might not act together and adopt the same system. If the House should not proceed with the Bill in the present Session, he hoped the subject would be taken up by the Board of Trade during the recess, with the view of seeing whether, in conjunction with the railway companies, they could not hit upon some scheme which would be satisfactory, and which might next Session be submitted to Parliament for its sanction.

The Duke of RICHMOND entirely concurred in the view stated by the noble Earl to have been expressed by the Manager of the South Eastern Railway, that the subject was not yet ripe for legislation. There seemed to be at present a system of communication between the guard and the driver; and he was quite ready to admit that it would be a great advantage if a system could be devised by which communication between the guard and passengers in trains could be safely established. It must, however, be borne in mind that when such a system was devised considerable difficulties would still remain to be overcome. Was the guard of a train, for instance, to pull it up under all circumstances the moment a passenger communicated with him? Must he at once stop in the middle of a tunnel, or suddenly while the train was running along an incline? If he were obliged to do that greater dangers would be occasioned than now existed; and if the question of stopping or not were left to the guard a greater extent of responsibility would be thrown upon him than was at all desirable. In the case of the North Staffordshire Railway, to which the noble Earl had alluded, there was, he believed, no communication between the guard and the driver, and, if there had been, the danger to which Mr. Broadhurst referred would not in all probability have occurred. The noble Earl had very truly observed that no system of communication could be regarded as good unless it were universally acted upon by the various railway companies; but then the present Bill contained no provision making it compulsory upon them to make use of the same system. He concurred, however, in the opinion that something ought to be done in the matter, and he would during the recess enter into communication with the railway companies for the purpose of carrying out that object. If the negotiations should not be attended with success, then Parliament might take the question into its own hands.

Earl GRANVILLE suggested to his noble Friend not to press the Bill. It was satisfactory to hear that the Board of Trade would give its attention to the subject.

Then the said Amendment (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Then the original Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn;* and Order for Third Reading *discharged.*

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, August 6, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Second Report*—On Parliamentary Deposits. [No. 511.]

Supply—*considered in Committee — Resolution* [August 5] *reported.*

Public Bills—*Ordered*—Metropolitan Municipal Government; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances.*

First Reading—Metropolitan Municipal Government [303]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * [304].

Committee—Expiring Laws Continuance [288]; Contagious Diseases (Animals) (*re-comm.*) [228] [R.P.]; Companies Act (1862) Amendment * [221]; Public Works (Ireland) * [262]; Patriotic Fund * [278]; Railways (Ireland) * [298].

Report — Expiring Laws Continuance [288]; Companies Act (1862) Amendment * [221 & 301]; Public Works (Ireland) * [262]; Patriotic Fund * [278]; Railways (Ireland) * [298].

Considered as amended—Army Reserve * [148]; Militia Reserve * [149].

Third Reading — Public Health (Scotland) * [284]; Turnpike Acts Continuance * [232]; Recovery of Certain Debts * (Scotland) * [296]; Trusts (Scotland) * [297], and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Life Policies Nomination * [201]; Game Laws (Scotland) * (*re-comm.*) [231].

The House met at Two of the Clock.

METROPOLITAN POOR LAW ACT.
QUESTION.

Lord CHARLES BRUCE said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Whether the Poor Law Board intend, on or before the 29th of September next, to put into operation the 73rd Section of the Metropolitan Poor Law Act, by issuing their order to every Union or Parish, in the Metropolis which is governed by a Local Act, so that from and after a day to be stated in such order the relief of the poor shall, in every such Union or Parish be administered by a Board of Guardians elected according to the provision of the Poor Law Acts; and, if any such Parishes or Unions are not brought under the operation of the 73rd Clause on or before the date mentioned, will they be entitled to share in the benefits of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, in reply, that he had to state that the Poor Law Board had already issued orders constituting five of the principal unions or parishes in the metropolis governed by a Local Act Unions or parishes to be administered by a Board of Guardians elected according to the provisions of the 73rd section of the Poor Law Act. The Poor Law Board were about to issue a sixth order, and a seventh case was under consideration, and it was expected that the arrangement respecting it would be completed by the 29th of September next; but in the event of any cause, now unforeseen, interfering to prevent the completion of the arrangement, the delay would in no case affect the claim of the parish or union to participate in the benefits of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund.

UNITED STATES—THE "ALABAMA" CLAIMS.—QUESTION.

Mr. REARDEN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the promised Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States relating to the Confederate Steamship *Alabama* will be laid upon the Table of this House before the close of the Session?

Lord STANLEY said, in reply, that the Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States relating to the claims of the *Alabama* would be laid on the Table before the close of the Session.

METROPOLIS—STATUE OF CANNING.
QUESTION.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, If it is intended to move the statue of Canning from its present site and to reinstate it in its former position?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: Sir, in answer to my hon. Friend, I have to say that the present position of the question affecting Mr. Canning's statue is as follows:—When the railway works were being made through Parliament Square they necessarily destroyed the trees and shrubs which heretofore had formed the background to the Canning statue; and it became necessary to re-consider the whole arrangement with regard to Parliament Square, and my right hon. predecessor at the Office of Works, in conjunction with Mr. Barry, gave his best attention to the subject, and arrived at the conclusion that it would be proper to remove the statue from the site it formerly occupied to the situation in which it is now placed. It appears to me that the conclusion at which they thus arrived was formed on very good grounds, and I have adhered to it; consequently the statue was removed to where it now is. But it appears that a very strong feeling exists in many quarters, more especially among those related to, or who were acquainted with, Mr. Canning, that the statue to his memory having once occupied a position in immediate contiguity to the Houses of Parliament ought not to have been removed from that site. I apprehend that if you view this question merely on the ground of artistic considerations the removal of Mr. Canning's statue to the site it now occupies is perfectly justifiable. If artistic considerations are put out of the question, and the subject is looked at merely with reference to the feelings of private connections, I admit there may be a good deal in what was said on the subject in "another place." On that occasion there was a very strong expression of opinion in favour of restoring the statue to the site it formerly occupied, or one immediately contiguous to the Houses of Parliament. In this conflict of opinion I consulted some of my Colleagues, and in concert with Mr. Barry carefully reviewed the whole question. No final decision has been come to, but I think I may say that if it is thought advisable on the considerations to which I have referred to move Mr. Canning's statue again, we should think it right not to place it precisely on the site it originally occupied, which under the changed circumstances would be very objectionable, but in the centre of Parliament Square. I should think the decision must be arrived at on one or other of the grounds I have indicated. Those who have seen the statue from the rear will be of opinion that nothing could be more objectionable than that it should be approached by the public in that direction. Any one who did not know the effect produced by viewing a large statue at the rear, when it was never intended that the eye should see it in that way, had only to walk down Regent Street, and he would be satisfied of the truth of that opinion. Great objection, he was afraid, would be taken to the replacing of Mr. Canning's statue in its former position by those approaching the Houses of Parliament from Victoria Street. On the other hand, those approaching the Houses of Parliament by Whitehall or by Westminster Bridge would no doubt entertain a different opinion; but, whatever decision is come to, either those who regard the question from the artistic, or those who regard it from what he might venture to call the sentimental point of view, must necessarily be disappointed.

IRELAND—SIR ROBERT KANE—APPOINTMENT.—QUESTION.

Mr. LEADER said, he rose to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether, in the offer to Sir Robert Kane of the post of Dean of Faculty of the College of Science in Dublin, any conditions were mentioned as to the time he was to devote to the duties of the office?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he thought the best answer he could give to the Question of the hon. Member, would be to read an extract from the letter of Mr. Corry to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated November 26, 1866, and the Minute under which Sir Robert Kane had been appointed—

> "It follows, if this position be correct, that some layman of administrative capacity and of sufficient distinction to carry weight, but unbiassed by any special scientific predilections, would, if one were required, be a proper head of an institution of this nature. At present, however, we consider a Council of Professors, with a Dean of Faculty, to be an organization more adapted to the requirements of a College of Science. The Dean would be the organ of the Professors in all communications with the Science and Art Department. He would preside at all meetings, where he should have a casting vote, and generally represent the professorial body. . . . . Such an arrangement would appear best adapted to induce general co-operation and harmony with energetic action. An honorarium of £100 should be attached to the office of Dean of Faculty."

The Minute was as follows:—

> "My Lords propose, therefore, that Sir Robert Kane, if he should be willing to accept it, and would devote the necessary time for constant attendance shall be appointed permanent Dean of Faculty, and receive the honorarium of £100 per annum attached to the post."

POSTAL—AMERICAN MAILS.

QUESTION.

Mr. GRAVES said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, If it is intended to confine the Tenders for Conveyance of Her Majesty's Mails from the United Kingdom to New York to ships sailing under the British flag; and, if not, whether vessels tendering under a Foreign flag will be subject to the surveys and conditions imposed on British ships carrying Her Majesty's Mails?

Mr. HUNT said, in reply, that the tenders the hon. Member alluded to, were asked for in pursuance of the Postal Convention concluded this year between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States. The object of that Convention was to carry out an arrangement which had been acceded to by the late Government, and under which the Postmaster General of this country was to provide for the conveyance of mails on stated days from certain ports in England to certain ports in the United States, and the United States were to provide for the conveyance of mails the reverse way. There was no restriction on either side with regard to the flag; but he believed that, other things being equal, the English Postmaster General would give the preference to vessels sailing under the British flag. The vessels under foreign flags would, by the tender, be subject to the same conditions as those imposed upon British ships, but such conditions did not include the surveys to which the hon. Member had alluded.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy.*)

[BILL 288.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. M'CULLAGH TORRENS: Mr. Speaker,—Sir, Before you leave the Chair I wish to redeem the pledge I gave at the close of last Session to call the attention of the House to the unsatisfactory state of our Extradition Treaties with foreign Powers. A few days before the prorogation last year a Bill was brought down from the House of Lords, to which our assent was asked, changing the rule of judicial procedure in the case of foreigners accused of crime. Time out of mind the rule of English law has been that no man should be committed for trial, either here or abroad, without *parôle* testimony as to his identity, and *primâ facie* as to his guilt. The accused, by himself or his counsel, have always thus had the opportunity of cross-examining the witnesses against him. But, save in the case of depositions made by a dying man, documentary proof was never, up to last year, held sufficient by itself to justify a magistrate in sending anyone to stand his trial as a felon, or in sending him out of the country to be tried by a foreign tribunal, or to be kept in prison for the rest of his life awaiting that trial. Our Judges and our magistrates applied the rule indifferently to the stranger and to him that was born in the land. We are a people loving justice. We have inherited its maxims and traditions from our fathers; and the reverence in which we hold them has done more than anything else in our customs and institutions to make us what we are—the freest people in the world, and the fittest people to be free. This rule of criminal law, however, we were last year called upon to change as regards French citizens or denizens resident here. This humane and wise and time-honoured system was an offence unto the French Government. Oral proof is not required in France for the arrest and imprisonment of any man, however exalted, virtuous, or above suspicion. Neither is it necessary to show him the whole of the depositions which constitute the charge against him; he is liable to be incarcerated without being confronted with his accusers. The Ministers of the Queen told us that, unless they could get Parliament to abrogate English law, and substitute French law, in dealing with Frenchmen, his Imperial Majesty would put an end to the Convention subsisting between the two countries for the mutual rendition of criminals. This was not, indeed, what the French Ambassador had asked. It appears by the Papers laid upon your table that he asked a great deal more. He demanded that a French writ should run in every part of Her Majesty's dominions as it does in every department of France; and he demanded that we should in every case, without discussion or discretion, surrender French refugees, tried and condemned in their absence, against whom the record of such condemnation should be produced before a magistrate. When I asked Lord Cairns, then Attorney General, whether he was prepared to entertain these two last demands, he replied, with a spirit that became him, that he would cut off his right hand before it should sign any assent to such submissions; but he sought to persuade us that the Government Bill, substituting documentary for *parôle* proof, would satisfy the French Government, and yet do no harm. My hon. Friends around me were not persuaded. We demurred to waiving, at the bidding of a foreign Court, a venerated and sacred principle of justice between man and man. We said it cannot be right to maintain that principle for ourselves and to renounce it where foreigners are concerned. You do not ask us to take it away altogether. You dare not venture to clip the coin of justice, as for centuries it has been current amongst us; but from the friendless and the helpless fugitives from absolute power, you ask us to take away a protection which we keep for ourselves. The noble Lord (Lord Stanley) and his Law Advisers argued that no harm would really be done; and when we pointed out the possibility of men being demanded for one crime and, when surrendered, tried upon another, we were told our misgivings were unfounded, our fears chimerical, our suspicions vain. No foreign Government, it was said, would think of playing a trick upon another, or seek to kidnap an obnoxious fugitive by charging him with a crime named in the Treaty, and then detaining him, or indicting him, for some other crime ; or if, by any unforeseen contingency, the fugitive were wrongfully obtained, regard for our offended dignity would be sure to cause an immediate *amende* and the restoration of the mistaken prisoner to freedom. We were not convinced ; but our objections were overruled, and our votes overborne. The Bill became law ; and then what happened ? The French police, who until then declared they could not, compatibly with the honour of their master, attempt to capture fugitives sheltering in the dominions of the Queen, became active and enterprizing. You told us they would be so if we passed this Act, and they redeemed your word with a vengeance. The Convention of 1843, you told us, would not work without this Bill, and that was the only reason assigned in its favour. Well, the Bill passed; and before six weeks had elapsed the agents of the French police had captured two individuals—the one in Canada, the other in London—both of which cases serve to exemplify in a manner not to be mistaken the force of all that we had urged. The case of M. Lamirande is probably familiar to most of those who hear me. It stands out in the history of this question so prominently that I hardly suppose any one will be found, whatever may be his opinions, to attempt its palliation. From first to last, it is about the most flagrant and unmitigable tissue of fraud and violence with which we have ever had to deal. Nothing that we said last Session as hypothetically agreeable can compare with the bare narration of undisputed facts recorded in the despatch of Lord Carnarvon of the 20th of November to Lord Monck, recounting what was done in Canada, and the despatch of the noble Lord opposite to Lord Cowley, stating what subsequently occurred. We may put aside altogether the speeches of advocates and the comments of journalists. From the official admissions of the Foreign Secretary and his late Colleague, the Secretary for the Colonies, the whole infamous story may be clearly gathered, and every inference we desired to impress upon the mind of the House may be conclusively drawn.

Lamirande, on a charge of forgery committed in France, was arrested at Montreal. Agents of the French police, who had followed him thither, applied for an extradition warrant, which by contrivance they induced the Governor General to sign, pending an application for an *habeas corpus*. Lord Monck promised that time should be afforded for the hearing of that application ; but the night before the decision was given by the Judge of the Queen's Bench the prisoner was delivered up under the Governor's warrant, and, after midnight, placed in a railway train which had been specially detained three hours, for the purpose of avoiding observation, prevented from having any communication with his law adviser, who tried to speak to him at the station, conveyed by steamer to England, and thence to France. The morning after his surreptitious removal, Mr. Justice Drummond granted the writ of *habeas corpus*, and declared his capture illegal on various grounds. With some of these I need not trouble the House ; but two of them deserve attention. The warrant issued in France was not produced ; but a copy, certified by no one who had read the depositions. So much for the evidence. Now for the crime itself. Lamirande was a robber ; but he had no more committed forgery than he had committed murder or arson. He had committed theft—he had stolen thousands of gold pieces out of the cellar of the Bank at Poictiers, of which he was cashier. He forged no document for the purpose ; he forged no document at all ; he did not tamper with the Bank accounts ; they remained unchanged. The books were right, but the bags were wrong. If a man steals your cheque-book and imitates your name, he is a forger ; but if he picks your pocket of your purse, or picks the lock of your strong box, you might as well call him a sheep stealer as a forger. Why, then, did the French police have him arrested for forgery, not theft ? I will tell you why : because theft is not one of the crimes named in the Anglo-French Treaty, and forgery is; and as they wanted to bring down their prey, not having a bullet, they used a slug. They brought the man to France, and tried him there for the offence of which he had been guilty ; and, the case being clear as to the facts, he was condemned to ten years' penal servitude ; but they had no more right to take him and to try him than they would have to take or try me. In the French Penal Code there are five classes of offences against property called "*faux*"—false witness, false coin, false weights, false seals or tokens, and false writings of a public or a private kind.

What we call forgery may be classed under the denomination "false writings;" and because in a logical category forgery is classed as "*faux*" the French kidnappers had the impudence to set up the barefaced cheat that "*faux*" is synonymous with forgery. Lamirande may have committed some of the offences denominated "*faux;*" but it was not even pretended at the trial that he had committed anything which we call forgery. Lord Monck—of whom I wish to speak with every consideration and forbearance — suffered himself to be puzzled to some extent by those about him who used this incredible imposture; but the moment the case was referred to, the Law Officers of the Crown in England flung it aside with contempt, as any upright and enlightened jurist would do. This part of the case needs only to be stated to be made plain. You named four crimes in your Treaty with France, and forgery is one of them. What you mean by forgery may not always be the same as that which is meant in France. But what is to be the rule of interpretation? Manifestly the rule of the law whose assistance is invoked—the rule of the country whose magistrates are to act: our Judges, and magistrates know our law, but they do not know the French law; and the French magistrates know their law, and they do not know our law. Every Court must administer its own law, which it is bound to know; not a foreign law which it cannot be supposed to know. But this is not all. Suppose any magistrate in England and the Colonies had copies of the *Côde Napoleon* and the records of the *Cour de Cassation*, and reports of all the trials and arguments which guide the decisions of French judges, spread out before him, and suppose the practitioners in his Court were equally capable of raising and discussing points of Foreign law—Would that do? Not at all. You signed a treaty in 1843 enumerating four offences. Even though you affected to believe that the criminal codes of the two countries were in 1843 absolutely identical, so that every step of prosecution would be equal and identical, what is to prevent either country from altering its laws under each head of offence after your Treaty was signed, inserting crimes that did not formerly belong to that category? Now apply this to offences against the person. You make loud professions of your care not to be entrapped into surrendering political offenders. But if you allow any French spy or bailiff to tell your magistrates what is constructively an attempt to commit homicide, and if the French writ, which he produces unsupported by oral testimony, compels the extradition of the accused, what need is there of a magistrate at all? You could get the thing done better and cheaper by machinery. The whole thing is a farce. Mr. Justice Drummond states distinctly in his written and published judgment that Lamirande appeared to have committed no offence named in the Treaty. He had not committed forgery, and he was accused of nothing else. He might have committed *faux*—one species of *faux*, and if that species of *faux* had been what we call forgery he would have been legally given up. But not having committed that crime, and the Treaty containing nothing about stealing money out of bags in the cellar of a bank, the *habeas corpus* must issue, and the man be set free. When the writ issued the man was gone. And why? Because Lord Monck had been misadvised that forty-eight hours was time enough to allow him for making the application. Now this brings me to one of the practical issues I desire to raise. I would have a fixed and inflexible law; not a miserable dependent enactment limping after the terms of a special Convention, concluded between two Governments when they happen to be mutually in good humour, but a permanent and imperative law which would prescribe that three months should elapse after the signing of the warrant of extradition by the magistrate during which the prisoner might sue for a writ of *habeas corpus*, and have the merits of his case duly heard. I have great faith in the consistency, impartiality, and independence of our supreme tribunals. Their judgments are not liable to be disturbed by diplomatic or political influences; our Judges are appointed for life, and their decisions are matters of record. I have great faith in their decisions; but I own I have not the same faith in despatches written off-hand by a Secretary of State no matter who he may be. At present the appeal, and the only appeal is to him, from the decision of the magistrate. But is he always capable, or in a condition to act judicially? Is it to be expected that on an *ex parte* statement not made on oath he can or ought to be expected to overrule the judgment of the magistrate? If he does he subjects his Government to just reproach on the score of caprice from the foreign Power whose fugitive subject is not surrendered. If he does not the prisoner has really no benefit of appeal. Either way the system is faulty and works ill. In the case of Lamirande the appeal had there been time, would have been effectual; but no time being specified by law the man was cheated of the privilege, and to all intents and purposes he was as much stolen out of the custody of the British Crown as the gold was stolen out of the cellar at Poictiers. The noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs felt keenly the humiliation and indignity that had been placed upon his country; and he tried every art of remonstrance with M. Moustier to induce him to give Lamirande back. He very wisely and properly abstained from claiming him as a matter of right, because by the unfortunate mistake made in Canada we had lost our claim under strict International Law and could only urge international equity; but the French Foreign Office turned a deaf ear to his expostulations. The Correspondence is upon the table; let whoso readeth understand. It went on throughout the greater part of the winter, and on the 9th of January the noble Lord grew very urgent in his entreaties for the rendition of Lamirande. Parliament was about to meet; and he tells our *Charge d'Affaires* at Paris if something is not done in time the subject is certain to be discussed, and the result will probably be fatal to the renewal of the Extradition Bill of last Session, if not to the existence of any convention on the subject with France. The noble Lord appreciated justly the susceptibility of Parliament on a question so nearly touching the national honour; and we are here today not to blame the noble Lord or to taunt the French Government with having got out of the scrape by the poor device of getting the wretched man to withdraw his claim to our interposition, impelled by what motives I leave you to judge; but we are here to-day to call upon the Government to provide official means without delay against similar abuses occurring again. Our purpose is not to make mischief out of the past; but to draw good out of evil for the future.

But was the case of Lamirande the only one which justified our misgivings with regard to the consequences of the Act of last Session which you now ask us to renew? We foresaw and forewarned you that the effect of passing that Act would be not merely to speed the work of the police by sweeping technical hindrances out of their way, but that it would be taken as a signal by all engaged in the administration of criminal justice, that Parliament in future wished them to be less punctilious and less particular in matters of extradition; and that they had better in doubtful circumstances give the benefit of the doubt to the foreign catchpole, not to the foreign refugee. Of course, this apprehension, like every other we expressed, when set in the balance against the courtly assurances of diplomacy was treated as of little weight. There is a freemasonry among those practising the art and mystery of Government at home and abroad, which not only makes their intercourse more smooth and agreeable, but which involuntarily—perhaps unconsciously—indisposes them to listen to words of warning from unofficial lips. But will anyone acquainted with the incidents of the past twelve months venture to treat lightly the fears we then expressed? I will not stop to criticize the tone of Lord Monck's despatches, wherein he seeks to vindicate the course taken by him regarding Lamirande. Nor shall I seek to strain the meaning of the noble Lord's words addressed to Mr. Fane on the 9th January, in which he clearly indicates his apprehension that unless Lamirande were restored by the French authorities Parliament would not easily be induced to renew the Act of last year. There is something much more serious and important to be adduced on this score. On the 7th of September last a Frenchman, named Dubois, was brought before one of the metropolitan magistrates (Mr. Vaughan) on a charge of forgery, committed at Villeneuve, three years before. Had the copies of the depositions against him been produced before the passing of the late Act they would not have been legal proof, and he would have gone free; for the only *paróle* evidence brought forward was that of a person, who stated that he knew Dubois had been tried in his absence and condemned *par contumace.* The question is not whether the prisoner was or was not guilty. The sole question for us to consider is, whether or not he was dealt with in such a way as to form a precedent for the surrender of other men of very different character, and accused of a very different kind of crime. Now mark—Had he been arrested six weeks earlier he could not have been detained for the reasons I have stated. Two sorts of evidence were adduced against him—the one documentary, which would not have been legal or sufficient had you not passed the Bill of last year; the other oral, which would not have been admissible; because, in the case of Frenchmen, you have not yet consented to treat men as criminals who have been tried and condemned in their absence. But, remember, you have been asked to do so by the Government of Napoleon III; and, remember, that Lord Malmesbury, when Foreign Secretary of State, actually signed a Convention in 1852 agreeing to give up Frenchmen who had been sentenced *par contumace*, and that it was only by the opposition of Lord Aberdeen and Lord Campbell that the sanction of Parliament was refused. Remember, further, that since then you have actually made that concession to Denmark; and, remember finally, that only eighteen months ago the present French Ambassador in England demanded on behalf of his Court this very concession to France. Are we then mistrustful without cause? Or can we be expected to read without the criticism of suspicion every case which seems to point towards a consummation, we look upon with such loathing? Objections were made on various technical grounds to the retention of Dubois. But all of them were overruled. I do not question the legality of that decision; but I do question the course pursued by the magistrate who, when asked for time to apply for a *habeas corpus*, refused to suspend the writ of extradition, or to give any opportunity for appeal. If this be right in one case, who is to say that it is wrong in another? Dubois was probably a thief whom it was well to be rid of, and for whom no honest man could feel any sympathy; but if next day a refugee, obnoxious on political grounds to his Government, were impleaded before the same magistrate on an identical charge, what security would he have had against a similar rule of summary adjudication? What happened? Had Dubois been without professional aid—as many a poor exile must often be—or had he been inertly or inaptly defended—as all men sometimes are—the warrant of extradition would have been executed forthwith, and we should have heard no more of the matter; or if the magistrate had been sitting in Edinburgh, in Dublin, or in York, it might have made all the difference; but Bow Street happens to be within half-a-mile of Whitehall, and the solicitor for Dubois happened to be a man of energy and perseverance. It was late in the day when the order of the magistrate was made, and in the month of September the best of administrators are not given to linger late in the public departments. The solicitor hastened to the Home Office, Mr. Walpole was in attendance on the Queen at Balmoral; but access was obtained to the Under Secretary, who undertook that the prisoner should not be given up until Mr. Walpole had had an opportunity of fully considering the whole circumstances of the case. Upon such consideration the Secretary of State wisely and humanely decided that time should be given to sue out a writ of *habeas corpus.* No injustice was or could be thus done to anyone; and the Lord Chancellor, having heard the arguments in favour of the Motion for the writ, refused the application on grounds which seemed to him just. It is not necessary to question the justice of the Chancellor's decision in point of law, or the guilt of Dubois in point of fact; but the case is important as illustrating this fact—that a foreigner may be delivered up on a charge made by foreign police without a particle of such proof of *primâ facie* guilt as would send an Englishman for trial; and that he is liable to be sent out of the realm without time to ask the benefit of an *habeas corpus* if his attorney does not win a cab race from Bow Street to Whitehall. Is this the condition in which a great principle and practice of international law ought to be suffered to remain? Suppose the case had occurred in Glasgow, Liverpool or Newcastle, and that any of the score of accidents that beset all communications by letter had interposed? It is all very well to talk of Lamirande's case as exceptional because colonial, but here is the very same contingency waiting at your very door. In every case there ought to be a time, specifically defined by statute after the decision of the magistrate, within which the accused may move the Court of Queen's Bench for an *habeas corpus.* To leave all to the temper or caprice of a single subordinate official, acting irresponsibly, is a thing without precedent or parallel in our law, without sense or decency in point of policy.

And now it will be asked, "What do we propose?" Would the refusal of Parliament to renew the Act of last Session satisfy us or close the question you have opened? Not so. When we debated the subject last year our talk was of technicalities; but you have driven us to reconsider principles; and to-day I trust that our discussion will not be limited to forms of procedure in a police court, but will embrace the consideration of a national policy. At all times there has been a conflict of authorities as to which way the presumption should be held to lie regarding the rendition of fugitives. In the Civil Law—that crystalization of overruling authority—no place was too remote for recapture, no integrity or purity of thought furnished any excuse why an individual ought not to be surrendered who had incurred the suspicion or the enmity of power. The dominion of Rome rested on the theory of resistless domination; and when that Power was at its zenith, international liberty lay in stirless sleep; but on the break-up of the hard frost of Cæsarism, every country that aspired to be free, in one shape or other, resumed the inherent right to give shelter to fugitives. It is, indeed, an essential part and parcel of international freedom. England, France, Switzerland, the commonwealths of Italy, the Hanse Towns, the German Principalities, the Swedes and the Dutch, all asserted, early and earnestly, the right of asylum. But I think history makes this clear that, just in proportion as the element of personal or imperious will prevailed in Government, the evil disposition showed itself again and again to overreach and overbear, in this matter, the justice and self-respect of neighbours who were weak enough to be bullied, or frail enough to be cajoled. I will venture to say this, after carefully investigating the subject, that hardly an instance can be pointed out of a State, where the Executive became practically irresponsible to the opinion of its subjects, in which we do not find this claim of extradition exaggerated, and put much higher than before; and, on the other hand, I think it can be clearly shown that, in proportion as communities worked out their domestic freedom, and came to be constitutionally governed, they not only dissuaded their rulers from straining this pretension, but steadily resisted the attempt to exercise it on the part of foreign Powers. It is remarked by Mr. Froude, in his last volume of the *History of England*, that nothing so emboldened the enemies of the Regent Murray as his fatal compliance with the demands of Elizabeth to surrender the Northern Earls, who had risen in rebellion against her, and fled across the Border. On other points Scottish factions differed; but all united in a sense of shame at the truckling of their Executive to a Foreign Sovereign; and, but for this, the historian thinks that Murray might not have fallen. In the growth of law and liberty under the Stuarts, international right was comparatively little thought of; but the greatest English jurist of his time saw clearly, and laid down plainly, the truth of extradition—

> "It hath ever been holden," says Coke, "that in separate kingdoms the subject of one fleeing to another for safety ought not to be delivered up."

One of the first, and one of the worst, excesses of Royalist reaction at the Restoration was the instructions sent by Clarendon to Sir George Downing, our Envoy in Holland, to obtain the surrender of Colonel Okey, Barkstead, and Corbet, who had sat on the trial of the King. Mr. Pepys, in his Diary, calls Sir George Downing "a perfidious rogue;" and William Penn marvelled how the man, who had been originally a chaplain in Okey's regiment, could lend himself to such a service. Downing persuaded De Witt to let him seize the unsuspecting English refugees at Delph. They were sent home in an English frigate, and executed at Tyburn. It is a memorable fact that, ere many years elapsed, the great and good statesman, who had suffered himself to be thus betrayed into an act unworthy of his country in the vain hope of conciliating the despotic Stuart, should have fallen at the hand of assassins pensioned by one of that family. Some strong things have since then been done by English Administrations; but, upon the whole, since the Revolution, the gradual course of our dealings with foreign States has been more lenient, more liberal, and more enlightened. During that dark season, when we went to war with France to humour George III, and to stem the tide of democracy, a shameful act of violence and wrong was perpetrated in England's dishonoured name. Parliamentary Reform and religious liberty were denied at home, and the right of public meeting was suspended. Ireland, goaded to madness, broke forth in rebellion; and, when the revolt was crushed with inhuman slaughter, three of the survivors escaped to Hamburgh, and there, in a free and neutral city, believed themselves secure. Our Resident, Sir James Crawford, was instructed to demand that they should be delivered up, and the magistrates yielded so far as to give him a party of police, who in the night surrounded the inn where the exiles slept, and in the morning conducted them to gaol. The English Minister claimed his prey; the Senate, warned by the French Envoy, hesitated long. By every principle of honour, humanity, and law, they were deterred from making the surrender—by all their sense of weakness and dependence for commercial life on the safety of their ships at sea they were tempted to yield. They stood out manfully against the threats of Lord Grenville and Mr. Pitt for eleven months, and they only then succumbed because the Czar Paul of Russia had, by our Government, been persuaded to lay an embargo on their vessels in his ports. Their city would be ruined if they persevered, and General Tandy with his companions were given up. Lord Cornwallis, a wise and just man, then Viceroy of Ireland, wrote confidentially to dissuade the Government from a proceeding which he foresaw could only entail reproach and humiliation; but his opinion being disregarded, he was obliged to order the fugitives for trial. Tandy was indicted for treason, condemned, and left for execution. Lord Cornwallis wrote to the Duke of Portland the reasons why he had respited him; but when his successor, Lord Hardwicke, commuted the sentence to transportation for life, Tandy refused. Napoleon had, upon his surrender, written to the Senate at Hamburg a letter full of scathing reproach—

> "It was not by cowardice and truckling that small States were preserved, but by courage and virtue. You have violated the laws of hospitality as the hordes of the desert would not have done; and if the blood of those brave men be shed on the scaffold it will do their captors more harm than a legion of armed men."

These were not idle protestations. While Tandy lay in Lifford gaol the negotiations for peace drew near a close at Amiens. Napoleon wrote to his brother Joseph on no account to sign the preliminaries until General Tandy was restored to France; and after having waded knee-deep in violence and illegality our Government thought it prudent not only to liberate the condemned traitor, but to place him on board a neutral ship by which he was conveyed to France. It is noted in a valuable work by my hon. Friend the Member for Elgin (Mr. Grant Duff) how M. Tourguéneff, the friend of Stein, and author of one of the first enlightened books on the social and political condition of Russia, was travelling abroad when, in 1825, an unsuccessful attempt at revolution broke out. The evil eye of autocratic suspicion fell upon him, and he was summoned peremptorily to return to his own land. He understood too well what the mandate meant and sat him down for shelter on the hearth of England. His extradition was demanded by the Russian Ambassador and was met by Mr. Canning with a scornful stare. Had he been surrendered he would have been sent to Siberia, if not to the scaffold. The admonitory shade of Canning's statue no longer falls upon our path as we approach this House; but although bad taste has put back his effigy I hope his noble-hearted policy in foreign affairs will not be cast into oblivion.

When Hungary was crushed in 1849 for asserting principles which within the last few months have been recognized by the Emperor of Austria, Kossuth and his companions claimed the protection of the Porte as political refugees. Both Russia and Austria insisted on their being delivered up, and when Lord Stratford advised the Sultan to resist, the pretext was resorted to of charging Kossuth with fraud and larceny of the Crown jewels. We all know now that the charge was utterly false. But if you hold the doctrine that a Government ought to give up every fugitive against whom a charge of ordinary crime is made, leaving him then to the mercy of his political enemies, you must be of opinion that the Porte had no right to refuse the surrender, and that we ought not to have counselled the refusal. But Lord Palmerston did not think so, for he wrote a despatch on the 6th of October, 1849, to our Ministers at the Courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg, in which he said—

> "If there is one rule more than another that has been observed in modern times by independent States, both great and small, of the civilized world, it is the rule not to deliver up political refugees. The law of hospitality, the dictates of humanity, the general feelings of mankind forbid such surrenders; and any independent Government which, by its own free will was to make any such surrender would be universally and deservedly stigmatized as dishonoured — unless a State is bound to extradition by the positive obligations of a Treaty; but such treaty engagements are few, if indeed any such exist."

That they do exist is unfortunately too certain. The network of treaties between despotic States is gradually spreading more and more. If we allow our policy to remain undefined much longer, it will be taken for granted that England too means to be a subscriber and shareholder in the system of joint-stock police which all absolute governments favour. But there would be no mutuality in the obligation, for we have long since repudiated all thought of following political offenders beyond sea, while with despotisms it is the primary object.

In 1830, the Neapolitan Government demanded from France the surrender of M. Pita Terra, a political refugee domiciled at Ajaccio, on a fictitious charge of murder; and he was surrendered on a warrant signed by Duc Pasquier. After the Revolution of July representations were made to the new Government that a fraud had been practised, and the Minister, then Garde des Sceaux, defended himself, on the ground that he could not believe it possible that false representations had been made for the purposes of extradition; but the Liberal party pressed the case so strongly that Casimir Perrier insisted upon restitution of the prisoner, and had him brought back to Corsica; but the French Government itself since the restoration of the Empire has not disdained to press that of Switzerland, with whom it has a stringent treaty of extradition to compel obnoxious politicians to quit their confines. The same course has been pursued towards Belgium; and they insisted upon Victor Hugo quitting the country and taking refuge in the Channel Islands. How long he will be safe there no man in this House can tell, if you leave your law and practice in its present state. There is nothing to prevent a charge of forgery or attempt to commit homicide being trumped up against him, and nothing to prevent a magistrate, on mere documentary proof—the unreality of which the wretches who are sent to produce it may not even know—from being given up as Lamirande was and tried for a totally different offence, or what is more probable, and more formidable, kept in durance without trial. You may say there is time for *habeas corpus*, and time for the suspension veto of the Secretary of State; but I have shown you both in the case of Lamirande and that of Dubois, how frail is that reliance. I say there ought to be a fixed and known law of England—a real English law, not a French Act of Parliament like that we are asked to-day to renew, which would prevent any man, under any circumstances, or on any pretence, being taken out of the realm within the space of three months after the magistrate's warrant of extradition had been signed. I say further that when brought before the Queen's Bench on *habeas corpus* it should be the prisoner's right to call upon that high tribunal to try the *bonâ fide* of the whole proceeding, and specially to inquire, if the prisoner desire it, whether he has ever made himself obnoxious to the Government that claims him by acts of a political nature. I did not believe last year, and I do not believe now, that it is in the power of Parliament to say beforehand what are political and what are not political crimes. I frankly own that there are offences against the person of the Sovereign or chief magistrate, or against those holding public offices in the State, which, though their motive be political, plainly fall within the category of murder. The acts of Booth and of Orsini were such crimes; but does anyone believe that the Court of Queen's Bench would have refused to confirm warrants for their extradition? On the other hand, I do not believe that that upright and learned tribunal would have given up Kossuth, or Victor Hugo, or Prince Louis Napoleon Buonaparte, late of King Street, St. James's; but now of the Tuileries, Paris. I do not care to raise again the subordinate question as to the precise scope and mischief of this Bill. Ministers feel it to be insufficient and unsatisfactory, and they only ask its renewal therefore for another year. I had hoped that the whole subject might have been brought under the consideration of Parliament this Session with a view to the adoption of some more easily intelligible, more permanent, more comprehensive, and, I will add, more worthy, enactment. Our time and attention have been so absorbed by topics more pressing that I felt it to be my duty to abstain from bringing forward the Motion of which I had given Notice on an earlier day; but I trust that the noble Lord will meet the forbearance we have shown by entering frankly into a disclosure of his policy, if he has one regarding extradition; and, if not, that he will at least give us a specific assurance that early next Session the whole subject will be submitted to a Royal Commission or to a Select Committee of this House; for certain I am that our inconsistent and anomalous treaties cannot be left as they are with safety to the honour, the dignity, or the peace of the nation.

Mr. LAYARD said, it was true, as stated by his hon. Friend, that the Treaty with France was prepared by the Government of which he was a Member. But his own opinion had always been opposed to that treaty, and he believed it to be wrong on two distinct points. In the first place, he objected to it because it was an exceptional treaty made with a single Power; and next, because it afforded facilities for demanding offenders ostensibly on account of criminal acts, but really on account of political offences. He did not mean to say that France would be guilty of demanding prisoners for political offences, but there could be no doubt that the treaty conferred the power. A person of the highest authority, a native of France, told him at the time that Treaty was passed that under it he might at any time be delivered up to the authorities for the time being in that country. It was most dangerous for such a power to be given to any State. Nothing could be more objectionable than the way in which extradition treaties were concluded. The last treaties with America, France, and Denmark, were all founded on different principles three or four years ago. He had the honour of proposing an extradition treaty with Prussia, but his hon. Friend the Member for Brighton opposed that treaty, and it was withdrawn. He did not say that his hon. Friend was wrong, but that Treaty had in its favour precedent. It was word for word the same treaty which had been agreed to in the case of Denmark ; and there seemed to be no reason why a treaty sanctioned in the case of one Power should be refused in the case of another. The great error lay in the fact that all these treaties were matters of negotiation and barter between the two countries. Each side gave up something, and when the treaty was ultimately agreed upon it was submitted to Parliament, which might either accept or reject it. That was a false position for the Government to be placed in. A treaty solemnly negotiated should be conclusive. We had no interest in detaining foreign criminals in this country, or in keeping up a system under which our own criminals in other countries were enabled to escape. We ought not to allow this question to remain one of bargain and sale. We ought to lay down for ourselves the principle upon which we were prepared to give up persons accused of crime to the State to which they belonged, without reference to any concessions we might obtain from them in return. His hon. Friend had fallen into error when he said that in the case of one of our treaties we were bound to give up a man who had previously been tried and condemned in his absence. That was not so. We gave up a man to be tried, and if guilty, to be condemned in the Courts of his own country, on certain evidence which was considered sufficient to warrant his extradition having first been adduced before tribunals properly constituted. It must be remembered that the laws of foreign countries were in many respects diametrically opposed to our own. Here we assumed a man to be innocent till he was found guilty. In France, anyone accused was treated as guilty till he was discovered to be innocent. What made the question still more difficult was that the evidence was taken without the knowledge of the person accused, and with closed doors. Copies of the evidence so taken were not even given to the State called upon to deliver the person that was claimed. This country accordingly was placed in a very awkward position; for it was called upon to do that which was in direct violation of English law. When the question was under discussion last year at the Foreign Office, he felt that the right course would be to appoint a Committee chosen from Gentlemen on both sides of the House, men of the highest diplomatic and legal experience, who should investigate the question thoroughly, and decide for what crimes, and upon what evidence, persons, claimed by foreign Governments, should be given up. When once these conditions had been laid down, any Power seeking for an Extradition Treaty with us should be apprised that such and such terms only would be granted, and would not be departed from. When these terms were acceded to, the treaty should be made by the Executive, and no reference to Parliament should be necessary. In the case of certain foreign countries the power of the Crown sufficed for the regulation of certain particular purposes. In the cases of China and Turkey, the Crown was empowered by Order in Council to pass certain laws concerning British subjects, and a similar mode of proceeding might usefully be adopted in this case. This question, he thought, ought hardly to have been raised upon a mere Continuance Bill. It was not the fault, probably, of the noble Lord, but last year a pledge was given that opportunity should be afforded for a full discussion of the question. That pledge ought to be redeemed. The noble Lord, in renewing this Treaty, should only do so for a period of one year that the question might be fully discussed next Session.

Mr. NEATE said, he wished it to be understood that the views of the hon. Member (Mr. Torrens) did not meet with general assent on that (the Opposition) side of the House. If any importance should be attached to his speech out of doors—and he did not suppose there would be much—he should say that a more mischievous one had never been made in Parliament. The principles it contained would, if accepted, place us outside the pale of civilized nations. They would so far place us outside the pale of civilized nations that they would render it impossible for us to maintain with them such relations as would enable us to demand the surrender of criminals that had fled from our shores. He entirely agreed with his hon. Friend (Mr. Layard) that it was not desirable to make this matter the subject of reciprocal treaties with other Powers, and that it would be far better to lay down the general rules on which this country would act, whatever foreign countries might do. At the same time it would be very difficult to pass such an Act of Parliament, because it would involve the definition of crimes punishable by the laws of other nations. Therefore, it was impossible to frame any Act on this subject dealing with foreign nations without consultation with those nations. He repudiated the principle that we ought to try foreign criminals by the rules of foreign law, and also the assertion that the principle of the French procedure was to assume that every person accused was guilty until his innocence was proved. If they looked merely to the principles of justice, the foreign procedure was not inferior to our own, and we had no right to give the law to foreign nations, though, no doubt, justice was administered in this country in a spirit of independence and purity unknown in other countries. All a foreign country was bound to show, or we to show to a foreign country, when demanding the extradition of a subject, was a *primâ facie* case such as that which was laid before a grand jury to justify the trial of a prisoner. Nor was there any injustice in the person whose extradition was demanded not being heard in his defence more than there was in the case of an accusation before a grand jury. Though, as compared with our proceedings, a spirit of unfairness towards the accused characterized the action of foreign tribunals, the principles of their jurisprudence were equitable, and they were entitled to repudiate any pretensions on our part to set ourselves up as authorities. We had no right to impose upon foreign nations our rules of procedure, or to say that they ought not to bring a man to justice unless *viva voce* evidence had been taken against him. The real thing, and the only thing, that required to be guarded against was lest civil crimes should be made the pretext for demanding the surrender of political offenders. We must trust to the honour of foreign nations that this was not done. If not, if they were to refuse to conclude extradition treaties because they felt suspicious that they would be converted to wrong purposes by other nations, it would follow that other nations would say, "If you treat us in this manner, as if we were rogues and liars, and not to be trusted, let us cease at once all diplomatic relations, withdraw your ambassadors, and have only commercial agents." He agreed, with the hon. Member (Mr. Torrens) that a greater space of time should be allowed to a man to obtain relief by *habeas corpus*, and that it should not be left entirely in the hands of the police magistrate. Without extradition treaties the ordinary ends of justice would constantly be defeated. A man might commit a murder, a cashier might rob the tills of his bank, and, within a few hours, and before discovery was in any way possible, he might laugh at those whom he had wronged, secure in the asylum of the French soil. Unless, then, we dealt with foreign nations in such a manner as to have mutual extradition in proper cases, the most inconvenient restrictions might be placed in the way of our obtaining possesion of the persons of criminals who had fled to other countries. He hoped that the noble Lord, in considering the subject would give due weight to that consideration.

SIR FRANCIS GOLDSMID said, that it was with great reluctance that he ventured to criticize the action, or even the inaction, of the noble Lord the Foreign Secretary, as he felt much admiration for his policy generally. With respect to this particular subject, however, he certainly thought that the noble Lord had not done all that might have been expected of him. He (Sir Francis Goldsmid), in the course of the debate on this subject last Session, proposed an Amendment to the effect that political offenders should be exempt from the operation of the Extradition Treaty; and the debate ended in the limitation of the Treaty to one year, the noble Lord stating that in the course of next Session the House would have an opportunity of carefully and deliberately considering the question. It might be said that the Reform Bill had stood in the way; but if this was true so far as regarded the House, it was not true with reference to the Foreign Secretary, who for some months past had not taken any such part in the debates on Reform as would have precluded him from devoting his powerful mind to the subject of extradition. The noble Lord during the discussion of last year said—

> "International courtesy demanded that the Treaty should not be materially altered without communication with the other party to it."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxiv. 2114.]

So also Lord Derby said in "another place" a few days afterwards—

> "Moreover, during the year an opportunity would be afforded of communicating with the Government of France, and arranging the terms of the renewal of the former Treaty, or of any new treaty which might be thought expedient."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxiv. 2154.]

Surely statements such as these justified the expectation that Ministers would seek an opportunity of communicating with the French Government and arranging a new treaty. But no such communication had taken place, and the House was now informed that the matter was in precisely the same position as it then stood. Before the debate of last year the general belief was that none of the extradition treaties applied to political offences; and when it appeared that this was an error, he (Sir Francis Goldsmid) had brought forward his Amendment limiting the operation of the treaties to non-political offences. This proposal was deemed too wide, and the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) pointed out that if it should happen that any one should shoot him in the Lobby and get away to France, the criminal would be secure of a refuge because the crime would be considered a political offence. Notwithstanding the persistent opposition of the hon. Member to the privileges of the City of London, he (Sir Francis Goldsmid) did not think it very likely that an indignant Lord Mayor or infuriated Common Councilman would come down to the House and shoot the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets. It was, however, true that if the treaties exempted all political offenders, the exemption would apply to those who had committed, or attempted to commit, political assassination, and that such persons as Orsini and Booth might thus be able to claim the benefit of the exception. Now, almost all were agreed that political assassins should not, and that other political offenders should, be entitled to protection. He (Sir Francis Goldsmid) was, however, afraid that the treaties as they were at present framed were not subject to any such limitation, and that a person engaged in civil conflict against any Power with whom we had such a treaty would, if he took refuge in England, have to be rendered up by us if any blood had been shed in the course of the contest. The attempt which had been made to show that the word *assassinat* in the French Code only applied to cases of assassination, altogether failed, and he believed that it also applied to deaths resulting from civil disturbances arising out of political agitations. The 297th Article of the French Penal Code showed that *meurtre* is synonymous with culpable homicide, and that *assassinat* is equivalent, not to assassination, but to murder; the premeditation required not being premeditated malice against a particular individual, but only an intention to fight anyone who opposes you. In the same way in England, killing anyone when the killer is intentionally doing an unlawful act, though without malice against the person killed, is murder. So also, the remark of the hon. and learned Member for Richmond (Sir Roundell Palmer), that taking life in a civil conflict in France is not murder, because resistance to the existing authority in France is not a crime in England, ignores the circumstance that under the extradition treaties the magistrate is to consider whether the act done would have been murder or attempt to murder if it had been done in this country, and that if the resistance had been made in this country, it would have been resistance to the Queen's soldiers or police. There was really, therefore, no reason to doubt that, under the existing Acts, we might be called on to deliver up anyone who had fought in a rebellion against the greatest tyranny. Then, again, it was said that the language of the Act was merely permissive, and that the Secretary of State might deliver up an accused person if he thought right. But the language of the treaty was obligatory, and if a proper case were made out the Secretary of State would be bound to give up the offender. If such a case occurred with reference to an individual who had only taken part in a civil conflict, a great shock would be caused to public opinion in England, and the right of asylum, as it had been hitherto considered, would be materially invaded. He trusted that, at all events, the noble Lord would not extend the Act further than one year, so that the subject might be duly considered next Session.

Mr. WATKIN said, he did not think that the hon. Member for Finsbury should have made any allusion to national subserviency. It was not necessary to give a lesson upon that subject to the House of Commons, as he believed no body was less inclined to give way to national subserviency than that House. The hon. Gentleman should have said that it was for the benefit of society all over the world that malefactors should get the punishment they deserved. Lamirande was cashier in one of the branches of the Bank of France; and was in the habit of extracting coin from the vaults and safes of the bank, making false entries, and falsifying the books. At last, on an occasion when it became necessary to send a large quantity of specie away, Lamirande disappeared, taking with him 700,000*f.* Everyone who knew the great importance of preserving the integrity of those engaged in banking operations must be aware that the crime of Lamirande was as atrocious as any crime except that of murder. He was, however, arrested in New York under a French warrant, and, having employed counsel, he escaped to Canada, and the counsel did what he trusted no English counsel would do for his client, stole the warrant. Evidence of his identity however was produced before the magistrate in Canada and he was handed over to the French police and sent to England. In the interval, however, a writ of *habeas corpus* was issued by Chief Justice Drummond, and immediately that the Governor General heard of that he telegraphed to the Colonial Office stating the facts of the case. So that every precaution had been taken in the case by the colonial authorities, and if any injustice was done to Lamirande, it happened in England. It was very much more important for society that murderers, robbers, and those who embezzled monies, should, under an extradition treaty, receive their punishment than that some few persons suspected as political offenders should unfortunately be given up on the pretence of their being criminals.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, that the argument of his hon. Friend (Mr. Watkin) carried out to its logical conclusion would carry him much farther than to giving up mere criminals; it would induce the House to connive at the most tyrannical exercise of power on the part of a Government. It was very important, no doubt, that malefactors should be given up, and that peaceably disposed persons should be able to walk about in security; but he did not think that anybody in that House would be found to agree in such an argument as that made use of by the hon. Member for Stockport, which was an argument that had always been made use of in defence of tyranny. If they restrained tyranny, if they restricted the abuse of power, if they did anything which had a tendency to weaken the hands of those who conducted the administration of the country, it did not follow that they were disposed to throw aside all the advantages which society derived from the existence of law and government. That argument, therefore, might be put out of the question. No doubt it was very important that malefactors should not be able to fly from one country to another. Other countries as well as this felt the importance of delivering up ordinary malefactors. But every country did not think it right to surrender persons who were only charged as criminals, because they were deemed to be political offenders; and to make such a concession would stamp any free country with disgrace. Was the House prepared to entertain the doctrine that we ought to have such unbounded confidence in every Government with which we had diplomatic relations that we ought to rely upon the honour of that Government that it would not demand the extradition of political offenders, instead of taking proper precautions against the abuse of the treaty by foreign Governments? The hon. Member had referred to the circumstances of the Lamirande case. Everyone was aware that the extradition of that person had been obtained by a fraudulent proceeding, but at the same time everyone was aware that Lamirande was a scoundrel, and probably the consciousness of that fact went far to prevent any prolonged discussion upon the subject of the treaty, such as would have taken place had it been the case of the extradition of a political offender. The hon. Member for Southwark (Mr. Layard) had alluded to the difference between the French and English procedure in criminal cases, stating that here we always presumed a man to be innocent till he was proved guilty, whereas in France a man was presumed to be guilty till he had proved himself to be innocent. No doubt this did not necessarily imply a failure of justice in foreign countries; because the tribunals were bound to act precisely on the same abstract principles of truth and justice as were presumed to be acted upon by our Courts of Justice. It was true, however, that in this country the tribunals considered themselves simply bound to hear the case, and if justice was defeated the fault was with the parties, the Judge being impartial; while abroad —in France for instance—the Judge acted to a certain extent as an officer of police as well as of justice; he thought it his business to hold an inquisition—not, of course, of the nature of the Spanish Inquisition—into the case, and felt bound to discover by whom the offence had been committed. He was as little disposed as any Member of the House to flatter his countrymen at the expense of other nations; but in this respect the feelings and opinions of our Courts were much better than those of most foreign countries, and in his opinion we ought not to give up any portion of the advantage which we derived from that difference. With their feelings in this respect, it was exceedingly natural that the French tribunals, and still more the subordinates of the French tribunals, should take very much the same view as the hon. Member for Stockport, and should think that everything was fair by means of which a person accused of a crime could be brought before a tribunal. This it was that was so strikingly illustrated by the case of Lamirande, which placed in a very strong light indeed the impolicy and injustice of that confidence which his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford was willing to place in the Governments and officers of foreign countries. It showed that it would not do for us to abandon the right that we had always exercised, of examining, before we delivered up an alleged criminal, whether there was such evidence as appeared to our tribunals to be sufficient to justify his being placed upon his trial. When, last year, the noble Lord (Lord Stanley), yielding to their arguments and not to their numbers, consented to limit the duration of this measure till the 1st of September, the general expectation was that the interval would be employed in placing the matter upon a more satisfactory footing, either by means of negotiation, or, as he (Mr. Mill) should prefer, by laying down some principle which should apply to all extradition treaties. They left the matter willingly in the hands of the noble Lord. He hoped that the noble Lord would be able to say that something of the sort had been done. Unless the noble Lord could make out some very strong case as to the extreme difficulty of dealing with this subject, he did not see how he could ask for a longer prolongation of the statute than that which was granted last year. The demand indeed reminded him of the story of Hiero and Simonides. Hiero asked Simondes to define the Godhead. Simonides asked for a day; at the expiration of that time he asked for two, and at the expiration of the two he asked for four, explaining that the more he considered the subject the more difficult he found it. The Government first asked them for a year and now, having had it, for what amounted to two years. An hon. and learned Friend of his, who was not in his place, contemplated proposing that, instead of prolonging the Act until the end of the Session of 1869, the endurance of the measure should be limited till the 15th July next, in order that the question might be thoroughly discussed in a full House. If the noble Lord was not prepared to assent to that Amendment he hoped that the noble Lord, when he rose to reply, would be able to assure the House that the time that had elapsed had been usefully employed, and that some plan had been drawn up, or that negotiations had been entered into with foreign Governments that would lead to a satisfactory result being arrived at with reference to this important question.

Lord STANLEY: In answer to the appeal which has been made to me by the hon. Member for Westminster and by the hon. Baronet who preceded him, I have to state that it never was my intention to ask the House to continue this Bill for more than one year. Both the hon. Member for Westminster and the hon. Baronet appear to imagine that during the discussion upon this matter last year I undertook that some general inquiry should be made into the whole subject of extradition. Upon that point, however, the hon. Members are labouring under a misapprehension; for all I then said was, that I thought it desirable inquiry should be made into the question, and that if some hon. Gentleman were to move for the appointment of a Committee to conduct such an investigation, I should offer no opposition to such a Motion. It is not my fault that the attention of the House has been occupied by matters of a different character, and that, therefore, no one has thought fit to move for the appointment of a Committee for that purpose. The fact is, that no one has even mentioned the subject. On consideration of the whole matter, I agree with the hon. Member for Southwark, that to appoint a

Committee to investigate the whole matter would be the most satisfactory mode of proceeding. It may be asked, "Why delay the settlement of the question by going to the trouble of investigating the subject, when you have only to enter into negotiations with foreign countries?" The reply to such a question is that it would add enormously to our labour, without producing any adequate result, were we to enter into negotiations with each foreign Power separately; whereas if we can once lay down some general principle with regard to the subject of extradition, it will be but a small matter to apply that principle to all extradition treaties we may enter into with foreign countries. At the same time, I must say that, although the adoption of such a uniform system is much to be desired, I think that if the hon. Member for Westminster were to serve upon this Committee next year he would find the story to which he has referred even more applicable than he supposes, because the more the matter is looked into in detail the greater the difficulties become. Let me revert for a moment to the speech of the hon. Member for Finsbury, who, no doubt, has studied and understands the subject, though I was certainly rather surprised at some part of his argument—that is, if I am to regard it as an argument bearing upon the Bill under consideration. The hon. Gentleman said that we were going to give up men without inquiring into the offences which they were alleged to have committed. Let me remind the House that the Act, the continuance of which is now under discussion, merely provides that copies of certain legal documents duly authenticated shall be admitted as proofs in English Courts without the Judge who signed them being called upon personally to prove them before some witness to be afterwards brought over to this country to verify the signature. The case of Lamirande was an unsatisfactory transaction, but it has no more to do with the Bill, the continuance of which I am now proposing, than with the Reform Bill. There is no doubt that Lamirande was unduly captured, that there was over zeal on the part of the French police, and laxity or mistake on the part of the colonial authorities. If that mistake had not been made, Lamirande would not have been captured and sentenced; but the difficulty which we felt and which prevented us from demanding his release as a matter of right was, that the error had been committed by our own authorities; and that, therefore, we and not the French Government were responsible for what had taken place; but supposing the Bill had not existed, the case of Lamirande would have stood upon precisely the same footing. The only difference would have been that, in order to obtain his arrest, instead of merely producing certain documents, the French police would have been compelled to take to Canada witnesses who would have proved the authenticity. That might have increased the expense but would not have added to the proof, nor prevented the arrest. The hon. Member said that the French police abused the Act of Extradition by putting it to a use which was never intended, and arrested Lamirande for an offence which he had not committed. That is a question as to the construction of a French law term; but, admitting that they strained the law for their own purposes, there is nothing in this Bill which bears upon that subject. It was as much open to the French police to do that under the Act of 1843 as under the amended Act of last year. The hon. Gentleman suggested a case in which some foreign Government might bring a pretended charge against a prisoner in order to get him into their power, and then proceed against him upon another charge and sentence him for an offence to which the extradition treaty did not apply. My answer to that is, that if anything of the kind were attempted, which seems to me very improbable indeed, it would be for us to demand back the man, and to insist that he should only be tried and punished for the crime for which the extradition was granted. I hold that that would be the proper course to take. Apart from going to war, or breaking off diplomatic relations, we should in such a case have a complete remedy, because if a treaty was abused in that way by any Power, it would immediately be allowed to drop, and the right of extradition, as far as that country was concerned, would cease. I shall not enter into a great many of the arguments which I have heard this afternoon, because they seem to have been chiefly directed, not against the Bill which we are now discussing, but against the whole principle, or rather practice, of extradition. No doubt, that is a fair subject for discussion, and I do not find fault with anyone for saying that the principle of extradition is a bad principle; but that will raise the whole question as to the policy of the Act of 1843; and I think I am justified in assuming that, unless this House expresses in some decided way a contrary opinion, the country is not prepared to depart from that principle which was adopted after the fullest consideration, which has been in force for twenty-five years, and with reference to which very few and slight cases of abuse had ever been alleged. With regard to the manner in which that principle is to be applied, I think that is a very fair subject for an inquiry; and, if a Committee is moved for to investigate the subject next year, I shall not then object—as I should not this year have objected — to its appointment.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, he must express his surprise at the extreme jealousy shown in that House with regard to the principle of extradition, which, in his opinion, was an essential part of civilization, and a benefit to human society generally. Hugo Grotius, the greatest of all writers on International Law, laid down the maxim that it was disgraceful for a country to give an asylum to criminals. The arguments adduced against the principle of extradition appeared to be based on a notion that it might lead to the extradition and punishment of political offenders. He admitted that Grotius also asserted what was termed the right of asylum, stating that it was sacred, and he (Sir George Bowyer) would never deny the right of an asylum to those who, in the course of political events, were compelled to leave their own country and seek refuge in another. At the same time he was of opinion that the right of an asylum should be confined to strictly political offences. A political offence might be defined as that which was an offence against the Government of a particular country; but not an act condemed as criminal by the laws of other countries, and by the opinion of civilized men. In the course of the debate on this question last year, it was stated that although persons might be guilty of murder or assassination—which was a peculiar species of murder—yet they ought not to be delivered up if the offence were of a political character. He denied, however, that murder or assassination, or attempts, or conspiracies to murder or assassinate could be properly termed political offences, because they were regarded as offences according to the laws of all countries, whether civilized or uncivilized. The taking, or attempting to take life, was condemned by the laws, not only of all civilized, but also of partially civilized countries. It was an offence against natural law. Therefore any person who had for a political motive taken the life, or conspired, or attempted to take the life of another ought to be given up to justice in the same manner as if he had committed the offence for the sake of gain, or from any other motive. These were the doctrines of jurists, and the principles which would stand the test of pnblic discussion. If they once removed this political element there was no difficulty in the matter of extradition. The offences ought to be clearly defined as well as the evidence on which the magistrates might safely act in delivering up the criminal. The Bill now under discussion related merely to a question of evidence, and did not touch the principle on which extradition rested, but he had taken this opportunity to state to the House what in his opinion were sound principles in regard to the general subject.

MR. HENLEY said, that the turn the discussion had taken made it clear that the whole question of extradition would have to be considered during the next Session of Parliament, as there was nothing in the four corners of the Treaty in question which warranted the discussion. With reference to the inquiry that was likely to take place as to the principles upon which extradition treaties should be based, every one must admit the importance of considering the means by which the laws of foreign countries as well as of our own were administered. It would be very inconvenient if "a hard and fast line" were drawn by those making the inquiry, to which foreign countries were unable or did not choose to assent. The hon. Member for Reading (Sir Francis Goldsmid), and the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill), had unfairly blamed the noble Lord (Lord Stanley) for not having attended to this matter earlier. They should have remembered that he had been engaged in the difficult task of preventing people cutting one another's throats. In that he had been successful, and was more beneficially employed than in attending to the matter under discussion. As it was the general wish of the House that an inquiry should be made he supposed it would be well to have it; but he believed the end of such inquiries would be the abolition of extradition treaties altogether. After all, the results from them were not large, and it did not very much matter whether the persons of questionable character exchanged remained on one side of the water or the other.

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he wished to correct a misapprehension as to the way in which this discussion had arisen. Very early in the Session, seeing the difficulties in which private Members were placed by the pressure of public business, he communicated with the noble Lord opposite, stating that Members on that (the Opposition) side were willing to wait until a Bill came before the House, on the understanding that the general question should then be discussed, either on the second reading or on going into Committee.

Sir FRANCIS GOLDSMID said, he thought that the mistake had arisen from its having been understood that the noble Lord would bring forward the question.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, he had never intended to say that the noble Lord had broken any pledge. If the noble Lord had given any pledge, donbtless he would have kept it. He had only said that there had been an expectation and a hope in the House that the question would be discussed.

Lord STANLEY said, what he stated was that if the matter could be inquired into by a Committee, the Government would offer no objection to such a course.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported ;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) *re-committed*) BILL (*Lords*)—[Bill 228.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that most of the Acts relating to the cattle plague would terminate at the end of the present month, and it was, therefore, necessary to pass a Continuance Act with those Amendments, which experience has shown to be necessary. The object of the present Bill was to relax, as far as possible, the restrictions now imposed on the movement of cattle within Great Britain. At present, if the local authorities were lax, the cattle plague might again spread over the country. To prevent that it was necessary to impose general restrictions on the movement of cattle in the place of local restrictions. The restrictions under the Bill would however be local and self-acting, so that a general freedom would then be granted. All restrictions were a burden and tended to raise prices. They should therefore be as partial as possible. But, under the altered circumstances of the country, they must be permanent. The demand for meat had steadily increased for the last twenty years in consequence of the improved condition of the labouring classes. Yet the supply in Great Britain had reached its limit. The various agricultural improvements which had been introduced had tended to diminish the amount of grass land in the country. Even the grass lands which were maintained were not so much devoted to the grazing of cattle as they were formerly. There were better returns from sheep ; sheep were ready for the market in one-third the time, and there was always a regular demand for wool. This led to a great increase in the breeding of sheep in preference to cattle. It was now absolutely necessary, therefore, that cattle should be imported from abroad. Before 1842 the importation of cattle was absolutely prohibited. The prohibition was then removed and a heavy duty imposed. This restrictive duty was taken off by Sir Robert Peel in 1846. It was argued at the time that this measure of freedom would prove entirely nugatory and without any result. The wealth and wants of the country however augmented, with the growth of our trade and manufactures. The price of meat rose; and it became worth while to import it from greater distances. Every year the cattle trade increased. And in the year 1865 we drew our meat supplies from Spain and Portugal, from France, Belgium, and Holland, from Sweden, Denmark, Schleswig-Holstein, the Baltic, Poland, Galicia, Hungary, and Styria. In 1843, 1,114 head of cattle were imported ; in 1844, 3,682 head of cattle ; in 1845, 9,734 ; in 1846, 17,191 ; in 1847, 27,831; in 1857, 53,277 ; in 1865, 188,326. Into London alone the importation of cattle, sheep, pigs, &c., had vastly increased. In the week ending May 6, 1858, 1,840 head of cattle, sheep, pigs, &c., were imported into the metropolis ; in the corresponding week of 1866, 8,572 ; in the same week of 1867, 12,099. On one side therefore we had a great and increasing demand ; and on the other, a daily more easy supply. But these very facilities and the rapidity of railway transit rendered us for ever liable to the introduction of the cattle plague. How was this danger met in other countries ? In France, prompt vigour, Imperial decrees, and military cordons, were sufficient to shut out the cattle plague. Holland was too trading to be vigorous; they feared to keep out the ugly customer, and were not free from it to that day. In this country the first impulse was a fear, on the part of the Liberal Government, to interfere with trade. But at last they found out that isolation and stamping out were the only effective resources. This was attended with marked success. Just before the restrictions were imposed with the intention of stamping out the cattle plague, the number of attacks in one week in Cheshire amounted to 4,378, and in Yorkshire to 2,028 cases. The Act passed on the 20th of February. In the week ending the 3rd of March the attacks of cattle plague in Cheshire had decreased to 1,273, and on the 31st of March to 765. It was a curious circumstance that the sanitary restrictions imposed seem to have had no effect upon the price of meat either during recent attacks or during those which took place in the last century. For the average of five years, from 1739 to 1744, immediately preceding the distemper, the price of meat was 2¼*d.* per lb. During the twelve years of the distemper from 1745 to 1756 the price was also 2¼*d.* During the five worst years of the distemper the price was only 2*d.* 2-5ths. During the twelve years after the distemper, from 1756 to 1768, the price was 2½*d.* a lb. The same features were observable in modern times. In 1864 the price of meat ranged from 6½ to 7¼*d.*; in the beginning of 1865 from 6⅛*d.* to 7⅛*d.*; in 1866, during the time that the cattle plague was very bad, from 5¾*d.* to 7*d.* In April this year the price was from 6*d.* to 6½*d.* The quantity of cattle slaughtered during the prevalence of the distemper had the effect of keeping down the price; while the demand was satisfied as the meat was bought locally; it had the effect of changing the venue of the market, the cattle, instead of being sold in London, being sold throughout the country; but the trade adapted itself to the altered circumstances. Another consequence of the restrictions imposed on account of the cattle plague was that other diseases which had been prevalent among cattle were almost extinguished. The foot and mouth disease was imported from Holland in 1839, and pleuro-pneumonia was imported from Holland in 1842. In the latter year, and before the disease was imported, the average mortality among cattle in England was from 1½ to 2½ per cent. From that time the percentage rose steadily till it appeared from the Reports of the Cattle Insurance Company, in 1848, that three-fourths of all their losses were due to pleuro-pneumonia. In 1860, 374,048 horned cattle died of disease in the United Kingdom, of which more than one-half was due to pleuro-pneumonia. From 1854 to 1860 the average loss annually from that cause amounted to 160,000 head of cattle. But after the restrictions were imposed what occurred? On the 12th of March, 1867, Professors Simmons and Brown reported that pleuro-pneumonia and the foot and mouth disease existed only to a very limited extent. This, they stated, was due to the restrictions on the movement of cattle, by which they estimated that we saved annually £1,000,000 worth of food. The Agricultural Society of Cornwall was unanimously of opinion that these diseases had been nearly eradicated by the cattle plague restrictions. Various agricultural societies accordingly desired that the same restrictive powers which had been applied to the cattle plague should be extended to other diseases. With that recommendation he could not concur, as the proposal was surrounded with many difficulties. Most persons, looking at a Continental *Bradshaw*, and seeing that the railways came straight from Hungary and Poland to Bremen and Rotterdam, jumped to the conclusion that all importation of foreign cattle should be stopped. But we might as well attempt to sweep back the tide with a broom as to keep the foreign meat trade out of the country. The object of all men was to make food cheap; but it may be raised in price by stopping the foreign supply as well as by the destruction of British cattle. Some persons maintained that the grass lands in the East of Europe, populated by millions of cattle, were the home of the cattle plague, and that as long as cattle were allowed to be brought from thence we should always run the risk of introducing it here. They then argued that if cattle were allowed to be imported they should be killed at the port of landing. Under the present regulations cattle were killed at all the ports, with the exception of Harwich and Southampton, which were permitted to send foreign cattle to the metropolitan market. But the metropolis was isolated from the rest of the country. The imports for London were so enormous that the attempt to deal with the matter otherwise would occasion a violent disturbance of trade, and an amount of inconvenience that would be almost intolerable. The question was narrowed to the metropolis. In 1866 no less than 164,557 head of cattle were imported into London. The next largest importation was into Hull, where, in the same year, only 26,009 cattle were imported. Newcastle imported 8,418, Southampton 5,045, Harwich 4,322, Leith 4,261. All the other ports in that year were considerably below 5,000. It was contended that dead meat might be sent into the metropolis in the same way that it now came from Aberdeen and the North of Scotland. But that was from a climate favourable for cooling, at a time of year favourable to keeping, and in quantities so small that loss would be trifling. Besides it must be borne in mind that, in that case, each lot was consigned at a named price, so that the consignee was the loser in case anything went wrong. But when meat was sent in large quantities, the loss cannot be fixed on any consignee; with foreign meat the risk was that of the foreign owner. And if the law were that cattle must be killed within a certain number of days buyers had only to hold back for a time, knowing that eventually the meat must come down to their price, and then the foreign farmer would send over no more cattle. Hence, even if the meat could always arrive perfectly good and sound, the foreign farmers who sent it must be losers, because the buyers knew that dead meat must be sold, and they would only have to wait a little in order to get it at their own prices. These were some of the difficulties in the way of dealing with the subject, but the greatest of all was the feeding of the poor. Two-thirds of the meat which came into London was consumed by the working classes at the East End. If the beasts were killed at Harwich or Southampton, only the best joints would be sent up, for it would not pay to send the rest. But the working classes fed not on beef steaks, but on shins of beef; not on South Downs, but on Merino sheep. It was not upon joints, but upon offal, that the poorest fed; and the offal would never be brought to London if the animals were killed at the place of landing. The head and pluck of a sheep were sold for 2*s.*; the head of a bullock cost 3*s.*; the heart 2*s.*; the tail 1*s.* 6*d.*; the liver and tripes 7*s.* 6*d.*; the tongue 3*s.* 6*d.*; the feet 1*s.*; the value of the whole offal of a bullock amounted to only 18*s.* 6*d.* If foreign bullocks were killed at Harwich and Southampton, they would rob the poor of the food to which they were accustomed. Again the sheepskins, and hides of bullocks, the hoofs, and horns, and even the blood, were used in trades. The factories of London would be deprived of these, and the poor of their work. With respect to the suggestion that quarantine should be established at the ports, he must remind the House that store cattle were never imported into this country, and fat cattle in quarantine sometimes lost as much as £5 in value in ten days, while their keep in the time of quarantine would amount to £2. The proof of the inutility of quarantine was that it had never been used. Besides, if one infected beast got in, the quarantine ground would become a pest-house, and perpetual focus of disease. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets wished to have a separate market in London for foreign cattle. But that would be a most expensive measure, as it would be necessary to purchase land and to erect buildings for the accommodation of not less than 5,000 cattle a week, as well as for slaughter-houses for all these beasts. Besides, if they were to have two markets, one for English and the other for foreign cattle, they would divide the buyers and destroy competition. The proposal was therefore "a gigantic system of protection." Another objection to the scheme was that in the Metropolis Market Act there was a clause forbidding the erection of a new market within seven miles of St. Paul's; and, therefore, if the suggestion were to be carried into effect, the buyer would have to go much more than seven miles for his meat, and the price would thereby be greatly enhanced. It was true that in other ports they had established Port-market Licences. But here there could be no competition as the one market was for foreign fat stock, and the other for English store stock. No doubt every restriction on the movement of home cattle was a tax; and every limitation on the importation of foreign cattle was a tax, and tended to an increase of price. They were placed between two difficulties. The English farmers desired that all restrictions upon the inland trade should be removed, while they desired to have the restrictions upon the foreign trade maintained or augmented. But the inhabitants of Liverpool, Manchester, and our other great towns had no objection to the maintenance of restrictions upon the inland trade, while they contended that restrictions upon the importation of foreign cattle led to a great disturbance of trade and an increase in the price of meat. The only means they had found of meeting the difficulty was to make the restrictions locally self-acting, instead of general. This they were attempting to do by that Bill, and they proposed to do so still more through the consolidated Orders which were shortly to be issued. They would endeavour to throw the foreign trade open as much as possible, taking care to preserve intact the principle of preventing contact between home and foreign cattle. That had been already done in the case of the metropolis, which was perfectly isolated, and treated as a foreign country, inasmuch as cattle that once got into it could not get out again. Nor could foreign cattle come in contact with English cattle at Harwich and Southampton, while at every other port they were killed within four days of their landing. He moved that the Speaker leave the Chair.

Mr. J. A. SMITH said, it appeared to him that all the restrictions of which the noble Lord had spoken would be absolutely useless unless something more were done in the matter. About six weeks ago a statement had appeared in the newspapers to the effect that twenty-one animals purchased at Doune in Scotland, and sent by railway to Hampshire, had been from four and a half to five days in the transit, during which they had received neither food nor water, and that out of the number two had died, while the remaining nineteen had arrived in a state of great suffering. It appeared to him that unless something were done to prevent such cases they must always expect to find cattle disease prevailing in this country. Having read that statement in the newspapers he had taken all the means in his power to ascertain whether it was well-founded, and he had received from the persons who had purchased the animals the most positive assurance as to its accuracy. He had then applied to the noble Lord for the purpose of seeing whether he could interfere in any way in the matter, but was told that the Privy Council had nothing to do with a case of that kind, and that he had better refer to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. He had afterwards addressed similar applications to the Home Secretary and the Vice President of the Board of Trade; but with them he had been equally unsuccessful. This was a case which could not be a solitary or isolated one, and it clearly had some connection with the progress and communication of the cattle plague. Under these circumstances he had thought it right to bring the matter under the notice of the House.

Mr. PUGH said, that in this discussion the Reports of the Cattle Plague Commissioners ought not to be forgotten. He wished to make some remarks in favour of slaughtering foreign cattle at the ports. There was a strong feeling in its favour in the country, as had been evinced by the Petitions which had been presented, and it was borne out by the Reports of the Commissioners. In inquiring into the origin of the disease, they came to the conclusion that it did not rise spontaneously in this country; that it was brought direct from Holland, and indirectly from Revel, from Russian Poland, and from the Russian steppes, in which it found its constant home. They therefore recommended an inspection of foreign animals in this country more minute than any that would probably be applied to them abroad. They stated that during several months in the year this country imported from 5,000 to 10,000 animals a week, which were landed at some few ports, and thence dispersed all over the country. Upwards of six-sevenths of these were landed at the three ports of London, Harwich, and Hull. They recommended that the foreign trade in cattle, which had grown to such enormous dimensions of late years, should be subjected to proper regulations; that the cattle should be slaughtered at the ports, and that good landing-places, lairs, and sheds should be provided there, by which much of the cruelty of the land transport would be avoided. He made these remarks with a view of directing attention to the subject. He believed that if the Government carried out the recommendations of the Commissioners, they might dispense with many of the restrictions now imposed inland, and give general satisfaction to the country. Those whom he represented, as practical men, had no objection to free trade in cattle as far as it was requisite to supply the necessities of the country, but they had a great objection to free trade in cattle plague brought from abroad, and to the unlimited importation of disease.

Sir J. CLARKE JERVOISE said, it was extremely important that the House should be put in possession of the Report of the International Congress at Vienna on the subject of Cattle Plague, for which a sum of £148 8*s.* 9*d.* had been voted. Was it intended to distribute it, and when? The Bill was an extraordinary mode of facilitating the introduction of cattle into this country. Many of the cases of so-called cattle disease were the result of hard usage and over-driving.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Meaning of Privy Council)—Clause A.

Mr. LIDDELL said, he found it very difficult to understand the clause, and feared that its ambiguity would lead to litigation.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that the clause had been inserted in the House of Lords.

Mr. HENLEY said, that the Orders issued by the Privy Council were tantamount to Acts of Parliament, and it was therefore essential that security should be given that somebody should attend the meetings of the Council, where the Orders were framed, who was thoroughly cognizant of the subject, and would be able to declare what was necessary to be done. If the restrictions were to be continued for three years, words should be added to the clause enacting that the President or Vice President of the Council, or a Secretary of State who would be cognizant of the policy of the Government with respect to the subject dealt with by the Bill should attend the meetings of the Council and sign the Orders.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that it might be very difficult to get the President or Vice President to attend at periods of the year when they would be out of town.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 5, 6, 7, and 8 *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Appointment of Inspectors by Local Authorities).

Mr. HENLEY said, he moved that the words should be struck out which gave power to the Privy Council to remove inspectors. If the Council were to be allowed, without giving a reason, to remove any inspector they liked, and to call upon the local authorities to appoint another, they would weaken the responsibility of those authorities, and prevent them taking a proper amount of trouble in the selection of the inspectors.

Sir J. Clarke Jervoise

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 32, to leave out from the word "inspector" to the end of the Clause.—(*Mr. Henley.*)

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he thought the Privy Council should have the power of removing incompetent inspectors, because that would make the local authorities more careful in their appointments.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he would suggest that a Proviso should be inserted in the Bill, enacting that when a local inspector made an error the Privy Council should have authority to rectify it by reversing the decision of the local inspector.

Mr. HUNT said, he thought the difficulty would be met by carrying out the suggestion of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire, and he would accordingly introduce at a future stage of the Bill words authorizing the Privy Council to reverse the decisions of the local inspectors.

Mr. HENLEY said, he believed that the Privy Coucil exercised that power at the present time.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he objected to placing the power of removal of inspectors in the hands of the Government, which were the worst it could be placed in.

Mr. HENLEY said, he believed the local authorities would be better able to judge of a competent inspector than the noble Lord and the Privy Council.

Mr. CANDLISH said, that the power of dismissing incompetent inspectors should be left in the hands of the local authorities. The Committee ought to reject the words at the end of the clause, as tending to destroy local self-government.

Mr. AYRTON said, he objected to the clause as most arbitrary, and calculated to remove local authorities by a mere stroke of the pen. It would be better to leave the local authorities and the Government to consider the matter. If the absolute power were given to the Government no such consideration could take place.

Mr. ORMSBY GORE said, he would propose that they should omit the words "Privy Council," and insert the words, "Court of Quarter Sessions," thereby giving the power to remove the inspectors to the Court of Quarter Sessions instead of to the Privy Council.

The CHAIRMAN: There is an Amendment already before the Committee.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The Committee *divided*: — Ayes 80; Noes 38: Majority 42.

Mr. NEWDEGATE moved an Amendment—

"Provided such Inspector shall, after inquiry, have been reported to be Incompetent for the performance of his duty, and to have been guilty of misconduct."

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he hoped the hon. Member would not put the Committee to the trouble of dividing again upon a question which had already been decided.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, the power should not be exercised by the Privy Council until they could show, after inquiry, that the person was unfit for the office of inspector.

Mr. BRUCE said, that it was to be presumed that the inspector would not be removed unless the Privy Council had good reason for removing him. Nothing would be done until after a Report by the local authorities.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that he had good reason for desiring to have the words introduced.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that if the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment he would undertake on the Report to introduce words to meet his objection.

Clause 12 (Where Cattle Plague discovered. Place to be deemed infected).

Mr. HENLEY said, he considered it a very serious thing to place power in the hands of an inspector to declare a place infected on his own mere fiat. It would have been well, he thought, to have made some provision as to the proof of the inspectors' competency before their appointment.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that from the nature of the rinderpest it was absolutely necessary to act promptly. There were three modes of declaring a place infected—first, by the statutory declaration of the inspector; next, by the action of the local authorities; and thirdly, by that of the Privy Council. The great object was at once to isolate the particular place infected.

Mr. BRUCE said, it was no doubt a large power to place in the hands of an inspector, but it seemed to be unavoidable to make such a provision.

Mr. ACLAND said, that provision should be made for declaring a place disinfected when it was so, and that without loss of time. Was there power to reverse the declaration of the inspector in case of his being mistaken?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that power was given to the Privy Council for that purpose.

Mr. READ said, he would suggest that the power of the inspector to declare a place infected should be provisional merely till the local authorities had time to examine the place.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he was afraid that would not be sufficient, as the local authorities were often unwilling to act.

Mr. HENLEY said, he objected to the cumbrous machinery of the measure. He feared that the making of a statutory declaration might occasion mischievous delay.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that the object of the declaration was to insure that the inspector should not act rashly.

Mr. AYRTON said, he would suggest that notice of the making of the declaration should be published, not by the local authorities, but by the inspector, in order that delay might be avoided.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that the local authorities were bound to publish the declaration immediately on its being made.

House *resumed.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—[Bill 237]

Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Secretary Lord Stanley.)

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Mr. SPEAKER read the title of the Bill.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I move that the Amendments of the Lords be printed and taken into consideration on Thursday.

Lords' Amendments to be considered upon *Thursday*, and to be *printed.* [Bill 302.]

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. AYRTON said, he rose to put a question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the Reform Bill, which had come back from the Upper House with some very serious Amendments. It would greatly facilitate the course of public business if the House were informed as to the course the Government intended to take. The right hon. Gentleman was no doubt aware that on occasions of this kind it had been the practice for the Member who had charge of the Bill to put down upon the Paper the Amendments he proposed to ask the House to agree to, and those he advised the House to dissent from. Perhaps before Thursday the right hon. Gentleman would be able to make some statement of this kind to the House?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Just as the House was about to adjourn, at a happy moment, when, if it had been a minute later, it would not have been in my power to make the communication to the House, the Bill for the Amendment of the Representation of the People was returned from the other House of Parliament. I stated then that I should at once move that the Amendments of the Lords be printed, and that I would move that the House should take them into consideration on Thursday. Now, as I understand the hon. and learned Gentleman, he wishes that in the interval I should state which of those Amendments of the Lords Her Majesty's Government would request the House to give their assent to or to dissent from. My knowledge is perhaps limited on these subjects, and I would not put it in comparison with that of the hon. and learned Gentleman, who on matters connected with the conduct of Parliament always shows so much information; but I was not aware that that was the custom of the House of Commons. I propose to follow the precedents—fortunately, rare precedents—in cases of this kind. On Thursday, when I move that the Amendments of the Lords be considered, I shall take the opportunity, before asking the House to consider them *seriatim*, of taking a general view of these Amendments, and I shall state the course which Her Majesty's Government are prepared to recommend the House to follow.

INDIA—SIMLA COURT-MARTIAL.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

MR. BRETT said, that he rose to move an Address to Her Majesty on the subject of the Simla Court-Martial. Three objections might be taken to the course he was about to pursue. It might be said that the case was one of individual and personal grievance which ought not to be brought before the House; that he was inviting the House to enter upon a discussion as to the administration and discipline of the army; and, lastly, that the facts he was about to bring forward constituted a personal attack upon an officer of the highest eminence — the Commander-in-Chief of the Army in India. With regard to the last point, the facts he should have to state, and the mode in which he should have to state them, would bear that appearance, but he had no vindictive feeling against Sir William Mansfield. He did not desire to bring this forward as a question between the retirement of Sir William Mansfield and the reinstatement of Captain Jervis in the service. It would give him no pleasure that the services of Sir William Mansfield should be lost to the country. He had but one object, and that was to persuade the Minister of War that Captain Jervis ought to be restored to the service. As to the second point, he had taken as much care as possible in framing his Motion to avoid any interference with the Prerogative of the Crown. He did not ask the House either to revise or control the sentence that had been pronounced, or the decision that had been come to. He only asked the House to lend its paramount influence to persuade the Sovereign to revise the decision, which was an unjust one. As to the first point, he would admit that a case of individual grievance ought only to be brought before the House under exceptional circumstances; but, in this case, he felt satisfied that a great injustice had been done. It could not be just that the faults which this young man had committed should be visited by a sentence of degradation and ruin for life. And this decision was the decision of an authority so high that there was no constituted authority in the country to revise or criticize that decision. In such cases it had always been one of the highest privileges of that House to express its opinion, to draw the attention of the Crown to the grievance, and to humbly ask of the Crown to devise redress. He would now refer to the facts. Captain

Jervis was tried at Simla, in 1866, upon charges of having fraudulently misappropriated the property of Sir William Mansfield, his Commander, to whom he acted as aide-de-camp. He was further charged with insubordination arising out of the other charge against him. The court-martial acquitted him on the charges of fraud, but found him guilty on the charges of insubordination. It sentenced him to be dismissed from the service, but accompanied the dismissal with a recommendation to mercy on the ground of the extenuating circumstances which appeared in the case. The only meaning of such a finding could be that the charges of fraud being false did extenuate the insubordination. Sir William Mansfield, who was more than the prosecutor, being also a witness and warm party in the cause, taking the sentence into his hands, specifically disregarded the sentence of the court-martial that these charges of fraud were not true. In a General Order to the army, he stated that these charges were true, and disregarding also the recommendation to mercy of the court-martial, he sentenced Captain Jervis to dismissal from the service. He passed upon him the exact sentence which would have been passed upon Captain Jervis if he had been found guilty of the charges of fraud. When that decision was laid before the Commander-in-Chief and the Minister of War, they confirmed the sentence; but, by way of gratuity, ordered Captain Jervis to receive the sum of £1,800. So that the next time his right hon. Friend the Minister of State for India read out that remarkable list—which he had read on one occasion that Session—there would be added to it, the case of Captain Jervis, tried on charge of fraud, dismissed the service, and thereupon ordered to receive the gratuity of £1,800. He proposed to show that the court-martial were perfectly justified in recommending Captain Jervis to mercy on the ground of extenuating circumstances; that Sir William Mansfield, for some reason or other, had taken a personal dislike to Captain Jervis before any of these charges were made; that he made these charges one after the other, in the most vindictive spirit, with every circumstance of provocation and insult; that these charges being all false, thereby drove this young man to acts which were clearly wrong, and which he could not attempt to justify. If, however, Captain Jervis was driven to these acts of insubordination by false charges made under circumstances of the greatest provocation, his dismissal from the service, so that his prospects in life were entirely ruined, could not be a just sentence. More than that, even supposing it were a sentence just in itself, it could not stand, having been passed by one who was a warm party to the cause. It would outrage public feeling if a judgment passed by a person who was really the prosecutor were confirmed. He had said that the charge of fraud was false. He was justified in saying so, because the court-martial had found that it was false. He declined to go into the facts themselves. He should not have the least fear of the result, for he would pledge his reputation that, upon the facts, as they were produced before the court, not a tribunal in England could have found the accused guilty. But this was an acquittal by court-martial. There could not be a more sensitive tribunal imagined for the investigation of a charge of fraud against an officer in the army. If there were the smallest taint of fraud a more dangerous tribunal could not be imagined; and after having been tried on such a charge by such a court, a person might say that he had gone through the ordeal of fire. He wished to show to the House the circumstances of provocation, and the mode in which the charges were brought forward, and to do that he should marshal the facts as they really happened, and not as they appeared in the blue book, where they necessarily appeared in the order in which the evidence was taken. He could not be said to be strictly impartial in these proceedings, as this young man was the son of his father's sister; but he could assure the House that he had never from his childhood up to the time of this trial heard the slightest reflection on his honour or integrity. [The hon. and learned Member then read at very great length the series of letters, documents, and evidence, as they appear in the blue book, and then proceeded to say:] He assumed that many hon. Gentlemen in the House had read the evidence taken before the court-martial, and he would ask anyone who had read the examination and cross-examination of witnesses, whether in the annals of any court with which hon. Members had had experience, they had ever known questions to be answered upon a criminal charge in the manner that the questions put to the prosecutor were answered on this occasion. One would have imagined that in a criminal charge preferred against a member of his own household, the prosecutor would have answered the questions put to him with pain, with an appearance of distress, with reticence; or that he would, at all events, have done what he could to shield or excuse the faults committed. But, on the contrary, not a single answer was given without the introduction of extraneous matter—matter evidently introduced for the sole purpose of aggravating the offence and accompanied with every expression of contumely and insult. The defence was, of course, written by the advocate for Captain Jervis, and what was the case with the prosecutor's reply? The nominal prosecutor in this case was an officer in the army, and he would ask anybody who had read that reply, whether it was written by a gentleman in that position. It was evidently written by an astute and practised lawyer; by one of those learned men who were frequently to be found in our colonies but who were but little accustomed to the rough wear and tear of life, and had but imperfect acquaintance with the rules of criminal procedure. This gentleman endeavoured to make out the charge of fraud upon what he called legal presumption, and to his surprise he found that the counsel of Captain Jervis followed the lead. But any man of experience would have scouted such an idea, and he could not understand how any man in his senses could have listened to such absolute nonsense. Besides what tribunal could there be that ought to be more sensitive on matters connected with such a charge than a court-martial engaged in trying a brother officer? This was not a simple prosecution in which the prosecutor was preferring a charge for the purpose of vindicating justice. It was a case in which the prosecutor was endeavouring to make out the strongest case he possibly could against the prisoner. Sir William Mansfield evidently took every possible means in his power, and by the greatest skill at his command to obtain a verdict. What was that verdict? The first charge was with having behaved in a scandalous manner, unbecoming the character of an officer and a gentleman, while employed as aide-de-camp in charge of the household expenditure of his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, in four respects. First, in having at Mahasoo, during the months of September, October, and November, 1865, dishonestly misappropriated to his own use, and for the entertainment of his own guests, the following wines, beer, and other stores, the property of the Commander-in-Chief, intrusted to him, Captain Jervis, for expenditure on his Excellency's account only; and in having then, or subsequently, with intent to defraud the Commander-in-Chief, entered, or caused to be entered, part of the said articles in the account books of the household in his, Captain Jervis's, charge, as having been expended on his Excellency's account. The charge set forth the misappropriation of so many dozen of wine, and so on, and went into the minutest particulars, stating, among other things, that Captain Jervis had misappropriated one bottle of brandy, one bottle of maraschino, one bottle of curaçoa, six bottles of lemonade, one tin of ham, one tin of bacon, one tin of tongue, three tins of oysters, two tins of sardines, one tin of giblet soup, one bottle of mixed pickles, two bottles of Harvey's sauce, one bottle of Worcestershire sauce, one jar of plum jam, one jar of raspberry jam, one ponnd of tea, two pounds of coffee, and one loaf of sugar. The whole of these articles were said to amount in money value to £92, though when the defence had been made, the value dwindled down to £23. The second portion of the charge was as follows:—

"In having at Calcutta, in or about the month of February, 1866, with intent to defraud the Commander-in-Chief, charged or caused to be charged to his Excellency's debit, in the account books of the household, in his, Captain Jervis's, charge, the sum of 700 rupees, or thereabouts, the same being the cost of his, Captain Jervis's, own private table expenses at Mahasoo during the months of September, October, and November, 1865."

That was, in fact, the same charge in another form. The third and fourth articles were—

"In having, at Calcutta, or Simla, or both these places, between the 16th of December, 1865, and the 25th of April, 1866, dishonestly misappropriated to his own use the following articles of stable necessaries and horse furniture, of the aggregate value of 275 rupees or thereabouts. In having at Simla, in or about the month of April, 1866, with intent to defraud the Commander-in-Chief, charged under the head of bazaar expenses to his Excellency's debit in the 'bazaar expenses' account book of the household, in his, Captain Jervis's, charge, the sum of 47 rs. 14, the same being the cost of his, Captain Jervis's, private expenses from the 25th to the 29th of March, 1866, inclusive, while *en route* from Calcutta to Simla, and not in attendance as aide-de-camp."

These four items went to make up the first charge. The second charge was—

"With having at Simla, on the 14th of May, 1866, neglected to obey the order of his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to produce before a military Court of Inquiry certain books, accounts, and vouchers, the property of the Commander-in-Chief, in his (Captain Jervis's) possession."

The third charge was—

> "With having at Simla, on the 22nd of May, 1866, neglected to obey the order of his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to attend a Committee of audit, which had been assembled by order of his Excellency."

The fourth charge was for having disobeyed the lawful command of his superior officer in refusing to give up his sword. The fifth with having written a disrespectful letter to the court-martial. The verdict was delivered in the following terms:—

> "The Court are of opinion that the prisoner, Captain Ernest Scott Jervis, of Her Majesty's 106th Regiment (Bombay Light Infantry) is not guilty of the first and second charges preferred against him, and do accordingly acquit him of the same, and that he is guilty of the third, fourth, and fifth charges preferred against him. The Court sentence the prisoner, Captain Ernest Scott Jervis, of Her Majesty's 106th Regiment (Bombay Light Infantry) to be dismissed the service. The Court having awarded a sentence of dismissal, and marked their sense of the prisoner's military misconduct, do now beg to recommend him to mercy in consideration of the extenuating circumstances disclosed in the proceedings."

That was, that the court-martial acquitted Captain Jervis of the first charge in which the four particulars of fraud were set forth, and upon, the second, in which he was charged with having neglected to give up the books, vouchers, and accounts, found him guilty of the three remaining charges, involving military misconduct. What was the meaning of that? It could not mean that the Court desired he should be dismissed the service. What were the extenuating circumstances to which the Court referred? That he had been falsely accused of fraud; for if he had not been falsely accused of fraud what extenuating circumstances could possibly be found in the case? Sir William Mansfield had brought certain charges of fraud against his own aide-de-camp, and had pressed them with the greatest subtlety before a court-martial which he himself had nominated, and, after doing all he possibly could to procure a conviction, that court-martial decided that the charges were incorrect and false. What would have been the feelings of an ordinary English gentleman under such circumstances? What might reasonably have been expected from any person holding the high position filled by Sir William Mansfield? It would naturally have been expected that he would have written to Captain Jervis, have expressed his sorrow that the charges should have been made, his happiness that they had been disproved, and would have acknowledged that it was impossible for him, under the circumstances, to confirm the sentence of dismissal. But what did Sir William Mansfield do? He drew out as artful and as subtle a description of the evidence as possible, bringing into prominence every point that could be urged against Captain Jervis, and he sent that statement, with the authority of his own name, to the court-martial, desiring them to re-consider their finding on the first and second charges, informing them, at the same time, that he had no fault to find with their verdict, as far as it referred to the three latter charges on which Captain Jervis was found guilty. What was the reply given?—

> "The court, having attentively re-considered the whole of the evidence, and also the communication from the revising officer, do now respectfully adhere to their original finding."

One would have thought that after such an answer hatred itself would have been satisfied, and that Sir William Mansfield would, at all events, have withdrawn any charge, but what did he do? He wrote a General Order. He supposed, though he was not sufficiently acquainted with military matters to be certain upon the point, that such an Order was published throughout the army, and he would venture to say that, coming from a man who had occupied the position of prosecutor, such a thing had long been entirely unknown in England. That Order was—

> "1st Charge.—It is to be regretted that, in accordance with precedent and the advice of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, the Court did not find a special verdict, with regard to the facts admitted by the prisoner and the intention denied by him."

The meaning of that was that Sir William Mansfield's counsel had agreed that, the facts having been admitted, the necessary conclusion of the law was that the intention should have been inferred—

> "Putting aside the question of form, it is now the duty of the Commander-in-Chief to say that his Excellency is advised that the proof for the prosecution is complete in the several instances of the first charge, with the exception of variances as to certain items. This was shown in the careful analysis of the evidence and the law regarding it, which was submitted to the Court on revision. The Court, in its discretion, having, nevertheless, recorded an acquittal, his Excellency may express his personal gratification that the character of one

he has long befriended will have the advantage of this verdict in time to come. His Excellency can only regret that serious military misconduct on the part of the prisoner should have deprived him, before the trial, of the benefit of the doubts on which the Court has apparently acted."

The House would observe that General Mansfield there spoke of the doubt entertained by the court-martial. But the court had not expressed any doubt. The General, however, took it upon himself to say that the fraud had been committed, and that doubt had prevented the Court from finding him guilty of it. In the judgment of Sir William Mansfield it was further stated—

"2nd Charge.—His Excellency is further advised that the verdict on the second charge is contrary to clear and sufficient proof. In this instance, the prisoner disobeyed orders which were reasonable, in accordance with the custom and regulation of the army, and without obedience to which he could not possibly clear his character of the most serious imputations. According to the principles of military discipline, and the dictates of the English Judges, all officers and soldiers are bound to obey orders which are reasonable and not contrary to the law of the land. The Commander-in-Chief might, perhaps, earn a cheap reputation for clemency and liberality by attending to this recommendation. His Excellency is compelled to show how such action on his part would amount to a betrayal of his duty. The Court, if it considered the prisoner a fit and proper officer to retain the commission of a Captain in Her Majesty's service, could have awarded punishment other than dismissal. With respect to the alleged extenuating circumstances as being the ground of the recommendation, his Excellency is under the necessity of showing to the Court that they have no existence."

Sir William Mansfield goes on to say—

"In the course of this long and unduly protracted trial, there was much requiring unfavourable comment in the matter of procedure. The Commander-in-Chief trusts that the faults of procedure to which he alludes, involving great loss of time, the abuse of the right of cross-examination, and the making use of a court-martial to propagate attacks on witnesses not in presence of the Court, will not be drawn into precedents hereafter. This matter will be more particularly dealt with in detail by the Judge Advocate General of the Army, for the guidance of General Officers and courts-martial."

In this case, Sir William Mansfield gave judgment in his own favour. Even if his judgment had been right, this would have been contrary to our notions of what was correct, because in this country it was never allowed that a judgment by a party in the cause should be allowed to stand. But, in point of fact, the judgment was clearly wrong. If the court-martial had considered Captain Jervis guilty of the fraud there could not have been any extenuating circumstances. The Court, however, found that there were extenuating circumstances. This General Mansfield took upon himself to deny, and ordered Captain Jervis to be dismissed the service. That judgment was referred home to his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief. He trusted the Members of that House had read the despatch of the Commander-in-Chief. It was a document which maintained the character that had won for his Royal Highness the respect and esteem of every one in the country. Nothing could be more satisfactory than this despatch. Though it was in guarded and dignified language, it did substantially use against the judgment of Sir William Mansfield the arguments which he was now endeavouring to bring under the notice of the House. He pointed out that Sir William was a party to the cause, that he had not carried out the sentence as the court-martial wished it to be carried out, that he had disregarded the extenuating circumstances, that he had reiterated the charges of fraud, and that therefore his Royal Highness entirely disapproved of the course he had taken. In pages three and four of the despatch there was this statement—

"Entertaining these views, therefore, the Duke of Cambridge is unable to concur in the propriety of the Instructions contained in your Excellency's Memoranda, dated 30th March and 14th of April last, drawn up for the guidance of the officers of your personal Staff, similar documents to which have never before come to his Royal Highness's notice. . . . . . But, granting even that your Excellency's views as to the position and duties of an Aide-de-camp were correct, the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief greatly deplores that the first steps taken by you in reference to Captain Jervis should have been of a nature so calculated to lead to opposition to your authority, and eventually to the necessity for bringing him to trial. His Royal Highness cannot help thinking that had you in the earliest stage of these proceedings acted in a more concilatory manner towards him — and, considering the long and personal intimacy of your relations with that officer, his Royal Highness is impressed with the conviction that your Aide-de-camp had a claim to such consideration at your hands—much of what afterwards occurred might have been prevented, and a great and deplorable scandal averted. His Royal Highness conceives that the course to have adopted on its becoming known to you that the management of your household and farm was not in accordance with your belief and intention was for your Excellency to have recalled Captain Jervis from his temporary leave of absence, and to have invited him to explain personally to you any matter in which it appeared to you that his conduct was questionable; a private invitation on your part to enter into a full and unreserved explanation was far more calculated to lead to a satisfactory result than the semi-official demand conveyed to Captain Jervis through your military secretary. The Duke of Cambridge makes every allowance for your feelings of surprise and mortification at believing yourself to have been deceived by an officer of your personal Staff, in whom for years you had placed such entire reliance, and his Royal Highness understands how distasteful it would have been to you to have had to avow personally to that officer that your confidence in him was shaken. Notwithstanding, however disagreeable to your feelings the adoption of such a course, his Royal Highness is convinced that it was the proper and judicious one, and deeply regrets that you did not follow it. Still more does he regret your having entered into a personal examination of your servant on matters so materially affecting Captain Jervis's character without inviting that officer to be present personally to explain or refute the accusations made against him. It appears to his Royal Highness that it was only due to Captain Jervis to give him this opportunity of entering into a personal explanation; and that this apparent want of consideration for his feelings as an officer and a gentleman was eminently calculated to lead to continued misunderstanding, and to rash and ill-considered action on the part of your Aide-de-camp."

The despatch went on to refer to the opinion of the Judge Advocate General, which even in his right hon. and learned Friend's presence he would say was an admirable one. The Judge Advocate General observed—

"No point which could possibly be urged in favour of a conviction was omitted in the very able reply for the prosecution, and all the arguments which could tell against the prisoner were accumulated with remarkahle subtlety and ingenuity in the minute and accurate analysis of the whole case drawn up by the Judge Advocate General of Bengal, when the Court was ordered to re-assemble for the purpose of revision; and this last document was submitted to the Court with the further sanction and authority of the Commander-in-Chief. The Court deliberately found in favour of the prisoner, and I do not feel myself justified in saying that such finding was wrong."

The despatch referring to that opinion stated—

"In this opinion his Royal Highness entirely concurs, feeling sure, from a perusal of the proceedings, that the Court had every opportunity of arriving at a just judgment, and only formed it after a most anxious consideration of every fact and argument brought before them. In rejecting the recommendation of the Court in the prisoner's favour his Royal Highness considers your Excellency to have allowed yourself to enter into observations which he extremely regrets with reference to their probable effect on the army at large."

He now desired to speak with the greatest possible delicacy. If that despatch had been consistently acted on he would have nothing to desire in this case. It seemed to him the real meaning of the despatch was that General Mansfield's decision had been wrong in both points. It had been wrong because it was a decision pronounced by General Mansfield in his own case. It was one which he ought never to have given, because he ought to have sent the matter home in order that the judgment might be pronounced in this country. Then it was wrong in fact. General Mansfield neglected to give effect to the extenuating circumstances. The court-martial acquitted Captain Jervis of fraud, and therefore it must be taken that he had been falsely accused of that offence. He repeated that if the despatch of the Commander-in-Chief had been consistently acted on in its reasonable sense he should have been satisfied. But, though he had not the least doubt of the desire of his Royal Highness that justice should be done in the case, he regretted to say that full effect had not been given to the despatch by the Commander-in-Chief, and by his right hon. Friend the Secretary for War. In a subsequent letter Captain Jervis was told that, after a full consideration of the case, his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief had decided that the sentence of the General court-martial should have effect from the date on which it was confirmed. The letter further stated that, with reference to the recommendation to mercy recorded by the Court, the Secretary of State for India and the Secretary for War had consented to Captain Jervis receiving a sum of money equivalent to the full value of a captain's commission, and that the sum of £1,800 would therefore be paid to him. What he (Mr. Brett) asked, was £1,800, or £40 a year to a young man dismissed from the service? A General Order had been promulgated throughout the Army of India in which the charge of fraud was reiterated. Who would now understand that the charge of fraud was not confirmed by the military authorities? Would it be understood in the army that the £1,800 was to be paid to Captain Jervis because he had been acquitted of fraud? The note of the Commander-in-Chief gave no more effect to the extenuating circumstances than the action taken by Sir William Mansfield. The £1,800 to be received by Captain Jervis was a thing of no value whatever, when considered as a *solatium* for wounded honour, and Captain Jervis was right in declining without hesitation to accept it. On these considerations, then, he asked the House to assent to his declaration, that although Captain Jervis had been guilty of grave military insubordination, which he did not for one moment wish to justify, yet his guilt was pardonable because it was induced by provocation rarely given, and that, therefore, the sentence upon him was unjust. Estimated in accordance with the principle of justice in its highest sense, the sentence was most harsh, simply because the whole circumstances of the case were not taken into consideration. He accordingly asked the House to join with him in praying Her Majesty to re-consider the sentence of the court-martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis, with a view to reinstate that officer in his rank in the army and in his regiment.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to re-consider the sentence of the Court-Martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis, with a view to reinstate that Officer in his rank in the Army and in his Regiment."—(*Mr. Brett.*)

General PEEL said, he could not but regret that the hon. and learned Gentleman had brought forward this Motion, and he still more regretted that the despatch of his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief had been moved for, and that the Government had consented to lay it on the table of the House. He thought that no one who read that despatch would disapprove the view taken by the Commander-in-Chief of Sir William Mansfield's conduct. That despatch was submitted to him (General Peel), and approved by him; and by that approval he had taken upon himself the responsibility it involved as the Secretary of State for War must always do in the case of actions of the Commander-in-Chief approved by him. In ordinary cases of discipline it would be very unwise for a Secretary of State to interfere with a Commander-in-Chief; but this was no ordinary case. The question of the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief in India, and the authority he exercised, was of such importance that his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief of the British Army thought proper to consult both the Secretary for War and the Secretary for India before acting in the matter. The first question submitted was, whether or not Sir William Mansfield should be removed from his command? His Royal Highness expressed a very strong opinion on the subject. Although he disapproved of the conduct of General Mansfield in reference to the Simla Court-Martial, his Royal Highness said there was nothing illegal in it, and nothing to justify the extreme measure of removing so high and distinguished an officer as Sir William Mansfield from his command. But his Royal Highness said he should not hesitate to express to General Mansfield in the most unreserved terms his opinion upon the whole case. That opinion was expressed in the despatch which had been read, and which he (General Peel) had approved. But that despatch expressed the private opinion of the Commander-in-Chief in England to the Commander-in-Chief in India as a guide for his future conduct. Had he (General Peel) known that the despatch would have been made public, he should not have given so unhesitating an approval of it. He should have pointed out to his Royal Highness that he would have thought it better at once to have removed General Mansfield from his command than to have subjected him to a public censure, which must have the effect of weakening his authority in India, and to a certain extent destroying the prestige and influence which a Commander-in-Chief ought always to possess. His Royal Highness would be the last person to do anything to weaken the authority of the Commander-in-Chief in India. Had he (General Peel) known that the despatch would be made public, he would have pointed out that it was too long and argumentative, and that, by quoting the opinions of the Judge Advocate, it almost invited an answer from General Mansfield. Had it been intended as a public censure, it ought to have been couched in terms which would admit of no answer. He objected to the production of the despatch as much on the part of the Commander-in-Chief as on that of Sir William Mansfield. He should doubtless be told that it was not a private or confidential communication; but he considered that to be a private document which was not intended by the writer to be made public. Had his Royal Highness intended to administer a public censure to Sir William Mansfield, he would have taken some method of making that censure known to the Indian Army, and not have left it to a chance Motion in that House. It often happened that the Government refused to lay upon the table communications that took place, not only with regard to such cases as these, but between the different public offices. The publication of such communications would tend to stop confidential expression of opinion between officers of State. His (General Peel's) only object was to request that the House would not assent to the Motion, unless it was prepared to approve of it on the only ground upon which it had a right to interfere. He presumed that they had not yet arrived at that point at which any hon. Member would deny the undoubted Prerogative of the Crown to dispense with the services of any officer without giving a reason for so doing. That Prerogative was exercised by a Minister who was responsible to the House for the manner in which he acted, and if the intention of the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Brett) was, as might be inferred from the conclusion of his speech, to censure the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief or of the Secretary for War, he had a perfect right to press his Motion to a division. He (General Peel) defied the House to pass that Resolution without, at the same time, passing a Vote of Censure on his right hon. Friend the Secretary for War and his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief. One point which weakened his regret that the despatch should have been laid upon the table was, that it proved how admirably his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief conducted the business of his office. It would prove to those who were always professing to believe that there was a constant antagonism between the Secretary for War and the Commander-in-Chief that nothing of the kind existed, but that the most intimate relations subisted between them. There was another point. If the House was ready to accord praise to the Commander-in-Chief in regard to General Mansfield's conduct, why not put equal confidence in what he had done with respect to the conduct of Captain Jervis? If General Mansfield were wrong, that did not make Captain Jervis right. He (General Peel) was not responsible for any decision that had been come to with regard to Captain Jervis, inasmuch as he had left office before that decision was arrived at, but he believed that the same justice had been done to Captain Jervis that had been done to General Mansfield. Why should it be supposed that the Commander-in-Chief should censure General Mansfield, and not be prepared to mete out justice to Captain Jervis? Of all tribunals that could be called upon to give a decision in a case of this kind the House of Commons was the very worst. If that House was prepared to make itself a Court of Appeal in such matters, it could not confine its deliberations to cases in which officers who had the good or bad fortune to have connections in that House were concerned. There was not a corporal who had the stripes taken off his arm, or a private who had stripes put upon his back at the instance of a court-martial whose case might not be brought before that House. That was the precedent they were about to establish if they passed the Motion of the hon. and learned Member. The case had been decided. Captain Jervis was dissatisfied, and called upon the House to reverse the decision. Supposing the House consented to reverse that decision, what would happen? In every similar case there would be a similar appeal. The Commander-in-Chief would no longer be regarded as the final appeal in military cases. He was afraid that he was about to make a very bad return for all the kindness which he had received from the House of Commons, but he had no hesitation in saying they were every day assuming a power which the Constitution of this country never intended that they should exercise. They were endeavouring to take upon themselves the Executive Government of the country, and in no case could that be more detrimental than when they interfered with the command and with the discipline of the army. What was the Motion? It asked them to agree to an Address praying that Her Majesty would re-consider the sentence of the court-martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis for the purpose of reinstating that officer in his rank in the army and in his regiment. He was not prepared to assent to that Motion. The case of Captain Jervis had been already considered by Her Majesty's Advisers, and he saw no reason for finding fault with their decision.

Mr. DUTTON said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman who had brought forward that subject had stated very candidly that he was a near relative of Captain Jervis. He must say, with equal candour, that he stood in near relationship to Sir William Mansfield. He spoke in all sincerity when he said he believed that Sir William Mansfield had acted from no personal dislike or ill-feeling towards Captain Jervis. Great stress had been laid on certain of the duties which Captain Jervis had to perform as aide-de-camp to Sir William Mansfield, and which tended, perhaps, to give that matter a somewhat ridiculous aspect. It might appear strange to some hon. Members that these duties should be performed by an officer in Captain Jervis's position. But he believed it was customary for aides-de-camp to fulfil such duties, and, at any rate, Captain Jervis himself knew what he was undertaking. It would be very distasteful to him to go through the evidence with a view to criminate Captain Jervis; but he felt bound to notice two or three points. It appeared that that officer became aide-de-camp to Sir William Mansfield in 1865, and subsequently, at his request, undertook the management of his household accounts and those of his farm. While Captain Jervis was away, owing to certain accounts that were sent into quarters, some suspicion attached to that officer. So far from Sir William Mansfield having summoned two servants in Captain Jervis's absence to criminate him, his butler, named Abbey, came forward voluntarily and gave some information which induced Sir William Mansfield to ask for an inspection of the books. Captain Jervis, who, he believed, was a remarkably good accountant, declined to give up the books, but asked for a committee of inquiry. He (Mr. Dutton) did not think it was the partial one that the hon. and learned Gentleman sought to prove, and every opportunity was given to Captain Jervis to free himself from suspicion. A fair course of conduct was pursued towards him, and it was natural to suppose that Captain Jervis should wish to prove that his conduct was above suspicion. It was charged against Captain Jervis that in managing the farm of Sir William Mansfield he traded on his own account, making use of his Excellency's name and of his Excellency's servants. By his refusal, if he were innocent, which he trusted he was, he did himself great injustice. The charge against Captain Jervis he did not wish to follow up too closely. A gentleman's farm very seldom did pay, and he believed that in this instance the thing did not answer. Another point was that Captain Jervis's travelling expenses were mixed up in an irregular manner. That fact was, he believed, put in evidence, and he had not seen it at all denied. Another case related to an outlay in building, where a very considerable sum of money was expended by Captain Jervis in excess of the amount which Sir William Mansfield authorized. The principal charge against Captain Jervis was that when Sir William Mansfield had agreed to pay 2,000 rupees for raising the aide-de-camp's house a storey Captain Jervis had spent on it 5,765 rupees additional, which he had drawn from other funds of Sir William's. He did not wish to say that an answer to all that could not be put in; but he did say that there was sufficient reason why Captain Jervis should be made accountable for his conduct. Sir William Mansfield, as he had said, had no desire to bring the matter before a court-martial, but wished that it might be dealt with by a civil proceeding. That, however, could not be done, owing to the provisions of the Mutiny Act and the distant situation of Simla; and his Excellency was advised by his legal advisers that the case should be dealt with by a court-martial. Sir William Mansfield, accordingly, brought the matter before a court-martial, and there he appeared in the position of prosecutor as well as Commander-in-Chief. This was a most unpleasant position for him to occupy, though caused by no fault of his, but one which was due to the unfortunate contingency which had arisen. Sir William Mansfield had endeavoured to act with impartiality. The court-martial acquitted Captain Jervis on the two principal charges, and they strongly recommended him to mercy, thereby putting his Excellency in a great difficulty. He said, with great pain, that the finding of the court-martial merely amounted to "not guilty," and was not a full and honourable acquittal. Had it been so, Sir William Mansfield's course would have been an easier one. His Excellency, however, thought it was not for the good of the service that he should overlook the finding of the court-martial on the other charges. The court-martial had the power of awarding any sentence, from a severe reprimand to a far heavier punishment. If they had done the former Sir William Mansfield would have been relieved from all reproach on the score of not having acted on that recommendation to mercy. His Excellency had consulted the Judge Advocate General, and had throughout acted upon the best legal advice which he could have taken. He thought it impossible to condone the matter. All he (Mr. Dutton) wished to do was to protest, which he did with all sincerity, that Sir William Mansfield had been actuated by no personal feeling in the matter; that he had deemed it his duty—and it was a very painful one—to carry out the finding of the court-martial; that he had done so very much against his own feeling and inclination; and that he had acted entirely throughout his long and distinguished career for the good of the army at large.

LORD WILLIAM HAY said, he knew

Sir William Mansfield to be a man who had served his country well, but he must confess that in this particular case he thought the conduct of that distinguished man had been most reprehensible. He concurred with every word of the despatch which had been alluded to by the late Secretary of State for War (General Peel). The question really at issue was not the conduct of Sir William Mansfield, but whether Captain Jervis should be restored to the army. He would only refer to one charge, or rather, one part of the charge against Captain Jervis. There was a difference between a simple acquittal on such a charge and a full and honourable acquittal. A simple acquittal was equivalent to the Scotch verdict of "Not proven." Captain Jervis was fully aware of the difference. He told the Court he must be regarded either as an innocent man or a felon, and an acquittal would be of little value to him unless it was a full and honourable one. That acquittal was not a full and honourable one, and therefore it would be, by his own confession, of little value to Captain Jervis. The first charge was that at Mahasoo, where Captain Jervis lived in part of the month of September, October, and November, 1865, he appropriated certain stores, including several bottles of sherry, champagne, and claret, and other stores. Mahasoo was six miles from Simla, of which place it was as it were the Fulham, and when Captain Jervis had charge of Sir William Mansfield's establishment at Simla he took a house for himself at Mahasoo. He lived in that house during the months of October and November, entertained his friends, and gave parties and pic-nics. And how did he entertain those friends? With the Commander-in-Chief's wines and stores. It was not disputed that no account was rendered of those stores. It was not denied that twenty-four dozen of wine and a variety of stores were consumed there by Captain Jervis, and no one asserted that the value was credited to Sir William Mansfield. Another aide-de-camp who took part in one of those entertainments, paid his share of the expenses amounting to 230 rupees, but neither that nor any other sum was credited to Sir William Mansfield for these stores. Something had been said about these stores consisting of "tins." In India everything except beef and mutton was kept in tins, and therefore the stores in these tins represented so much money's worth. Some 222 of these tins and several dozen of wine were appropriated by Captain Jervis, and next year when the Commander-in-Chief went back to Simla, no account of them was rendered, nor had they been accounted for to this day. He did not mean to say that Captain Jervis meant fraudulently and dishonestly to appropriate these stores, but his conduct was calculated to excite suspicion. He had no intention to express a full conviction of Captain Jervis's guilt, but if his conduct in the other cases entered into by the court-martial were as suspicious and as discreditable as this case, he was not surprised that the Commander-in-Chief had not restored him to the army.

Mr. KARSLAKE said that the right view of this question had been taken by the right hon. Gentleman (General Peel) —namely, that it was not the province of that House to review the decision of a lawfully constituted tribunal, either in this country or elsewhere. If the House should declare its readiness to re-open the decisions of the tribunals of the Empire, he or any other member of the legal profession, having a client who might be dissatisfied with the judgment of a Court of Law or Equity, might come before the House and ask the House to agree to a humble Address to Her Majesty very much in the terms of the present Motion with a view to reverse the decision of a Judge of one of the Superior Courts. He had read with surprise some of the items of duty imposed by the Indian Commander-in-Chief on his aides-de-camp, who seemed in that part of the world to be placed pretty much on the level of footmen. It was not the province of that House to entertain the question.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he would remind the noble Lord (Lord William Hay) that the court-martial had before them the witnesses in the cause, and after due consideration they not only found Captain Jervis innocent of the charges against him, but after Sir William Mansfield, using the influence of his position, had called upon the officers of the court-martial to review their decision, they deliberately re-affirmed it. The noble Lord could not be as well qualified to pronounce a decision as the court-martial. He had the highest possible respect for the right hon. Gentleman (General Peel); but it was a strange principle to lay down that such a despatch as that of his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief of the Army ought not to have been made public. That despatch had a much wider application than to the officer to whom it was addressed. It conveyed to every officer in the army that, although he was liable to military law, and must be amenable to military discipline, yet there was at the head of the army a Commander-in-Chief who might be looked to as a Court of Appeal, and who would see that justice was done to the humblest officer in the service. It was said that this was a private despath; but despatches marked "confidential" in diplomatic negotiations on matters of European importance were constantly laid before the House. He understood that a document issued by any department which was meant to be purely confidential was always styled a letter as distinguished from a despatch; the use of the latter word implying that it might under conceivable circumstances be produced. The 27th paragraph of his Royal Highness's despatch, which had not been read by the hon. and learned Gentleman, but which contained the gist of the whole question, was as follows:—

> "It becomes the duty of the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, under these circumstances, to inform your Excellency that he cannot approve the remarks which you have thought fit to publish in your General Orders, for his Royal Highness cannot ignore the fact that those remarks have a practical tendency to weaken the independence of courts-martial, to bring contempt on military tribunals in the eyes of the public, and to affect the discipline of the army in a very material degree."

That paragraph implied that the public must be made acquainted with the opinion entertained in high quarters. His belief, after reading the Papers, was that Captain Jervis became unpopular in Sir William Mansfield's social circle by not satisfactorily discharging his social functions, and that on this account he was sacrificed. To remove him from the Staff was a very different thing, however, to removing him from his profession altogether. He could now understand why many of the Staff officers were not appointed from the Staff College, for there were probably no Professors there to teach the particular regulations presented in Sir William Mansfield's Memorandum. The treatment of Captain Jervis had been oppressive and unjust. Even, however, if Captain Jervis could not be retained in the army, he protested against the people of India being saddled with the £1,800 requisite for settling the dispute between him and Sir William Mansfield. The Indian Department, the War Office, and the Horse Guards being in a difficulty, they apparently determined to solve it at the expense of the impoverished people of India.

Mr. HOWES said, that justice had not been done to the high tone of feeling manifested by Sir William Mansfield throughout these proceedings. At his examination at the court-martial, Sir William Mansfield said—

> "There is one thing which, in the exercise of my office, I cannot cast aside or condone, and that is the allegation of scandalous conduct against an officer bearing Her Majesty's commission. When such an allegation has been made it is the imperative duty of the superior officer, according to Act of Parliament, to compel the accused to clear his character, or to see justice done in the sense of the Mutiny Act and Articles of War. The superior officer, even if he would, is himself responsible in this matter that there shall be no condonation. I would hold any officer commanding a regiment in this army responsible for such condonation, if it came to my knowledge, and I would attack his commission for it. That which I exact from others in the execution of my office I cannot flinch from myself, however odious and disgusting the duty, as in the case of the present prosecution."

He believed that was the explanation of Sir William Mansfield's course, which was taken under the advice of the Law Officers of India. He regretted that his hon. and learned Friend, in bringing forward the Motion, had allowed himself to use expressions with reference to Sir William Mansfield hardly worthy of him. His hon. and learned Friend had spoken of the charges of Sir William Mansfield as false, incorrect, insulting, vindictive, and he even used the expression "hatred." As one connected with Sir William Mansfield, he knew he was incapable of the feelings attributed to him by his hon. and learned Friend, and that he was animated by a strong desire for justice and for the discipline of the army.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: Accepting the entire responsibility of the decision arrived at in this case, I wish in the first place to remind the House that I have no relationship with either party; that I have never, as far as I am aware, seen either Sir William Mansfield or Captain Jervis, and that I formed my opinion upon an impartial consideration of the merits of the case. With regard to the production of the letter of the Commander-in-Chief, my right hon. Friend (General Peel) has stated that he was responsible for it, and that it would never have been written had he thought it would be made public. I was fully aware of the importance of that letter, and it was produced with the concurrence of my Colleagues, and on my deliberate conviction that its production was essential to a proper understanding of the case. It was in no respect a private document. It was not marked "private" or "confidential," nor was it signed by the Commander-in-Chief. It was written as a public State paper, it was signed by his Royal Highness's Military Secretary, and it conveyed to the Commander-in-Chief in India the deliberate judgment of the highest authority in England. It was written, moreover, after reference to the Judge Advocate General, and it contains several extracts from his Report upon the evidence. Being, therefore, an important part of the proceedings in this matter, I felt bound to produce it, and, in my opinion, if it had not been produced justice would not have been done. The answer which I am prepared to make to the Motion is two-fold. First, I rest it on what I consider the grave impropriety of making the House of Commons a Court of Appeal from a grave and serious decision of a military tribunal. Secondly, and irrespective of that question, I say that full justice has been done in the matter. I confess it would have been difficult to have contended that full justice has been done if the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief had not been produced on the merits of the case. No one can wonder that my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Brett) should desire to vindicate the conduct of his relative, and make the best possible answer on the merits of the case; but I confess I feel surprised that any Gentleman of the great professional standing and long professional experience of my hon. and learned Friend should have thought it right to invite the House of Commons to act as a Court of Appeal, to revise the proceedings of a court-martial, and enter into the whole merits of an elaborate trial which occupied, I think, twenty-seven days before one of the established tribunals of the country. Sir, I submit to this House that we are not competent to these duties, and that if we were to attempt to discharge them we should take a course fatal to the discipline of the army and to the administration of justice in this country. There are two elements indispensable to any Court of Appeal—one is a complete knowledge of the case, and the other is that such a review should be entered into in a calm, judicial, and impartial spirit. Now, let me ask how many Gentlemen are there at present in this House who are prepared to rise in their places and say that they have made themselves masters of the evidence which occupied twenty-seven days in the hearing, and of the various arguments which have been brought forward in the elaborate statements by which that evidence has been supported or rebutted? I think that very few will venture to say that they are at this moment in a position to enter into this question with impartiality. What is the position of my hon. and learned Friend who brought the case before us to-night? His position is this—he appears before us in a three-fold capacity as advocate, juryman, and judge. I venture to caution the House, before they decide on supporting the Motion of my hon. and learned Friend, to take warning from the proceedings of this House a few years ago with respect to the last court-martial to which the public attention of this country was directed — I refer to the case of Colonel Crawley. The House must remember that in 1863 the public mind was agitated about the proceedings of a court-martial which was held in India. The House must remember how strong was the public prejudice, how loud the public clamour, how the press of this country condemned Colonel Crawley and accused him of the murder of Sergeant Lilley. We must all remember the speech delivered by the hon. Member for Andover (Mr. D. Fortescue) when in 1863 he brought the case before the House and paved the way for the proceedings that followed when Colonel Crawley was brought to trial at Aldershot. And now let me remind the House how the case ended, and read the terms of the finding of the court-martial. They were these—

> "The Court is of opinion, with regard to the first charge, that the prisoner is not guilty. With regard to the second charge, the Court is of opinion that he is not guilty."

And then the Court went on to use these words—

> "The Court does therefore fully and honourably acquit Lieutenant Colonel Crawley of all the charges preferred against him."

That case of Colonel Crawley led to debates in this House, and I cannot help quoting some words which fell from the noble Lord the Member for North Lancashire (the Marquess of Hartington) who then represented the War Department in this House, and who used on that occasion language peculiarly applicable to the question before the House. The noble Lord said that—

> "The conduct of the Government in ordering the court-martial at Aldershot has been the subject of criticism, and the Government are perfectly prepared to afford the House all the materials that could be possibly desired to form a judgment upon the merits of their conduct. But the Government did not expect, and I think the House will hardly hold it to be right, that, when a full and ample investigation has been gone into before the only tribunal, to form and pronounce a decision upon the case, it is hardly fair, or honourable, or consistent with our notions of fair play, that the evidence should be again gone over in this House, and that the country should be invited to arrive at a different conclusion from that already formed."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiii. 1656.]

But the House will see that that is the very course which is now being taken. My hon. and learned Friend has gone over all the evidence again and has asked the House of Commons to re-try the case. He has has gone into all the arguments and the painful correspondence which took place between Sir William Mansfield and Captain Jervis. He has asked us not only to form a judgment of our own, but to reverse the decision deliberately arrived at, not only by the court-martial, but by the military authorities in this country, and to address the Crown to set aside the solemn decision of a court-martial, whose independence, impartiality, and justice, have been distinctly recognized by the Judge Advocate General and the Commander-in-Chief. I have never heard the impartiality or justice of that court-martial impugned, and yet my hon. and learned Friend has asked me to review their decision, to reverse their judgment, and, as the noble Lord opposite had said, "to arrive at a different conclusion from that which had been already formed" after a patient trial of twenty-seven days. I have here a similar passage delivered at the same time by a right hon. and learned Gentleman, whom I am sorry not to see in his place to-night, because there are few in this House who could give us better counsel—I mean the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. Headlam). That right hon. and learned Gentleman said upon the occasion to which I have before referred—

> "I can assure the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) that every one who has had anything to do with the administration of the affairs of the Army join with me in deprecating the discussion of the proceedings of courts-martial in this House."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxiv. 67-8.]

Such was the language of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. I cannot imagine anything more inconsistent with our ideas of justice than for a popular assembly to re-try this case, and give a verdict upon

evidence which occupied the Court for such a length of time, and a decison upon which was arrived at after the most solemn and deliberate inquiry. If there were anything which would justify a Motion of this kind it would be that there had occurred a grave violation of justice. But justice has been fully done, and the object of the authorities in this country has been to carry out the decision of the court-martial in India. I am a party to the decision, and I know that the anxious desire of the authorities in this country has been to act as fairly as they could upon the judgment of the court-martial. When I accepted the office I now hold this case was under consideration at the Horse Guards. My right hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) has stated very justly that as regards Sir William Mansfield the case had been decided before he left office in conjunction with the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Viscount Cranborne) then Secretary for India. The Commander-in-Chief, with the assistance of both the noble Lord and right hon. and gallant Gentleman, had arrived at the decision to send out the despatch which has been the subject of discussion this evening. With respect to that despatch, no one will dispute that the Commander-in-Chief approached the judgment that was delivered, with regard to Sir William Mansfield, in a way of which every one must approve. Of all the men I have ever known I have never met one less likely than his Royal Highness to be guilty of anything like undue severity, or to take any course which might be open to the charge of harshness or unfairness towards any person upon whose case he had to decide. When I entered upon my present office his Royal Highness did me the honour of consulting me upon this question. There were two questions to be decided with respect to Captain Jervis—first, did the circumstances of the case require that in strict justice he should be reinstated; and, secondly, if he could not be reinstated, by what course could the Commander-in-Chief give effect to the recommendation to mercy of the court-martial? It was the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief—an opinion in which, after full consideration, I concurred, and in which every military authority of high rank whom I consulted agreed, that, looking at the whole of the case, and with every endeavour to do justice, Captain Jervis could not with propriety be reinstated in the army. I have no wish to speak with any undue harshness of

Captain Jervis, but I protest against the competency of this House to re-consider the case. I say, first, that the case was disposed of by court-martial, upon a principle of justice that no one can impeach; and, secondly, that it has been disposed of with due regard to the same principle by the military authorities at home. We would not be carried away by popular clamour on the one hand, or on the other by the feelings which may influence relations or Gentlemen in this House respecting the conduct of Sir William Mansfield. I am not standing here as the champion or the advocate of Sir William Mansfield. I admit entirely the grave indiscretion which has marked his conduct throughout. I do not for a moment defend the conduct of Sir William Mansfield. I think it is open to much censure. It has received—I beg the House to remember—great censure. It has received a grave rebuke from the highest authority in the army. At the same time I beg the House to bear in mind that it does not follow because Sir William Mansfield is wrong that, therefore, Captain Jervis is right. I accept the responsibility for what has been done. Although this is the act of the Commander-in-Chief, as the head of the army, his Royal Highness has not taken this step without consulting the responsible Minister of the Crown. The Commander-in-Chief was most anxious to fulfil his duty with perfect impartiality and justice. But we had to consider what was the real position of the case as regarded Captain Jervis. I am sorry that this question has been raised, and that I am compelled, in the discharge of my duty, to hold any language which may now appear harsh towards Captain Jervis. But it was impossible to disregard the fact—which I ask the House of Commons to consider and not be carried away by prejudice or clamour—what is the usual practice of courts-martial in drawing up their decisions. I challenge any man who is the advocate of Captain Jervis to deny that the usual practice of courts-martial, especially in charges which at all affect the honour or character of the accused party, is, where they believe him to be wholly innocent of the charge, to declare him fully and honourably acquitted. I have read the terms of the finding in the case of Colonel Crawley. There was never a case in which a man had been subjected to more obloquy and clamour. Time passed, a deliberate trial took place, and the finding was a full and honourable acquittal. If Captain Jervis had been fully and honourably acquitted the decision at home must have been different. But in taking a fair, judicial view of this question, it is impossible to disregard the fact that a full and honourable acquittal was not contained in the finding. The omission was a remarkable one. Was it accidental, or was it deliberate? At any rate, in deciding the question, whether Captain Jervis ought to be reinstated we could not disregard that omission. Then, a fair element of consideration was the view taken of this case by a perfectly impartial person, the Judge-Advocate General. My right hon. and learned Friend had to report to the Commander-in-Chief upon the merits of this case. He is open to no suspicion of partiality or prejudice; but, after deliberately reviewing the evidence, he said he thought the evidence would have justified either an acquittal or a conviction; and that the court-martial having given a deliberate verdict in favour of the accused he was not prepared to say that that finding was wrong. This was not the language of a judicial officer who thought that Captain Jervis had been the victim of a most unjust and unfair charge. I think the noble Lord opposite (Lord William Hay) made a fair and just observation, free from harshness or prejudice, when he stated that the substance of this finding was what we are familiar with in Scotch law as a verdict of "Not Proven." Then, the House will remember that the subsequent conduct of Captain Jervis was not such as to give him any particular claim to the favourable consideration of the authorities, or to inspire them with any desire to reverse the judgment of an impartial tribunal. Thinking he had reason to complain of portions of the examination of the counsel of Sir William Mansfield, he proceeded to commit a violent assault upon that gentleman at the door of the Court, and assaulted three other witnesses on the trial, for which violent conduct he was brought before the Court, made a public apology, and was bound over to keep the peace. These facts did not bear on the material points at issue in the trial, but they did bear upon the question how far the authorities at home were called upon by the whole circumstances of the case to reverse the finding of the court-martial and restore Captain Jervis to his rank. The question was what force was to be given to the recommendation to mercy? It was the anxious desire of the Commander-in-Chief, and it was my own desire, that this recommendation should not be disregarded. There were only two ways of attending to it. One was by reinstating Captain Jervis; the other was to remove the stigma of his conviction by allowing him to sell his commission, as though in a purchase regiment. That appeared to the Commander-in-Chief and to myself the most effectual way of giving effect to the recommendation of the Court. This is the view taken by the military authorities in this country, and I earnestly hope that this House will not, by supporting the Motion, take a course which, in my opinion, will be inconsistent with justice, dangerous as a precedent, and inconsistent alike with the discipline and character of the service.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: It is with great unwillingness that I trouble the House with a few words on this subject. I am unwilling to do so, because this is a most complicated and difficult question, and because I feel that I have not studied the voluminous Papers in this case so completely as to enable me to give an authoratitive opinion upon many of the points raised. Indeed, I would not have troubled the House at all, if it had not been for one or two observations made by speakers who have preceded me. I do not, like the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (General Peel), go the length of deprecating the interference of the House of Commons altogether in discussions of this nature. The right hon. Gentleman has, on many occasions, expressed his opinion that the interference of the House in almost all military subjects is a source of unmitigated evil. I believe there are many points of military administration in which this House may most usefully and beneficially interfere. But I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that this House ought to be extremely careful as to the occasions and the manner in which it interferes with military questions of a personal character. Still there are occasions even of a personal character in which it may properly interfere. If there is a suspicion that personal favour has been shown to an officer, or that justice has not been done to his merits, the publicity given to such cases cannot but be beneficial. But we ought to be very careful when we undertake, in questions affecting military discipline, to review the decisions either of legally constituted tribunals or of officers who have the power to revise such decisions. There is one point to which I wish to refer. It may be said that the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Helston is an invitation to us to revise the decision of a court-martial. To a certain extent that is true, as a court-martial did sentence Captain Jervis to be dismissed from the army. But the hon. and learned Member will probably reply that he is not so much inviting the House to revise the decision, as to attend to the recommendation to mercy given by the Court. Although, therefore, this Motion can hardly be taken as an invitation to revise the sentence of the court-martial, it is an invitation to an act which is almost if not equally delicate and dangerous—namely, to undertake the revision of judicial decisions come to by persons legally qualified to give them—the Commander-in-Chief in India and the Commander-in-Chief at home, backed up by the authority of the Secretary of State for War. No one can deny that the Commander-in-Chief in India legally had the power to confirm or revise the decision of the court-martial at Simla; no one can deny that he legally had the power either to act upon or to set aside the recommendation to mercy. Although I concur in many of the strictures passed this evening upon the want of judgment displayed by Sir William Mansfield, I must avow my firm opinion, so far as I have been able to form a judgment from reading the Papers, that Sir William Mansfield, was not actuated by personal motives of dislike to Captain Jervis, and that, although he may have been mistaken in his view, he did act upon the view he took of his public duty. I believe that the real state of the case as regards Sir William Mansfield is correctly stated in two paragraphs of his despatch, which are as follows:—

> "It can hardly be said that the accident of grave offences of insubordination having been committed against the Commander-in-Chief in person is a reason for the latter to forget his duty of maintaining the discipline of the army according to law and usage, when the conduct of the accused person has compelled the Commander-in-Chief to the last resource of a public trial My view has been, on the contrary, that it was for the Commander-in-Chief to elevate himself above the whole matter, as if he were not a party concerned, and to treat it as it would have been treated in the case of any other superior officer who had been insulted and met with the grossest insubordination by one under his immediate command, it being recollected that the protection of his office on the part of the Commander-in-Chef is a positive obligation on him."

No one can deny that the Commander-in-Chief was legally entitled to act or not to act upon the recommendation or the proceedings the court-martial. They were forwarded to England. They were revised by the right hon. Gentleman the Deputy Judge Advocate General, who, having perused the proceedings with as much care as any Gentleman in this House, did not think it necessary to recommend to Her Majesty that these proceedings should be reversed. The Duke of Cambridge, as admitted by all who have spoken, also studied them with care; and he did not think it necessary to act upon the recommendation to mercy. Although he did not shrink from the responsibility of severely censuring Sir William Mansfield for his conduct, he did not think that the sentence of the Court should be reversed, or that the recommendation to mercy should be attended to. Both these officers—Sir William Mansfield and the Duke of Cambridge—were the legally constituted officers on whom the duty devolved of considering whether the sentence of the court-martial should be acted on in its integrity or not. The House will take upon itself a very grave and serious responsibility if it undertakes to revise, not the sentence of the court-martial, but that of the legally constituted authorities whose duty it was to revise it. After what has been said on both sides of the House, I think it is tolerably clear no injustice has been done by removing Captain Jervis from the army. I cannot forget the fact, referred to by the Secretary of State for War, which I think is a material point in the case, that the Court arrived at a verdict of mere acquittal, and not, as the accused requested, at one of full and honourable acquittal. With that I couple the conclusion at which the Court arrived on the charges of insubordination, including that of refusal to appear before the Court for the purpose of clearing his own character. When I look at these circumstances I cannot bring myself to believe that any substantial injustice has been done by the removal of Captain Jervis from the army. Unless the House is fully convinced that an act of substantial and gross injustice has been done, it will be setting a bad example and establishing a mischievous precedent, if it undertakes to revise the decision not so much of the Simla court-martial, as of all those authorities whose duty it has been to revise and to act upon them.

Mr. OTWAY said, he wished to ask those who deprecated the discussion in that House of the proceedings of the court-martial, why they had been laid on the table if they were not to be discussed. On the other hand, he admitted that the House of Commons was hardly a good tribunal to try again cases of this kind. Therefore, in suggesting an Amendment to the hon. and learned Member for Helston (Mr. Brett) he took what was the safe course of abiding by the decision of the court-martial? He was the more satisfied that this was a right and wise course, because that decision had been upheld by the Commander-in-Chief in a despatch which did him the greatest honour. Therefore he would suggest as an Amendment, that an Address should be presented to Her Majesty, praying that—

> "She will be graciously pleased to give effect to the recommendation to mercy contained in the sentence of the court-martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis."

That court-martial was one of the most impartial and painstaking of military tribunals that ever assembled. The omission of the words "full and honourable" before the word "acquittal" in the finding of the Court was capable of explanation. If he were well informed, it was so. There were many tribunals in which differences of opinion arose, and in considering such a difference of opinion, account must be taken of the circumstances under which it arose. Here the Commander-in-Chief had summoned officers, all subordinate to himself. It was quite possible, without for a moment imagining that they would act with the slightest partiality, that they might have been unable to come to an unanimous decision on some questions, and that they therefore agreed to a compromise. These matters were no longer secret. Indeed, the Commander-in-Chief in India referred to the opinions of individual officers. He had been told by the gentleman who was charged with the defence of Captain Jervis that the reason the words "full and honourable" were omitted, was that the Court determined they would give a recommendation to mercy. They decided on an acquittal accompanied by a recommendation to mercy, the effect of which they reasonably imagined would be the restoration of Captain Jervis to his place in the army. He had no hesitation in saying, on the authority of the same gentleman, that if this expectation had not been entertained, the words "full and honourable acquittal" would in all probability have been used. When the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) said that substantial justice had been done, how did he measure the professional honour of an officer? At a sum of £1,800. This was not a question of degree of guilt. Captain Jervis must be innocent or not. If he took a pot of jam or a jar of pickles with intent to defraud, he was a thief, and no longer fit for the army. But if his doing so was merely part of a loose debtor and creditor account he was entitled to an acquittal. Captain Jervis was either innocent or guilty. He could not be partly both. The insubordination was induced by these disgraceful charges of which he had been acquitted. Captain Jervis had been dismissed from the army and disgraced. Was it probable for instance that he could be a member of any Club in London? Yet, being innocent, it was said that full and substantial justice was done by awarding him the sum of £1,800. And from what source? From the revenues of India! If a Sultan were to be entertained, or if an injustice to an officer of the army were to be redressed, the revenues of India were equally available. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India (Sir Stafford Northcote) seemed to lend himself to these negotiations with a facility that was perfectly surprising. The right hon. Baronet received on the 7th of June from the Secretary of State for War a letter written in a very easy and pleasant style, enclosing the following communication from the Horse Guards "for the consideration of the Secretary of State for India in Council:"—

"I am directed by the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief to acquaint you, for the information of the Secretary of State, that his Royal Highness proposes to give effect to the sentence of dismissal passed on that officer by the general court-martial which sat on his trial at Simla last year. But with reference to the recommendation of the court in Captain Jervis's favour, and to the peculiar circumstances of the case, his Royal Highness desires me to suggest that a sum equivalent to the full value of his commission—namely, £1,800, may be granted him. On receiving your reply to this communication measures will be immediately taken for succeeding Captain Jervis in the 106th Regiment."

In the same easy and pleasant style the Secretary of State for India returned an answer on the following day, the 8th of June. The right hon. Baronet was evidently in too great a hurry to consult his Council, as his reply was singularly short—

"In reply, I am directed to acquaint you that Sir Stafford Northcote concurs in the course proposed, and I am to request that Captain Jervis may be informed that the sum of £1,800 will be paid to him on application at this office."

He was treated as if he were an officer

Mr. Otway

who had purchased into a regiment of the British Army, whereas he was an officer in the Indian Army, in which purchase had never been permitted. This was the easy manner in which the India Office was always ready to give out of the revenues of India the hush-money recessary to keep unpleasant subjects quiet. But if Captain Jervis was, as Sir William Mansfield had once declared, a man of "scrupulous honour," no grant of money could compensate the injury he had sustained. He did not agree with the opinion of the right hon. and gallant Member for Huntingdon (General Peel) that the despatch of the Commander-in-Chief—which did His Royal Highness infinite credit—ought not to have been produced. A curious illustration of the harmony which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman assured the House existed between the Commander-in-Chief and the Secretary of State for War was furnished by the right hon. and gallant Gentlemen, when he accused the Secretary of State for War of having improperly published a dispatch of the Commander-in-Chief. There was no want of precedents to justify the House in coming to a decision respecting the sentence of a court-martial, and it was not for the first time that it was called upon to remedy an act of injustice that would otherwise pass unrevoked. He begged to move his Amendment.

Motion made, and Question put,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give effect to the recommendation to mercy contained in the sentence of the Court Martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis."—(*Mr. Otway.*)

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, that he rose to answer the most unfair and extraordinary quotation of documents he had ever heard in the House. He referred to that part of the subject in which he had a share. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last had said that the grant of £1,800 upon the revenues of India had been settled in a couple of short and agreeable letters between the Secretary for India and the Secretary for War—one written on the 7th and the other on the 8th of June; and that, consequently, it was quite impossible that the Council for India could have been consulted. This was the statement. What were the facts, as shown by the Correspondence to which the hon. Gentleman had referred? The Correspondence on the subject began, not on the 7th of June, but on the 13th of May, in a letter addressed by the Under Secretary of State for War to the Under Secretary for India. The gentleman by whom it was written, said:—

> "I am directed by Secretary Sir John Pakington to transmit to you for the consideration of the Secretary of State for India in Council the accompanying copy of a letter which has been received by the Military Secretary to the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief from Captain S. Jervis, 106th Regiment. Sir John Pakington having been in communication with his Royal Highness on the subject of this application has arrived at the conclusion that, with a view to meet the case of Captain Jervis, it is desirable to make such arrangements in mitigation of the sentence on that officer, and in deference to the recommendation to mercy by the court-martial, as may be equivalent to permitting him to sell his commission as if he were an officer in one of the purchase regiments in the British Army. His Royal Highness has expressed his concurrence in this proposition, and I am to request that should Sir Stafford Northcote see no reason to dissent from it you will move him to cause the necessary arrangements to be made accordingly."

On the 24th of May, eleven days after, having had ample time to bring the subject before the Council by whom it had been considered, he (Sir Stafford Northcote) sent, or rather General Pears sent, the following reply:—

> "I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th instant, forwarding a letter from Captain Jervis of the 106th Regiment, and stating that Sir John Pakington having been in communication with His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief on the subject of that officer's application has arrived at the conclusion that, with a view to meet his case, it is desirable to make such arrangements in mitigation of his sentence, and in deference to the recommendation to mercy by the court-martial, as may be equivalent to permitting him to sell his commission, as if he were an officer in one of the purchase regiments in the British Army, and requesting that in the event of Sir Stafford Northcote concurring in this view, he will cause the necessary arrangements to be made accordingly. 2. In reply, I am desired to state that, as far as Sir Stafford Northcote has been made acquainted with the present position of Captain Jervis, that officer has been sentenced by court-martial in India to be dismissed the service, but with a recommendation to mercy, and that the sentence has been confirmed by the Commander-in-Chief in India, but that effect has not yet been given to the sentence in this country, either by its publication in the *Gazette*, or by the removal of Captain Jervis's name from the regiment in the official Army List. 3. Captain Jervis, although he retained, on transfer to the 106th Foot, a prospective claim to pension under India rules, is not yet entitled under those rules to any pension, having entered the army as recently as 1856, but I am desired to state that should the sentence of the court-martial be carried out, and this officer be removed from the service, the Secretary of State in Council will be prepared, on the recommendation of his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief and the Secretary of State for War, to grant him from Indian revenues a sum equivalent to the selling value of his commission."

The letter he received on tho 7th of June referred to by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Otway), simply acquainted him with the final decision which had been arrived at, and all that was then necessary to be done was to notify the fact that arrangements had been made to carry out what had been determined upon. The hon. Gentleman apparently felt himself justified in entirely ignoring the important communications of the 13th and the 24th of May, in which the question was dealt with at length, and in referring to the last two letters which had passed, as if those two letters comprised the whole of the correspondence, and this he did in addressing hon. Gentlemen who had not the Papers in their hands. If the hon. Gentleman regarded such conduct as fair and candid, all he could say was that his views on the subject of fairness and candour, and those entertained by the hon. Gentleman, differed very widely. The matter was duly brought under the consideration of the Council. In regard to the merits of the case, the Council for India looked at it in this light: if Captain Jervis had remained in the service he would upon the time arriving for his retirement have been entitled to a pension upon the revenues of India, and under the circumstances he was entitled to compensation. The amount of it might be a question for discussion. With regard to the mode in which the matter had been determined, as far as related to the Correspondence on the subject, he hoped the House saw that it was entirely different from that represented by the hon. Gentleman.

Major JERVIS said, that every officer had a right to appeal to the Crown against the decisions of a court-martial. That right was not in any way affected in consequence of the court-martial having been held in India instead of in this country. The conduct of the Commander-in-Chief in India had been blamed by the Commander-in-Chief in England, and the former, in replying to the remarks made upon the course he had pursued, said—

> "In your 33rd and 34th paragraphs you indicate that, as I was unable to concur with the Court and to act on their recommendation, I should have altogether refrained from dealing with the case, and that I should have forwarded the proceedings to England for submission to the Queen to be disposed of according to Her Ma-

> jesty's pleasure. It is further said that this course would have relieved me from all responsibility, and would have extricated me from a most anomalous and exceptional position. In answer, I have to submit, with great deference, that this course did not escape my consideration, but that I did not feel myself justified in evading my due responsibility according to my warrant and the position I hold as Commander-in-Chief in India."

In this case, owing to the course adopted by the Commander-in-Chief in India, an opportunity was not afforded to the Crown to carry out the recommendation of the court-martial. And yet the officer by whom that letter was written had expressly declined to act upon the recommendation to mercy that was made by the court-martial, on the ground that such mercy belonged only to the Prerogative of the Queen. His conduct, therefore, plainly showed that he designedly confirmed the sentence of the court-martial, rather than he would submit it to a quarter where a clemency to which he was averse might have been exhibited. Hitherto, the case had not been submitted to the Crown, and all that was now asked of the House was that the privilege to which every British officer was entitled might be made available to Captain Jervis, and that the case should be submitted to the Crown for the exercise of clemency.

Colonel SYKES said, the House would readily believe that his predilections were in favour of upholding the properly constituted military authorities. There were, however, exceptional cases where injustice had been committed, and where interferences consequently was called for. For such interference they had a precedent in the case of Colonel Crawley. There was an appeal from the Judges of Assize to the Courts, and ultimately to the House of Lords. It was not unreasonable that in cases like that of Captain Jervis there should be an appeal to the House of Commons. The case was this—Captain Jervis was tried for fraud. The charge was preferred by the Commander-in-Chief. Captain Jervis was also charged with insubordination. The court-martial, consisting of officers equal to Sir William Mansfield in experience and judgment, acquitted Captain Jervis of fraud, and with respect to the other charge, recommended him to mercy in consequence of extenuating circumstances. What was now asked was that the recommendation should be carried into effect.

Mr. BRETT said, he would withdraw his Motion in order that the Amendment of the hon. Member (Mr. Otway) might be put in its stead.

The House *divided:*—Ayes, 48; Noes, 66: Majority, 18.

METROPOLITAN MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT BILL.—LEAVE.

FIRST READING.

Mr. J. STUART MILL said, he moved for leave to introduce a Bill for the better Municipal Government of the Metropolis. The Bill embodied the remainder of the plan, part of which he had introduced in another Bill at an earlier period of the Session. It could not be expected that the Bill could pass into law this Session, and his object was simply to have it printed so that it might be laid before the public with a view to its being considered next Session. It provided for a central municipal government, as the other Bill provided local district municipalities. The Bill borrowed from a variety of sources; from the recommendations of a Royal Commission some years ago; from those of the Committee recently presided over by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton); and from the views which had been brought before the House on various occasions by the hon. and learned Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke). The Bill did not make a *tabula rasa* of the old system, but made use of the existing materials. The Bill proposed that the present corporation of the City of London should be enlarged by absorbing the Board of Works. The object of the Bill was to enlarge the corporation into a municipality for the whole of London, leaving behind in the City as much power as was necessary for purely local administration, which under the other Bill all the other districts of the municipality would also have. The Lord Mayor, under this Bill, would grow into a Lord Mayor for all London, and the Common Council would be converted into a Common Council for all London. That Common Council would consist of the Lord Mayor, aldermen, and common councilmen, but the aldermen, would not be a separate body, but, with the Common Council, would be elected by the ratepayers. It was proposed by the Bill that the present aldermen of the City should retain their offices for life, but that no vacancy amongst them should be filled up until their number was reduced to six, which would be double the number of aldermen for other districts of the Metropolis. There would be two aldermen in the Common Council for each district, they being those among the successful candidates for the district councillorships who had obtained the greatest number of votes. The corporation property would pass into the possession of this larger municipality. The City, it was right to say, had not given its assent to this transfer, but from what was known of the state of opinion in the City, there was ground to hope that there would be no corporate opposition to it. In consideration of the surrender of the corporation property, it was proposed to make certain concessions to the City in return, which he thought would not be considered more than a fair equivalent. It was proposed that the City should have twice the number of representatives in the Common Council that its population would justify. It was further proposed that the Deputy Mayor, who would represent the Lord Mayor in his absence or fill his place in case of his dying in office, should always be one of the aldermen of the City. There were a few other arrangements which would be sufficiently shown by the Bill itself. The county of the City of London would become the county of all London, and would have one Commission of Peace, of which all the aldermen would be members. As a temporary measure it was proposed that the Board of Works and all the present aldermen should be added to the Council, Sir John Thwaites being appointed Chairman of the standing Committees at his present salary, provided that he was willing to accept the office.

Mr. LOCKE said, he did not propose to enter into any discussion of the measure. Though he approved of the Bill now introduced, he thought there were considerable difficulties in its way. He did not at present see how it could be worked in connection with another Bill which the hon. Member for Westminster had introduced on the subject of the municipal government of the metropolis. He hoped, however that the introduction of the Bill would assist in reforming the municipal government of London, which stood very much in need of reformation.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he would not oppose the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE said, the proposal of the hon. Member for Westminster was one of great importance. The corporation of London had not yet had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on it. The subject no doubt would be brought before the House next Session. The corporation of London would be most ready to consider all the plans proposed, and were only anxious that the extension of the municipality should not take place at the expense of any of those valuable privileges they had so long held, and still continued to hold, for the benefit of the metropolis.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill for the better Municipal Government of the Metropolis, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Mill, Mr. Thomas Hughes, and Mr. Tomline.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 303.]

RAILWAY COMPANIES (IRELAND) ADVANCES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Hunt, Bill to authorize the extension of the period for repayment of Advances made under "The Railway Companies (Ireland) Temporary Advances Act, 1866," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Hunt and Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 304.]

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, August 7, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—*Second Report*—On Public Accounts. [No. 519.]

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Railway Companies (Scotland) * [306].

Second Reading—Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * [304].

Committee—Increase of the Episcopate [213].

Report—Increase of the Episcopate [213 & 307].

Considered as amended— Expiring Laws Continuance * [288]; Public Works (Ireland) * [262].

Third Reading—Uniformity Act Amendment [68], *negatived;* Libel [215]; Militia Reserve * [149]; Railways (Ireland) * [298], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Pawnbroking * [182].

SIERRA LEONE—LAW COURTS.

QUESTION.

Sir JOHN GRAY said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether, having regard to the fact that in a Despatch from the Governor of Sierra Leone, bearing date the 22nd of March, 1867, His Excellency acknowledges the commission of a series of assaults upon Natives of the Colony by certain servants of the Crown, it is the intention of the Colonial Office to deny the protection of Trial by Jury in Civil Actions to the Native Population; and whether the attention of the Government has been called to certain judgments recently delivered in the Criminal Courts of that Settlement, in which the punishment awarded is said to have been in excess of and contrary to Law, and which are set forth in a Petition said to have been addressed to the Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs?

Mr. ADDERLEY, in reply, said, in the first place, it was untrue that a series of assaults had been committed by servants of the Crown in Sierra Leone upon Natives; and, in the second place, the assaults that had been committed had been effectually dealt with by the authorities on the spot. In some cases actions were brought, in which the aggrieved parties had received money by way of compromise. Assaults were, unfortunately, too common of whites against the negroes wherever the two races came in contact; but they had not been specially committed by public servants of the Crown. In one case, certainly, an assault was committed against a negro, under great provocation, by a person who happened to be a public servant, but the offence was fully punished. The Question of the hon. Gentleman conveyed the inference that, in consequence of those assaults, the Government had been led to give effect to the recommendation of the local authorities in respect to the abolition of Trial by Jury in Civil Actions. The Crown had, in fact, confirmed the local ordinance, which it was intended should be as serviceable to the negroes as to the whites. There was ample evidence to prove that this system of Trial by Jury in such cases had worked extremely ill towards all who were brought under its operation. With regard to the second part of the hon. Gentleman's Question, the Petition referred to was signed by fifteen persons, of whom the only known one was an editor of a newspaper. In no single instance had sentences been complained of by the prisoners, or any persons on their behalf. Nevertheless, the circumstances alluded to were certainly such as to demand the most serious investigation, which was now being carried on. He quite admitted that if Juries were done away with in Civil Actions, it was essential that the Judges should be men without spot as to their integrity and of undoubted capacity for office. The statement set forth in this Petition, so far as the facts had been investigated, contained many inaccuracies.

YELLOW FEVER IN THE MAURITIUS.

QUESTION.

Mr. J. A. SMITH said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary for the Colonies, Whether the Government have any further information as to the ravages of the yellow fever in the Mauritius, and whether they propose to allow Parliament to separate without providing means to alleviate the severe distress reported to be existing there?

Mr. ADDERLEY said, in reply, that the last information at the Colonial Office relative to the ravages of the yellow fever in the Mauritius was dated on the 20th of May, and was received on the 20th of July. The statement was that the health of the population had been improving since the 7th of May, but that there had died in Port Louis and other districts up to that date 7,000 persons. Governor Sir Henry Barkly had already instituted certain inquiries as to the causes of the epidemic, and the local Board of Health was still considering the question. The Colonial Office also intended to send out other persons to assist in that inquiry. With regard to any relief which Parliament might render, he could only say that the circumstances of the distress were not sufficiently known to justify the Government in asking Parliament for a Vote of Public Money on the subject. Such Votes for the relief of the population in distant Colonies were very rare, almost the only cases being for relief of distress caused by hurricanes in the West Indies. A private subscription was now being collected in the City on behalf of the sufferers in the Mauritius, and a large amount had already been collected, and any gentleman sympathizing with the object of that fund could, of course, contribute to it.

PARLIAMENT—CUSTODY OF PETITIONS.—QUESTION.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief explanation before I put the Question which stands on the Paper in my name. On Tuesday Mr. Lord, the Chairman of the Protestant Association, came to me, and represented to me that the Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, and the Roman Catholic Relief Act, had been published, and that some of it appeared to him to be unfounded, and that such Evidence was given exclusively by persons who were known to be opposed to the Law which the Committee in question was appointed to consider. This gentleman accordingly asked me to present a Petition to this House from the Protestant Association, signed by him as Chairman, praying that certain other Evidence might be heard before the said Committee. I assented, and presented the Petition alluded to on the 31st of July. It was an important one, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read two paragraphs from the document. ["Order, Order!"] Or, if that course be not considered in Order, I will not persist in it, but simply state the substance of the Petition, which was to this effect, and I think it bears directly on the Orders of the House—

> "Your Petitioners humbly submit that the Evidence in question is of such importance that it ought not to be closed until some persons have been examined, whose testimony would tend to show that the said Act is declaratory of the Common Law, whereby the independence of this country is maintained and the Prerogatives of the Crown are guarded; and that the said Act ought not to be repealed or altered otherwise than in the sense of giving effect to the Common Law."

The Petitioners, then, conclude by saying that they knew that there are persons who are competent to give such evidence, and are ready and willing to be examined before the said Committee; and they, therefore, humbly prayed that an opportunity might be afforded for tendering such evidence. On Wednesday I brought this Petition down to the House, and having presented it, I moved that it be referred to the Select Committee appointed to consider the Ecclesiastical Titles Act and the Roman Catholic Relief Act. I found, Sir, on the Journals of this House, as part of the proceedings of Wednesday last, the following notice:—

> "Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts—Petition of the Chairman of the Committee of the Protestant Association for an opportunity of tendering Evidence on the subject; referred to the Select Committee on the Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts."

I may now state that the Evidence to which this Petition referred was that of—

MR. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. Member is rather exceeding the bounds of his inquiry. The object of his question, as I understand it, is simply to ascertain why this Petition, which was ordered to be referred to the Select Committee, was not placed before them?

MR. NEWDEGATE: The Evidence to which the Petitioners alluded was that of Dr. Wordsworth, the Archdeacon of Westminster; of the Rev. Dr. M'Neile, of Sir Joseph Napier, ex-Chancellor for Ireland; and of Mr. Lord himself, a barrister, and a gentleman, who has published a work containing very valuable information on the subjects the Committee were appointed to hear evidence and to consider and to report upon. The Petition was, therefore, I submit, an important one as regarded the matter in question. Well, Sir, after this Order of the House, which appears on its Journals, I naturally concluded that the Petition would certainly reach the Committee, and under that impression I left London on the next day, Thursday. Subsequently, however, on the Monday following, I was surprised to hear that the Committee had already reported. And yesterday I received a Copy of the Proceedings and the Report of the Select Committee. I found, from a perusal of the proceedings, that no such Evidence as that to which the Petition referred, had been received by the Committee. I immediately came down to the House and asked a member of the Committee whom I met whether he had seen or heard anythig of this Petition, which had been ordered to be referred to the Select Committee. The Lord Advocate, the Gentleman to whom I refer, said, in reply, that he had never heard a word of it. I then went the Journal Office to ascertain who had been the Clerk of the Committee. I accordingly went to him, and asked him what had become of this Petition. He told me that he had heard nothing of it—that he did not see the Order of the House, and it had escaped his notice. I asked him to come with me to the Office of the Committee on Petitions. He did so, and at this Office the Clerk found the Petition amongst several others, and on the back of it I saw the note of the Clerk at the Table marking the Petition as referred, by Order of the House, to the Committee. I ascertained from the Clerk in the Office of the Committee on Petitions that the Petition had never been removed from that Office—had never been delivered to the Chairman when the Committee were sitting on Friday last, and that, in fact, no steps whatever had been taken to comply with the Order of the House. It appears to me, Sir, that this proves the existence of a great laxity of practice in regard to Petitions, and that it ought to be corrected as soon as possible. I therefore beg to ask Mr. Speaker, Whether it is consistent with the intention and practice of the House that, when the House has ordered a Petition to be referred to a Select Committee, no Officer or Clerk of the House should take charge of the Petition, and be required to deliver the Petition to the Chairman at the next meeting of the Committee, or otherwise to call the attention of the Committee to the Petition, which has by order of the House been referred to the Committee for their consideration, and is for this purpose in the possession of the officers of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: When the House refers a Petition to a Committee, it makes over that Petition to the examination and consideration of such Committee. But Petitions, whether referred or not, go in the first instance to the Journal Office, where they are examined by the Committee on Petitions. It generally happens that Petitions referred to a Special Committee have been presented by some Member of that Committee; and if he should think the subject-matter of the Petition to be of sufficient importance he brings it under the notice of the Committee. But certainly all Committees should be made acquainted with the Petitions that are ordered to be referred to them. It is certainly the duty of the Clerk to make the Committee acquainted with such Petitions. Now that is an Answer to the hon. Gentleman's Question as it appears on the Paper. If the hon. Gentleman should wish to enter upon a discussion of such points as those to which he referred, it would perhaps be better that it should be done after some previous notice of his intention, in order that the members of the Committee to whom his question refers might be present and prepared to reply to him. But, as I had to inquire into this matter, I can inform the hon. Member what had really taken place. The Committee had decided not to receive any more Evidence, and had adjourned to consider their Report. In the interim this Petition was presented to the House. The Committee had met for the purpose of considering their Report, intending not to receive any more Evidence. The Clerk, under those circumstances, had not any longer paid close attention to the Petitions that might be presented, considering that all the Evidence before the Committee had closed. When the Committee met to consider their Report, he did not mention to them that this Petition had been presented.

MR. NEWDEGATE: I trust that the House will pardon me for detaining it so long upon this subject. I will not give any formal notice with reference to the non-delivery to the Committee of this Petition, but I hope that the practice of the House in respect to Petitions will be observed with more regularity than it appears to have been.

UNIFORMITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

[BILL 68.] — THIRD READING.

(*Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Bouverie.*)

Order for Third Reading read.

MR. FAWCETT, in moving the third reading of this Bill, said, that at that late period of the Session he should not occupy the attention of the House by any lengthened observations upon it, particularly as the principle of the measure had already been fully discussed upon its second reading. It was moderate, useful, and just in its provisions. It simply proposed to give to each of the Colleges in Oxford and Cambridge power to confer the highest rewards at their disposal upon students who did not happen to be members of the Church of England. It was useful, inasmuch as no one could doubt that they were often obliged to reject distinguished students because of the existing prohibition; and they knew that if those rewards were thrown open to all there would be a much larger number of distinguished students available. It was just, because the nation at large had a right to participate in the splendid endowments of those ancient seats of learning, irrespective of religious opinions. The longer he lived, the more he became attached to his University, and the more he was determined to do everything in his power to extend the advantages of that and the twin University to the greatest possible number of his fellow-countrymen, with the view of rendering them what they ought to be in the broadest sense, truly national institutions.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the Third time."—(*Mr. Fawcett.*)

MR. BENTINCK, in moving the rejection of the Bill, said, that the Motion which stood on the Paper in his name, had been placed there by him a considerable time ago. It appeared to him that the principle of the measure had never undergone a proper amount of discussion, and that those who supported it on the last occasion had given very little reason for their votes. The hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett) had stated that the Bill was of a permissive character ; whereas, on the occasion of the second reading, the hon. Member for Plymouth argued in favour of the Bill as being placed on a different foundation. That hon. Gentleman contended that those endowments were public property, and that sooner or later, they would be treated as such. The hon. and learned Member for Portsmouth (Mr. Serjeant Gaselee) might be very learned in the law of the land, but he appeared to be very ignorant of the law of the Universities when he stated that the greater part of the endowments were derived from the Roman Catholics. He (Mr. Bentinck) submitted that at that advanced period of the Session the question involved in this measure could not be fairly discussed or considered. He was satisfied that if the Bill were considered upon its merits the Roman Catholics themselves could not consistently vote for it. As a constituent of the hon. and learned Member for Clare (Sir Colman O'Loghlen), he appealed to him whether he could support a measure which would divert such endowments from their original and natural uses. If that hon. Baronet did so he (Mr. Bentinck) was sure that the prelates of his own Church would do their best to turn him out of Parliament. If the Roman Catholics were in favour of the Roman Catholic endowments being preserved to Roman Catholics on their side of the Channel, they must conscientiously support the same principle in its application to the Protestant Church in this country. Since the Reformation the great proportion of those endowments had been given to the Colleges by members of the Established Church. They therefore belonged to the Church of England; and they had no more right to dispoil the Church of England of those endowments than they would have to deprive private individuals of their property. The hon. Member concluded by moving that the Bill be read a third time that day three months.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Bentinck.*)

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he wished the hon. Gentleman had replied to his speech sooner, as he really did not remember what he did say on the occasion referred to. All he knew was that whatever he said on that occasion he was quite prepared to defend, although he thought it was rather exceeding the terms of courtesy in the House to impute gross ignorance to a Member. He (Mr. Serjeant Gaselee) would merely advise the hon. Gentleman to look more at home. What he recollected saying, and he still adhered to it, was—that many of the endowments at the Universities were made by Roman Catholics. So far from the Bill not having been amply discussed, it had been discussed *usque ad nauseam*, and it would be much better for the hon. Member, instead of dividing the House upon his Amendment, to enter a protest against the Bill, which would receive the attention it deserved.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 34; Noes 41: Majority 7.

Words *added*.

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *put off* for three months.

LIBEL BILL.—[Bill 215.]

(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Baines.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen.*)

Mr. AYRTON rose to move that the measure should be read a third time upon that day three months, and expressed his regret that it should have come before the House at so late a period of the Session, when it was almost impossible to induce hon. Members to direct their attention to the great importance of the questions it involved. The Bill had not, up to the present time, been properly discussed, and its character was very imperfectly understood, and therefore he objected to its being read a third time without comment, lest the other House of Parliament should be led to believe that it had met with the general sanction of the House of Commons and of the public, and thus be induced to give it a consideration to which it was not entitled. On this ground, therefore, he had felt it to be his duty to enter this protest against the principle of the measure, which, in his opinion, was open to three or four grave, if not fatal, objections. In the first place, the provisions contained in the Bill, while they would be injurious to those who spoke at public meetings, would be no less injurious to those who were spoken against; they would tend to frustrate the due administration of justice as regarded the offender; and, in the end would, he believed, tend to destroy the liberty of the press itself by leading to the imposition of those restrictions which were imposed upon it in other countries, and which would become necessary if we were once to allow the press to have the advantage of exceptional laws which would deprive the public at large of that protection which the law of the land now gave them. This Bill endeavoured to place the law of slander and the law of libel upon the same footing; whereas heretofore, upon what he believed to be solid grounds, a great distinction had been recognized between words spoken and words written. And from the nature of society it was important that distinction should not be lost sight of, because it was impossible for men to exercise the same care in the selection of their words in speaking as they could do in writing. It was unnecessary for him to enter into any long argument to convince hon. Members of the necessity of maintaining this distinction; for any one who had sat in that House for a month must have perceived how exceedingly difficult it was for speakers to restrain themselves when taking part in an exciting debate, to the choice of words which expressed their meaning with perfect accuracy, and how frequently when carried away by their feelings they made use of observations which they would most certainly not have used in writing, and which, when challenged, they withdrew on the ground that they had not expressed themselves as they had intended. This difficulty experienced by speakers was so obvious that the law took notice of it, and declared that a person should not be responsible for what he said unless he so far transgressed the bounds of propriety as to inflict injury upon another person by charging him with having committed a crime, or by inflicting pecuniary loss upon him, and that he should not be responsible for uttering that general language of excitement, and it might be of abuse, for which he would be amenable were he to put his language into writing. The definition of slander was totally different from that of libel, and the question raised by this Bill was—whether under circumstances most likely to excite the speaker, and to lead him into the commission of an error, he was to be made responsible for what he said to a greater degree than he was by the law as it stood at present. There might be grounds for abolishing that distinction in cases where a man spoke with great calmness, deliberation, and thought; but the cases selected was exactly the reverse—namely, that a person who published for his own profit what another man said was not to be made liable for what he so published. Each ought to be held responsible for his own act, as by the present law. It was said that the speaker would be exempted from the consequences of this Bill if he could show that he had been misreported, but hon. Members must see at what a great disadvantage a speaker would be placed in maintaining that he did not say exactly what was ascribed to him, because the reporter would declare that he had taken down what was said; and the unhappy speaker, having nothing to refer to but his own memory, would be unable to adduce any evidence in his defence. If, however, he admitted that the report was accurate, but did not publish an apology, he would be held responsible for publishing a libel, although he had no concern whatever in the publication of it. It might be that a speaker might not know that a reporter was present when he made use of certain expressions; yet, on their being published, without his knowlege or consent, he would be held responsible for them in an action for libel, and a notable example of such a circumstance occurred very recently. A select assembly took place in a part of this House, where certain statements were made, and, after the meeting, if it could be called so, had come to an end, it was stated that reporters had been present. Thereupon the persons who had spoken appeared very much astonished when they heard that fact, but still the reporters had intruded themselves, and had actually prepared a report of what had occurred. The parties calling the meeting had, it appeared, invited reporters to be present. In some cases even where a speaker had expressly desired that his observations might not be reported his request had not been attended to, and his speech was published. There was, therefore, no protection to speakers. The other day, on an occasion when he knew that reporters were present, he desired that some remarks he made affecting the conduct of others should not be reported, nevertheless, the reporters, in the exercise of their discretion, took down his words and published them. Under such circumstances as these it would be most unjust to render the speaker liable for the publication of expressions which he had specially requested might not be reported. If such a course were to be adopted they would be imposing a tyranny over speakers at public meetings which was uncalled for, injurious, and unnecessary, and the result would be to repress free discussion in this country. The House must recollect that under the law of libel a person was responsible for holding another up to ridicule and contempt in writing; but that no such responsibility was incurred where the words were merely spoken. In most discussions, even those that took place in that House, half the speakers held up those who did not take their view of a subject to ridicule and contempt; but, if the language they used were to be published, the speakers would be liable, although for the mere utterance of it they were not responsible. He wished to know why persons should not be free to discuss any subject at a public meeting without being rendered responsible for the language they might use in consequence of a reporter being present and publishing their speeches. That was the unfortunate position in which the speaker would be placed by the Bill; but what would be the position of the person libelled? Under the provisions of the Bill the person libelled would be practically deprived of all protection, because the newspaper proprietor would be exempted from all responsibility if he could show that the report was accurate. A person at a public meeting might make malicious statements respecting another person, and the newspaper reporting them would be free from any liability if it could show that the report was a faithful account of what had taken place. It was said that the person attacked might write a defence of himself in the newspaper in which the report appeared, provided, in the opinion of the editor of that journal, it was not too long for insertion, and provided it did not attack the reputation of any other person; but in nine cases out of ten the question was, whether the person attacked or some one else was guilty of the impropriety alleged; but by this provision he would be deprived of all opportunity of vindicating his own conduct. Then what remedy would he have under the Bill? He was to be at liberty to sue the person who had uttered the speech containing the accusation; but how was he to know who had made the speech? The report might state that a man, calling himself John Smith, got upon the platform and delivered this tirade or invective; but the reporter was not bound by the provisions of this Bill to ascertain that the speaker's name really was John Smith, or whether it was a feigned name, or anything about him. All he had to do was to put down the name which the speaker might give. He was not sure that, under the provisions of the Bill, the reporter was bound to give any name at all, as it might be that it would be quite sufficient for the reporter to say "that a person got upon the platform and made the following speech." In such a case it would be impossible for the person injured to ascertain who had brought the charge against him. The effect conveyed by speech as delivered at a meeting, and when published in a newspaper, was totally different, because those present could judge from the character, conduct, and tone of the speaker what weight should be attached to his statements; but where was the protection in the report that that impression should be conveyed to those who read it in a newspaper, because the reporter would not be called upon to give a dramatic account of the wild mode of delivering the speech, or of the violent conduct of the speaker? A speech, therefore, which might not have compromised the character of the accused in the slightest degree in the minds of those who were present might go forth in the newspaper as a wise, well-considered, and effective one, of the most damaging description to the person attacked. There was, however, another class of cases to which he would refer, which strongly exhibited the unjust manner in which this Bill would work. By Clause 3 a person speaking was to have the same privilege when charged with libel as he would have had if the action had been one of slander; but the effect of that clause had not yet been explained, although it would be of the gravest and most unjust character. The principle which regulated the law of privileged communications was, that a man was at liberty to make a communication for the purpose of business which he was prohibited from making on any other occasion, and therefore it was not there protected. The Bill proposed that if a newspaper published a privileged communication, that then the utterer of it should have all the protection that belonged to that class of communications, and that the newspaper should be exempted from any consequences in consequence of its being a *bonâ fide* privileged communication. The result of that proposition being agreed to by the House would be that both parties would be relieved from all responsibility in the matter. The provision would, of course, apply to the meetings of the shareholders of all railway and other companies; and when the House remembered the large number of these meetings at which reporters were present, because it was disagreeable to order them out of the room, they might imagine the evil that was likely to result if they permitted the publication of these privileged communications. The provision would also apply to the meetings of vestries and of local boards. It might be necessary for the conduct of the business of these various bodies that statements should be made which might be unpleasant to some persons, and it might be most inconvenient for those statements to be published in a newspaper, where they would be read by persons who were not in any way concerned with that business. The present law was a most wholesome one, because the reporters present at these meetings, knowing that they were responsible if they chose to publish that which was a libel, kept within bounds, and excluded from their reports all objectionable statements; and in his opinion, were that restraint to be removed, a great wrong would be done to society. He then came to the remedy which the Bill gave the aggrieved person against newspaper proprietors. The Bill proposed to exempt one class of persons from the general law of the land, to an extent never but once before proposed, and then it was deliberately rejected by that House—namely, in the case of the Vexatious Indictments Bill. The Bill proposed if a magistrate dismissed an indictment for libel, the person aggrieved should have no further redress not even giving him the power to indict before a grand jury in the event of the magistrate declining to commit the accused, or to compel him to enter into recognizances. In his opinion this would amount to a denial of justice, and he trusted that it would not be assented to from a desire on the part of some persons to curry favour with newspaper proprietors, who were anxious to pass this Bill. But the matter did not stop there; the Bill went on to say that in the event of the committal of the accused the aggrieved person must give two sureties for the payment of the costs of the prosecution, a provision which inflicted a most grievous wrong upon the prosecutor in a case of libel. He asked whether such a grievous injustice was to be done in behalf of a class of persons whose solicitations some people were unable to resist? It would almost appear that the Bill had been drawn up by newspaper proprietors for their own protection, utterly regardless of the interests of society, and he was sure that the House would not tolerate such provisions as it contained for a moment. He further objected to the provision in the Bill which rendered the aggrieved person liable for costs in the event of his withdrawing from the prosecution he had instituted, although he might have had reasonable grounds for preferring the indictment, and good reasons for withdrawing from the presecution. He protested against newspaper proprietors being exempted from the ordinary rule of law that applied to all other classes of the community, merely because they happened to be able to exercise an influence over Members of the House, and he asked hon. Members to consider whether in gratifying the owners of newspapers, they were not doing themselves and society at large a great injury? Having thus pointed out what appeared to him to be the chief objections to the Bill he asked the House to go a little further, and to see whether in attempting to gratify the newspaper proprietors they would not in reality be doing them a great injury? If they once commenced this exceptional legislation they must proceed further, and it would be well for them to consider whether it might not lead to the fettering rather than to an extension of the freedom of the press, because persons who are injured by the press would raise such an outcry against its injustice as might lead to the imposition of restrictions which newspaper proprietors should be the last to invite. It was a remarkable fact that demagogues, or those who considered themselves the leaders of the people, were those who most resented the attacks of the press, and by passing this Bill the House would be strengthening their views and the result might eventually be to lead to the adoption in this country of the system that was in force in France with regard to the press—namely, that the writer in a newspaper should be personally identified with his production, so that he might be held morally, if not legally responsible for what he wrote. Such a result would, of course, greatly interfere with the liberty of the press enjoyed under the existing law. The great security for the freedom of the press in this country was that newspaper proprietors should be subjected to the law of the land in the same manner as any other class of society ; but if they placed newspapers under a separate law of restraint and under a separate law of responsibility it would prove most injurious to them, because it would put those which were badly conducted on a footing with those which were well and honourably conducted for the benefit of society. By continuing the present responsibility of newspapers they would continue to have the reports written by men who were, or ought to be, able and competent to discriminate between what was right and what was wrong to be printed and published, but if they passed this Bill, any newspaper which employed the most ignorant and incompetent reporters, would be put on a level with those who employed gentlemen of intelligence, ability, and discretion, and they would also by it give protection to the worst conducted papers in the country. The object of this Bill was to weaken the present excellent footing on which the press of this country was placed, and he would illustrate it by an observation which a gentleman of great experience in public affairs once made to him. He said—

> "The most effectual way to put an end to the influence of the press in this country would be to abolish the law of libel."

Thinking this was a somewhat paradoxical statement, he asked for further explanation, when the gentleman said—

> "As long as the newspapers are responsible for what they print their contents will carry a certain character and weight with them, because it is felt that the proprietors will not recklessly give publicity to statements while they are liable to heavy damages in case such statements should be libellous. If, however, the law of libel were to be abolished nobody would be responsible for any statement, and the result would be that people would not care a straw for anything which appeared in the newspapers."

There was in his opinion great truth in that remark, and as he (Mr. Ayrton) hoped that such a calamity would not overtake the newspaper press of this country, he entirely objected to the present measure and begged to move that it be read a third time on that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months."—(*Mr. Ayrton.*)

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that considering the late period of the Session and the stage at which this Bill had arrived, it was not his intention to go into any argument in support of the measure. He objected to the mode in which this Bill had been opposed by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, whose speech was wholly directed against the principle of the Bill, which was discussed on the second reading. He did not consider it altogether legitimate for an hon. Member who had not opposed the second reading, nor ventured to divide on the clauses in Committee, to give notice at the last moment of his intention to move the rejection of the Bill on the third reading. The Bill passed through Committee on the 28th of June, and would have been read a third time shortly afterwards, had not his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets, knowing what was the state of public business, gave notice of the Motion he now moved, with the view of preventing the Bill from passing during the present Session, and when his Motion did come on in the ordinary course, a few weeks ago, an opponent of the Bill, perhaps a Friend of the hon. and learned Member, got the House counted out, while the hon. and learned Member was speaking in support of his Motion. Now, he did not think that was a legitimate mode of opposing a Bill, and he therefore would not now discuss the principle of the measure. The Bill, he might remark, was introduced on the 8th of February, and, consequently, it was absurd for his hon. and learned Friend to say that there was no opportunity for its full consideration and discussion. On Wednesday, the 13th of March, it passed the second reading without a division, and on that occasion no fewer than twelve hon. Members took part in the debate on the Bill. At the suggestion of the Home Secretary the Bill was then referred to a Select Committee, who had held several meetings and fully considered the Bill, and ultimately the Bill, with considerable Amendments, was reported to the House on the 8th of April. The Committee was fixed for the 13th of April, but owing to various circumstances the House did not go into Committee on the Bill till the 25th of June, when its provisions were discussed for upwards of two hours. The hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets spoke in that discussion, but did not then venture to divide the House, and it was unfair for the hon. and learned Gentleman now to oppose the Bill on the third reading. The Bill as amended was reported on the 28th of June, and would have been sent very shortly afterwards to the House of Lords had not his hon. and learned Friend placed his Motion on the Paper. Having given this short history of the Bill, he would not now discuss the various questions which had just been raised by his hon. and learned Friend; but there was one point on which he had a remark to make. This Bill did not, as had been so frequently stated, relate to newspapers alone. The first three clauses had special reference to newspapers, but the remainder of the clauses related to the law of libel generally. He might mention that the Bill had received the sanction of the Provincial Newspaper Press Association, which was composed of 160 or 170 newspaper proprietors in this kingdom, and that from eighty to ninety Petitions had been presented in favour of the Bill, while only one had been presented against it, and that proceeded from a gentleman who had commenced fourteen actions against newspapers for reporting a speech delivered in the House of Lords. The object of the clause which provided that security should be given for costs by persons proceeding by way of indictment for a libel was to place them in the same position as they would occupy at the present time if they applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a criminal information. In conclusion, he would remark that although his hon. and learned Friend might succeed in preventing the Bill from becoming law during the present Session, he was still most anxious that it should be read a third time, and therefore he should certainly divide the House.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, this was a very peculiar Session, for the House having been pre-occupied by another and a great question the present Bill has been passed through the House with a rapidity which in ordinary Sessions would not have been permitted. He opposed the Bill on the second reading; and therefore the hon. and learned Member for Clare could not complain of him for deferring his opposition to the last stage of the Bill. The Secretary of State for the Home Department expressed an opinion on the second reading that there were portions of the Bill that might be advantageous to the public, and that the best plan would be to refer the Bill to a Select Committee; it would have been idle for him (Mr. Newdegate) to dispute that opinion. Still he had felt that it was almost out of the province of a Committee to strike out the principle of the Bill, however vicious. The Select Committee seemed to have felt this, and the Bill had come back to the House modified and qualified; but, still containing that vicious principle: he felt that, if passed into law, the Bill would have a mischievous operation. The principle of the Bill was to exempt the proprietor of a newspaper which published slanderous or libellous words, reported as having been spoken at a public meeting, from all responsibility for publishing such slanderous matter, and to transfer the responsibility to the person who was supposed, judging from the report, to have spoken the words at the meeting. This he held to be a vicious principle. If a man spoke slanderous matter at a public meeting there was an opportunity of correction, because anyone could rise and demand an explanation or retractation of the slander; but where the slander was reported, it travelled beyond the sphere of the meeting, the slander became stereotyped, there was no power of refutation sufficiently prompt to correct the evil entailed on individuals by the wide dissemination of the libel or slander. It was evident, indeed, that the Select Committee and those who drew up the Bill were conscious of this difficulty, for there was a clause almost ordering a newspaper to insert a retractation of the libel or slander—the retractation, be it observed, not of what had been spoken, but of the impression of the reporter as to what was spoken, which impression, whether correct or incorrect, had been stereotyped by the newspaper and disseminated among the general public, who were not present at the meeting when the speech was delivered. It should be remembered that to speak slander was an offence; but to repeat it, to retail it in writing or in print, a second and a greater, because a more deliberate, offence. He wished to bear his tribute of praise to the care and intelligence, and the usefulness of the press in this country, and to the manner in which, under circumstances of great difficulty, the conductors of newspapers had avoided the dissemination of mischievous libels and mischievous slanders; but he was convinced that if the press were relieved of this responsibility there would immediately spring up a tendency to deteriorate the character of the press; that there would spring up papers of a low character, as had been properly observed by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, papers of a low character and unrestricted competition—a competition he meant not restricted by the character of the newspapers, which had been so useful to the country; that character largely depended upon the solvency of the proprietors, and had contributed to raise the character of the press in Great Britain to a height that the press had never attained in any other part of the world. The hon. and learned Member for Clare had complained that the course taken by the opponents of the Bill was unfair. He said that he would not enter into a discussion on the principles of the Bill, because the stage was the third reading. [Sir Colman O'Loghlen: Hear, hear!] He had himself undertaken the responsibility of counting the House when the hon. Baronet's Bill came on, not on the second but on the third reading. The circumstances were these:—on entering the House he was told that Bills were passing rapidly without discussion. He saw that there was not a quorum, and as an independent Member he claimed that the House should be counted, and the count proved that there was not a quorum in the House. The hon. Baronet, then, had no right to complain of his preventing the final stage of this Bill being passed on the occasion he had adverted to, when there was not a quorum of the House present. For himself, he could see nothing factious in such a proceeding. As the Select Committee was not competent to alter the principle of the Bill, it would, in his judgment, be an abuse if the House were not to avail itself of the present opportunity of again discussing that principle. He trusted that the House would reject the Bill because it was in direct opposition to the present law of libel, and to the principle on which the press of this country had been hitherto so advantageously regulated by law and conducted. The existing law of libel was framed on those principles which were most likely to secure the real and permanent freedom of the press—it was framed by the late Lord Campbell. Was he, or was he not, a person competent to deal with the subject? In early life Lord Campbell had been in straitened means, and he reported for the press, but by his own talent he rose to the eminent position of being Lord Chancellor and the possessor of a peerage, first by right of his wife, and then in his own right—a peerage now inherited by his son. That noble Lord framed the present law of libel. He would read a short extract from the writings of Lord Campbell for the purpose of showing how completely he was actuated by a sincere attachment to the principles of freedom—the freedom of the individual, the freedom of the press. Lord Campbell was not chimerical enough to suppose that by allowing the law of libel to remain in the hands of the Judges alone freedom would be secured. The old law of libel had stood in that position previous to Lord Campbell's Act; it enjoined on the Judge to state to the Jury whether the matter complained of was libellous or not. Could there be a more complete departure from the Constitutional law of the country than this—that the Judge, without the previous intervention of the Court or of the Jury, should prejudge the very matter which was about to be submitted to the Court? And yet, this was the law that had once existed in this country; and he would show the House that if they passed the present Bill, they were in danger of reverting to that state of the law. Lord Campbell said—

> "I am afraid that the law, as far as it concerns the nature of the writings which may be treated as libellous, must always remain indefinite, and that the effectual protection against publications injurious to private character, or dangerous to the community, and against vexatious and oppressive proceedings, dangerous to the freedom of the press, can only be found in the discrimination and firmness of juries, who may acquit or convict as they think that the intention of the accused was innocent or malicious."

In all cases, if they secured freedom, they must allow the public and the Jury, ever their legitimate representative, to judge what was consistent or inconsistent with their freedom and the freedom of their fellow-subjects. That system had been the Palladium of the freedom of this country; for centuries it had been found effectual, and in this matter, which touched the private character of individuals, the interests of the State, and the freedom of the press, he trusted that the House would pass no Act that would interfere with the main principles of the law of libel and the law of publication. There was great truth in the statement of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, that if we excepted the press from the general principle of the common law of the country there would arise other exceptional legislation, and we might hear of principles such as existed in the Legislature and laws of France and of other countries carried out until the press was deprived of the freedom which, thank God, in England it possessed, and did not abuse. But he wished to point out how this Bill had escaped from the pressure of its vicious principle. The Bill proposed to enact that a report in any newspaper, which was *bonâ fide*, and without actual malice, and printed in the ordinary course of business, should not be liable to action for libel, "without actual malice." But the plea of "not guilty" already denied malice, so that this clause would not change the existing law, but would merely offer as a boon that which was merely an affirmation of an existing right. And what did the second clause contain? A command that the newspaper which published the libel or slander should publish the retractation but with a condition. And what was the condition? It was that newspaper proprietors should be bound to publish the explanation or retractation of the speaker, if the explanation or retractation was not libellous. Therefore, with respect to the retractation or explanation, the Bill was obliged to claim the discretion of the press, of the newspaper proprietors, under penalty not to publish any retractation that was slanderous or libellous, though as to the report it exempted him from the necessity of using any discretion. How did this operate on the individual who was reported to have spoken a libel or slander? It might be very difficult for an individual who had not spoken a libel or slander to prove that he did not speak the libel or the slander attributed to him. This was a danger to which the individual would be exposed, and the restriction upon the publication of his explanation, which was to be at the discretion of the newspaper proprietor, would aggravate the danger to the individual who had spoken. But, after all, were they to incur this danger in order to exempt the newspaper proprietor, in the first place, from all responsibility? He appealed to the Members of the House, as guardians of the freedom of the people of this country, to reject the Bill. If it went to "another place" at this late period of the Session he did not believe that the House of Lords, which contained within its walls several Members who had risen to their present eminence by the same course as Lord Campbell, would endanger the freedom of their fellow-countrymen by sanctioning the vicious principle embodied in this measure. He admitted that some of the subordinate provisions which the hon. Member for Clare had explained were disconnected from the first part of the Bill, relating to the press, and there were among these latter provisions, some which might be advantageous. Yet there was the provision which enabled the Judge, independently of the Jury, to exercise a jurisdiction as to costs, which he thought trenched upon the principle by which the Judges were, under Lord Campbell's Act, forbidden to exercise a personal jurisdiction, independently of the Court, in matters touching libel and slander. There were objectionable provisions, even in the latter part of the Bill, but the one glaring vice of the Bill was contained in the first clause, and he did say this, that it was unfair, that it was unjust, that it was an attempt to take an undue advantage of the press itself, to tender to them the prospect of an exemption, and that an exemption at the expense of the freedom of the subject. It would be easy to frame provisions which would render persons bringing vexatious actions against newspapers liable to the punishment they deserved; but in order to attain that object it was not necessary to adopt a principle so vicious as that contained in the present measure. For these reasons, he, for one, should most cordially support the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets in his just and legitimate opposition to this Bill.

Mr. WHALLEY called attention to the first clause of the Bill, which stated that no proprietor of a newspaper should be liable to a prosecution for reporting proceedings if there was no malice. But a libel might be of serious consequence to an individual, and the mischief of the libel might be accomplished before a retractation could be resorted to. He agreed with the hon. Member for Clare that it was too late now to enter into details with regard to this measure, but he complained of the Government for allowing a question of constitutional law, which agitated the Courts of Law, and affected the liberty of the subject more than anything in the present day, to remain in the hands of an individual Member. There could be no necessity for pressing on the Bill in this Session. There had been no complaints of the existing state of the law on this subject, except from a few members of the press; and the House had no grounds to induce them to take on themselves the duties of a Court of Appeal on this branch of the constitutional law of the country affecting the liberty of the subject, and to overrule the decisions of the Courts of Law—a subject which only a fraction of the House pretended to understand.

Mr. HENLEY said, he did not think he should have said a word on the subject had it not been for the course which the discussion had taken; but having been a member of the Committee he could not avoid saying a few words. His hon. Friend said it was not in the power of the Committee to strike out the vicious principle of the Bill. That was a great mistake. It was open to the Committee to pass the first, or the second, or the third clause of the Bill; and the third clause of the Bill was altered as much as it could possibly be altered, or rather a new clause drawn by the Attorney General was substituted for the third clause. The whole principle of making the speaker liable rather than the reporter was fully discussed, and the Committee decided the point unanimously. It would be idle to endeavour to conceal the fact that in a question of this sort there were conveniences and inconveniences on both sides, and the Committee had to decide on which side the balance lay. In this country public meetings, or rather meetings at which reporters were present, were of everyday occurrence on all sorts of things. Was it or was it not of great advantage to the public to know what took place at these meetings? Take the case stated by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, the case of the railway meetings. Was it or was it not of advantage that the thousands of railway shareholders who were not and could not be present at those meetings should know what took place there? Again, look to the meetings under Local Government Acts. Should the ratepayers not have a fair and just report of what passed between their representatives when engaged in transacting parish business and voting the money of the ratepayers? In all these cases he answered in the affirmative, and proceeded to inquire whether it was just or not that the reporters of such meetings and the proprietor of the newspaper publishing the report should be liable, on account of some remarks which had fallen from a public speaker, to be mulcted not only in damages, but in the costs also, which was of much more importance, considering that the proceedings were in most cases instituted by some professional man solely for the purpose of getting costs on account of a matter which had resulted in damage to no one? Was it just that the man who spoke the libel should be liable to an action rather than the newspaper which reported him? Of course the report should be fair and full in the matter of explanation and denial, and if so the newspaper should be held blameless in his opinion. The speaker who uttered the libel was fully protected by the clause drawn by the Attorney General and adopted by the Committee. If a man in the heat of the moment made assertions which on reflection he would not have made, he was held harmless if he retracted the scandal. Was that a hardship on him? If he had not the honesty and manliness to retract, was it not right that he should be punished? He was aware that in former times spoken and written words were placed in different categories. Now-a-days meetings were taking place every day. Formerly the scandal which Tom uttered to Jack at the corner of the street was not libellous. At present a man going to a meeting to make a speech knew that his words would be taken down and recorded, and he ought to be careful what he said, and ought not to complain if he were afterwards called over the coals by persons supposed to be injured by his remarks. On a balance of conveniences and inconveniences he thought the Bill was on the side of the conveniences, and he would support the measure.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: On the Motion for the second reading of this Bill, I expressed the opinion which I adhere to now, that the hon. and learned Baronet's proposed alteration of the law was entitled to great consideration. I therefore took an active part in the Committee which considered it, and I am bound to say that the Bill is entitled to be read a third time, although I agree with the hon. and learned Baronet in the opinion that in all probability it will not be passed into law this Session. The hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) said it was the duty of the Government, if it approved the hon. and learned Baronet's Bill, to have taken it out of his hands; but how can the Government take in hand all the numerous Bills of the hon. and learned Baronet? It seemed to me that he was perfectly entitled to bring in such a Bill, and I thought it but just to accord him a fair hearing. I formed a favourable opinion of the measure, and did as much as possible to amend it in the Select Committee. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) says it is a most objectionable thing to put the press under exceptional legislation; but surely he is aware that the press is under exceptional legislation already. Has he forgotten the Bill which he, in all probability, assisted in passing in 1843 for the purpose of enabling newspaper publishers to plead in answer to an action for libel that the passage complained of was inserted without malice and without neglect, and this plea should be accompanied by the payment of a sum of money into Court, and by the offer to insert an apology either in the journal which contained the libel, or in another, as the plaintiff might select? [Mr. Newdegate: Is that an apology of the proprietor?] I was only on the point that exceptional legislation on the subject of newspapers exists at present; and the question raised by the Bill under discussion has been mooted before. Lord Campbell introduced a Bill in the House of Lords very much indeed in the form in which this Bill was brought in by the hon. and learned Baronet; and it was discussed to a very considerable extent.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: That Bill kept the newspaper proprietor within the general provisions of the law of libel; this excepts him from them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think I am right in saying that the two Bills are very similar in principle. Lord Campbell tried to define more at length than is attempted in this Bill what meetings should be regarded as public, and which of those a newspaper might report; but he failed, because, as Lord Lyndhurst pointed out, it would be impossible to confine the enactment to those meetings or to do justice if it were so confined. The Select Committee considering this Bill thought a *bonâ fide* report of a meeting called for a lawful purpose, published without malice in the ordinary course of business should be allowed; but I thought that too great a privilege to extend to the press, unless the persons who spoke at the meeting were made answerable for the matter they uttered. Therefore it seemed to me that when any person at a public meeting expresses defamatory matter he should be liable to an action in the event of his refusing to publish an apology when his attention had been called to the libel he had uttered. There is nothing unfair in that. And with reference to the distinction which is set up between slander and libel, that the one is often spoken in heat, but that the other is written intentionally, I apprehend that where a person goes to a meeting which he knows to be of a public character, for the purpose of making a speech which he knows will be reported in the newspapers, it is hardly fair to allow him to say, "I knew all this; I used words reflecting on the character of another person; I decline to make any apology for what I have done, and I say you shant have a right to bring an action against me, although it was circulated throughout the country by the newspapers." It seems to me but fair that he should be made answerable. The principle agreed on by the House when this Bill was read a second time was this, that the person who deliberately utters words reflecting on the character of another should be liable for an action on account of those words, and should be free from such liability only when he had apologized. The hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) says that privilege is taken away by this Bill. I believe that it does nothing of the sort. [Mr. Ayrton: I said exactly the reverse—that the privilege of the speaker was fully maintained.] Every privilege which a person has is preserved by this Bill. The hon. and learned Member has assumed that it applies to ordinary newspapers only, but it applies to other publications. I confess I thought, and I think still, that a larger measure of justice ought to be meted out to the Press, in respect of cases where the publisher of a newspaper accidentally reports something which turns out to be defamatory, especially because there are too many persons ready to pounce down upon a publisher for the purpose of getting damages and costs from him on account of a matter for which he was not in the least to blame. I do not think it fair in discussing a Bill of this sort to say that those who brought it forward did so because the newspapers were urging them to press it through Parliament.

Mr. NEATE said, he thought the Bill good in respect of those of its provisions which increased the responsibility of speakers; but in getting this good by the Bill they were in danger of losing what might turn out to be of much more value—namely, the responsibility of the newspaper. The law worked very well at present; a great many foolish things were said at public meetings which the better class of papers did not publish, and those who spoke those foolish things were no doubt very glad when they found next morning that they had not been reported; and, as a great many mischievous as well as nonsensical remarks were made at meetings, he thought it unwise to diminish the responsibility of those who made it their business to circulate reports of public proceedings.

Question put, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 79; Noes 18: Majority 61.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE BILL (*Lords*).—[Bill 213.]

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. FAWCETT, who had given notice of his intention to move the following Instruction:—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that no new Bishopric be founded under the provisions of this Bill until a sum shall be raised by voluntary subscriptions, which shall provide not only for the stipend of the new Bishop, but shall also be sufficient to provide for all the other expenses of a cathedral establishment"—

inquired of the right hon. Gentleman in the Chair, whether he should be in Order in proposing it?

Mr. SPEAKER said, the course the hon. Member had intended to pursue was not in order, because the Committee had power already to make the alteration in the Bill to which the Instruction pointed. Where a thing could be done voluntarily it should not be done in a mandatory form.

Mr. J. A. SMITH said, he wished to explain that, although when this Bill was under discussion on a former occasion he had used words which had been so interpreted as to cause pain to the Bishop of Adelaide, nothing could have been further from his thoughts than a desire to cause that pain; and he was glad to be able to bear testimony to the admirable manner in which the Bishop of Adelaide discharged the duties of his office.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Schemes may be prepared by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Three new Sees).

Mr. AYRTON proposed to insert the following words:—

"Provided that no such scheme shall be submitted for confirmation to Her Majesty in Council until there shall have been paid or transferred to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners by voluntary gift or bequest, monies, securities, or estates, of which the annual interest, rents, or profits shall be sufficient to pay the annual income of the Bishop and of all other persons to be appointed to any office under such scheme according to the stipulations thereof, and all other charges and expenses of carrying the same into effect."

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER offered no objection to the Amendment: but the wording he thought might be improved if it were made to read—income of the Bishop and of all other persons, "if any."

Amendment, with the suggested additions, *agreed to*.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*.

Clause 2 (Income of new See).

Mr. AYRTON, in proposing to omit this clause, said, that in the case of persons called upon to fulfil the double duties of Bishop and Peer of the realm, there was a necessity for maintaining a certain appearance in London; but a Bishop proposing to confine himself entirely to the local duties of his office had no need of an equally large income. Accordingly, he moved the omission of the clause, rendering it indispensable that the income of the new see should be equal to that of any existing see.

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER said, that this clause was not contained in the Bill as originally introduced by Lord Lyttelton, but was inserted upon a division by a majority of 1, at the instance of Earl Grey, and afterwards affirmed upon Report by a larger majority. The Peers who voted for that clause were induced to do so by a fear lest inequality of incomes among the different episcopal sees might revive the old objectionable practice of translation from one see to the other. He believed, however, that the moral feeling of the country, very different now from what it was in former times, would prevent translations taking place except in cases where these could be plainly justified upon public grounds. Even as matters stood, there were grave inequalities between the incomes of the different Bishops. Yet the present Bishop of Sodor and Man, who had less by £3,000 annually than the majority of English Bishops, had continued in the same see for a great number of years. He allowed full weight to the motives influencing noble Lords in the other House; but he certainly thought it would be an advantage if the Bill were, in this respect, restored to its original shape.

Clause 2 *negatived.*

Clauses 3 and 4 *agreed to* with some verbal Amendments.

Clause 5 (Scheme for new See to define Particulars respecting Boundaries, Patronage, &c.).

Mr. AYRTON said, the clause was incomplete, as it only provided conditionally for the appointment of "a capitular body, minor canons, honorary canons, archdeacons, and other officers for the said diocese." The scheme, whatever its nature, ought to be complete in itself; this was a matter of principle, and therefore he proposed to leave out the words "if need be."

Viscount CRANBORNE felt bound to object to the somewhat extravagant Conservatism of the hon. Member. He could not admit that the existence of deans and chapters was matter of principle in the Church of England. If a dean and chapter were insisted upon in the case of every bishop, they could hardly avoid a somewhat expensive cathedral; and these charges all thrown upon public subscription would tend to prevent or delay the Church of England obtaining those officers who were absolutely requisite for her proper spiritual administration.

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER said, it was in the highest degree undesirable to make necessary the payment of sinecure deans and chapters, and he intended to move an Amendment to Clause 7, which he thought would meet the views of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, and the noble Lord the Member for Stamford. The principle of gratuitous canons and deans, so far as this new arrangement was concerned, was recognized by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets in another Amendment of which he had given notice, referring to the salaries or emoluments, "if any," which they were to receive, and he (Sir Roundell Palmer) intended to move an Amendment to Clause 7, enabling the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to make provision for the residence, if any, and for the salaries or emoluments, if any, of the deans and chapters. The effect of that Amendment would be to recognize the principle which the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets had in view.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE trusted his noble Friend the Member for Stamford would agree to that proposal. It would be simply strangling the Bill, and making it a nullity if private subscriptions were to endow opulent deans and canons. He believed it was essential to keep up the old ecclesiastical framework, but the offices should be allowed to be honorary; and he therefore hoped that the Amendment suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Richmond would be agreed to.

Mr. AYRTON explained that his object was to determine at the outset whether the deans and other officers were to be endowed or not; so that after their appointment they would have no ground for coming forward and contending that revenues ought to be attached to their official positions unless this were distinctly expressed.

Mr. NEATE held that the dean and chapter as now existing constituted an innovation upon the ancient system under which the bishop was master of the diocese. He knew cases in which the bishop had been turned out of his own cathedral by the dean and chapter.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. MONK proposed to add at the end of the clause words to the effect that in any provision for the appointment of a capitular body the *status* and duties of such body should be regulated according to the mode prescribed by the 4th and 5th sections of the 13 and 14 *Vict.*, so far as the same might be applicable to the circumstances of the case. He said that on the formation of the diocese of Manchester, a complete scheme was elaborated, the Act was most carefully considered, and it was desirable that any new dioceses to be formed in this country should be formed on the mode thus provided.

Viscount CRANBORNE said, it was not fair, at a moment's notice, to ask them to adopt the provisions of that Act.

Mr. COLERIDGE said, it was not necessary they should do so. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners had the precedent before them, and if they thought fit to follow it they could do so.

Motion *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (*Congé d'èlire* for new Sees).

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER said, that the Amendment of the clause had rendered it unnecessary, and he therefore proposed its omission.

Clause *omitted.*

Clause 7 (Residence of Deans and Canons).

Sir **ROUNDELL PALMER** proposed to omit the words—

> "Until the dean and canons of any new diocese shall have been completely endowed, according to a scale to be fixed in the said schemes, they shall not be bound to reside at the cathedral,"

and to insert words to the effect that it should be lawful for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in settling any scheme, to make such provision as to them should seem fit concerning the residence to be required from the dean and canons of any new diocese, having regard to the amount of the endowments, if any, leaving it optional to them to provide (in the concluding words of the clause) that the dean should hold an ecclesiastical benefice within the limits of the diocese. This Amendment, he said, would simply declare more effectually the object of the clause as it stood.

Mr. **WHITE** objected to an Amendment of this nature, which opened up so very large a question, being agreed to now. The hon. and learned Gentleman ought to have given notice of the change which he proposed. It would be much better if he would bring up this Amendment on the Report.

Mr. **AYRTON**, who had given notice of an Amendment for striking out the clause, said, his reason for doing so was that it seemed to contemplate that at some future period the deans and canons were to be endowed, and it left the House hereafter to find the endowment as it could. In any Amendment care should be taken that any funds intended for the benefit of the people should not, by any contrivance, be appropriated for the endowment of dignified clergy. If his hon. and learned Friend would take care that the words introduced would not open the door to that abuse, but would secure to the inhabitants of a parish the funds that ought to be applied to their benefit, he should not see any objection to the clause.

Mr. **COLERIDGE** said, the best plan would be to omit the clause altogether. The present position of the capitular bodies was a great scandal. He could understand a collegiate body living together for the common pursuit of a common object; but nothing could be more inefficient for its purpose than the present mode of regulating the residence of deans and chapters. What could be the common feelings of persons who never met together, and simply resided in a place for a set time? The hon. and learned Member for Richmond dropped a word which, to his mind, was a very fatal word for a Member of the Church of England—he spoke of "sinecure canons.' The existing state of things as to sinecures was a scandal, and he did not wish to see any more sinecure canons created. If the canons had nothing to do why did they exist? It seemed to him that, under the 5th Clause there was abundant power to regulate generally the performance of Divine service, and the conditions of the existence of the titular authorities. It would be a bad thing to pass a clause which said that the present regulation of residence was the sort of thing that was satisfactory, and which implied that the term of residence was to be proportionate to the amount of stipend paid, and he thought it would be better on general grounds to omit the 7th Clause altogether.

Mr. **GLADSTONE** said, that the purpose of the clause was to obviate and prevent just that which was apprehended by the hon. and learned Member for Exeter; it was to provide against deans and canons falling into the present stereotyped condition of the law with respect to residence, and to enable the Commissioners to do that which was obviously desirable—namely, to vary and depart from the present condition of things. He therefore hoped the hon. and learned Member for Exeter would take a different view of it.

Mr. **BERESFORD HOPE** said, the dean and chapter were to elect the Bishop, but who were to elect the dean and chapter? It would be desirable for the hon. and learned Member for Richmond to consider this matter, and bring up an amended clause on the Report which would provide for it. He suggested, further, that the dean, in the first instance should be appointed by the Crown, and the canons by the Bishop of the diocese out of which the new diocese was to be carved. Subsequently the future deans and canons should be appointed by the new Bishop of the new diocese. There was ample precedent for that course. Many of the English cathedrals had canons appointed by the Bishops, and in the four Welsh bishoprics the deans were also in the patronage of their respective Bishops.

Mr. **BARROW** said, rural deans would make good capitular bodies without the necessity for residence.

MR. AYRTON said, the dean and chapter would be appointed in the manner prescribed by the scheme, and would proceed to elect their Bishop.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, the 5th clause enabled the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to provide for the appointment of the titular officers in the first instance, so that there would be no difficulty on that point. With regard to what had been said by the hon. and learned Member for Exeter, his objections were sound and solid objections to the present law, and applicable to the present capitular bodies, but they did not touch the present Bill in any way.

MR. SERJEANT GASELEE said, the hon. and learned Member for Richmond had given way too much, and the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets had made confusion worse confounded. The best plan was to let a Bishop be appointed if there were the money, and to strike out all the nonsense about the dean and chapter.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, that when the hon. and learned Member for Richmond regarded a clause as clear and satisfactory, it might be taken for granted that it was so. He quite agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Exeter that recent legislation had greatly impaired the utility of their old cathedral institutions, but he did not believe that the existing canons were all sinecurists.

MR. COLERIDGE said, he only remarked that the hon. and learned Member for Richmond dropped the word "sinecure."

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, he only used the word in its legal sense, sinecure benefices being those without the cure of souls.

MR. HIBBERT thought it would be better that the deans should hold benefices within the limits of particular cities.

Amendment *agreed to*.

Clause *agreed to*.

Clause 8 (Real and Personal Estate to vest in Bishop upon his Election).

MR. AYRTON moved to insert after the word "see," the words—

> "Except any capital monies or securities of which the interest may be payable to the Bishop, and which shall be held in trust for him and his successors by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, subject to the directions, if any, of the donors thereof."

Words *added*.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*.

Mr. Barrow

Clause 9 (Number of Bishops sitting in Parliament not to be increased, 10 and 11 *Vict.* c. 108.).

MR. AYRTON moved the omission of this clause. He thought it extremely undesirable that these new Bishops should have the right under any circumstances of sitting in the House of Lords. By giving them that privilege they would be placed in a false position—a position which, with the endowments they would probably possess, would be found irksome and burdensome, while their dioceses would be deprived to a great extent of their care and attention.

MR. BARROW supported the clause. The Bishops had now ceased to sit by tenure, their property being subjected to the control of the same Commission under whose management that of the new Bishops was to be placed.

MR. GLADSTONE wished to join in the appeal made by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets. To assent to the clause would render the position of the Bishops having seats in the House of Lords very anomalous. We had assented in principle to the creation of great ecclesiastical officers, whose temporal circumstances would in all probability be such that to impose upon them the duty of sitting in the House of Lords would be to impose upon them the burden of sitting in the House of Lords. It would be to call upon them to assume a rank, and to discharge the social duties connected with that rank, to which their temporal means would be quite inadequate. It was to the fact of poor bishoprics such as those of Exeter and Oxford, which in former times did not exceed £1,500 a year, being connected with seats in the House of Lords, that the objectionable system of translation had grown up.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, that when the Bishop of Sodor and Man had no seat in the House of Lords it could not be contended that the proposal introduced a novelty. If we established new Bishops for ecclesiastical purposes alone, without connecting them with Parliamentary duties, we should get rid of the objections to any future increase of bishoprics, which would inevitably recur, if every such measure must involve a re-consideration and re-settlement of the title of the Spiritual Peers to their seats in Parliament. Having charge of the Bill, he should have felt bound to support the retention of the clause had there been any material differences of opinion in the Committee. As, however, it appeared to be the general feeling that the clause should be omitted he should not raise his voice in its support.

Sir WILLIAM HEATHCOTE said, the effect of this Bill, in connection with the existing law, would be to exclude four Bishops at a time from seats in the House of Lords, thus making an approach to the system of rotation adopted in the case of the Irish Church. He therefore did not see his way so clearly as his right hon. Friend the Member for South Lancashire; but, with the precedent of Sodor and Man before them, he saw no reason to apprehend evil consequences.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he would have been inclined to support the retention of the clause if his hon. and learned Friend had insisted upon its being retained. Still, he was desirous that the unanimity with which the Bill was received should be undisturbed, and he should not oppose the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets. He might, perhaps, hope from the unanimity which had marked the progress of the Bill that the same absence of political considerations would attend the appointment of these new Bishops, and that they would be selected solely on account of their fitness for the duties.

Mr. KINNAIRD anticipated great benefit to the Church from the Bill.

Clause *struck out.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

Mr. HADFIELD moved the insertion of the following clause:—

> "No Bishop hereby authorized shall, as such Bishop, be liable or entitled to be summoned to attend in Parliament, or to sit therein."

Clause *negatived.*

Mr. HENLEY moved the following clause:—

> "And whereas it is expedient that assistance should be provided for Bishops who may be disabled by old age or other infirmity, and that for this purpose facilities should be given for the more ready and convenient application of an Act passed in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of King Henry the Eighth, chapter fourteen, intituled 'An Act for nomination of Suffragans and Consecration of them,' which Act is still in force: Be it Enacted, That so much of that Act be and is hereby repealed, as relates to territorial titles to be taken from certain towns in England, as episcopal sees for such suffragans, and that any suffragan who may be henceforth nominated and consecrated under that Act, be called and styled Suffragan Bishop, or Coadjutor, without any such territorial title; and that in case of mental decay and failure, duly certified, of a Bishop of a diocese: Be it Enacted, That the Archbishop of the province in which the diocese is situate, be and hereby is empowered to act on his behalf, and to provide a Suffragan or Coadjutor for the said Bishop according to the terms of the said Act, as modified in the manner hereinbefore mentioned."

The law on the subject was in a most disgraceful state, and the Report of the Committee of the Upper House of Convocation was a sufficient justification for his endeavouring to amend the present Bill by such a clause as he proposed.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR objected to the clause on the ground that there was already a remedy existing, and which had been applied hitherto without difficulty—namely, by passing a short Act of Parliament. If the Bishop died, and the Suffragan succeeded as a matter of course, this clause would give a great increase of power to the episcopate, and if the Suffragan was not necessarily to succeed to the see, the clause would be open to the objection that it would largely increase the number of Bishops in the anomalous position of being without dioceses.

Mr. AYRTON asked how these suffragan Bishops were to be remunerated under this clause. It would be necessary on adopting this clause to pass another directing what portion of the income of the Bishop should be given to the person appointed as Suffragan to discharge the Bishop's duties. He considered that legislation was necessary with regard to the mode of paying Archbishops, Bishops, and clergymen. When they could not do their duties it was not right that they should, as at present, receive the full emoluments of their offices. The clause opened a very wide question which he thought had better be dealt with next Session in a measure dealing with the whole question of superanuation in the Church.

Mr. GLADSTONE admitted that the right hon. Gentleman had raised a question of considerable interest and importance, but thought they were hardly in a position at present to come to a decision on the clause. Means should be afforded to remunerate the Suffragan; but it was not easy at a moment to decide how the provision should be made. He advised his right hon. Friend not to press the clause, because, although there was no objection to make provision for the payment of the suffragan Bishops in the case referred to, they were not at once prepared to adopt the proposal submitted to them.

Mr. HENLEY said, that the Act of

Henry VIII. provided that the Archbishop should submit the names of the ecclesiastics of the Crown, and that the Crown should nominate one of them. No arbitrary power of appointing suffragans would therefore be given by the clause.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE admitted, that the present state of superannuation in the Church was a scandal, and he should like to see a remedy applied. What they wanted was to have a person to discharge the episcopal duties in the diocese of an incapacitated Bishop. No person suggested that there was any evil in the proposed remedy, and if they agreed to the clause there was nothing to prevent them from making a better arrangement in a future year.

MR. HENRY SEYMOUR remarked, that the adoption of the clause would increase the power of the Bishops, and he was not surprised that the Upper House of Convocation was in favour of it.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER urged his right hon. Friend not to press the clause, because it was not germane to the present measure. The question was raised in the House of Lords, but the proposition met with considerable opposition, and was rejected.

Clause *negatived.*

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER moved, in consequence of the rejection of the 9th Clause, the addition of a clause to the effect that the number of Bishops in the House of Lords should not be increased by virtue of the operation of this Act.

Clause *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered upon *Friday,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 307.]

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, August 8, 1867.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Libel * (313); Militia Reserve * (314); Public Works (Ireland) * (315); Railways (Ireland) * (316).

Second Reading—Church Rates Abolition (256), *negatived;* Admiralty Court (Ireland) * (273); Guarantee of Government Officers * (297); Public Health (Scotland) * (306); Sewage * (285).

Committee—Banns of Matrimony (216 & 311); Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal* (265 & 312); Militia Pay *; Indemnity * (274); Bank Post Bills (Ireland) * (275); Customs Revenue * (284); Inland Revenue * (287); Dominica Loan * (288).

Report — Barrack Lane, Windsor (Rights of Way) * (295); District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland) * (272); Militia Pay *; Indemnity * (274); Bank Post Bills (Ireland) * (275); Customs Revenue * (284); Inland Revenue * (287); Dominica Loan * (288).

Third Reading—Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) * (294); Weights and Measures (Dublin)* (266); Dublin Metropolitan Police * (267).

CHURCH RATES ABOLITION BILL.

(No. 256.) (*The Earl of Morley.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF MORLEY, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, he desired, in the first place, to disclaim any feeling of hostility towards the Church of England on the part of its promoters, or any desire for a separation of Church and State. However strongly attached they might be themselves to the doctrines and principles of the Established Church, they felt strongly that those who did not share their religious convictions ought not to be called upon to pay for the maintenance of the fabrics of a Church to which they did not belong. He would not discuss the various substitutes for church rates which had been proposed without success at different times; but it seemed to be very generally admitted that the church rate system as it now stood was not in a satisfactory position. Three distinct schemes on this subject were brought forward last year; one to exempt from the payment of church rates all who were willing to sign a declaration that they were Nonconformists; another proposed to excuse from payment those who signed a declaration that they wished to be relieved from payment; and finally, a measure for settling this long-vexed question was brought in by Mr. Gladstone, entitled the Compulsory Church Rates Abolition Bill. It sought, in the first place, to abolish all compulsory church rates whatever; secondly, to preserve the existing machinery for the purpose of collecting voluntary church rates; and thirdly, to preclude all persons who did not pay church rates from taking any part in the management of church affairs. That scheme was accepted as a compromise by the advocates of church rate abolition in the House of Commons last year, and passed through that House without a division; but, owing to the lateness of the

Session, it fell through. This Session a Bill embodying the main provisions of Mr. Gladstone's measure had been introduced into the other House, had passed through all its stages, and was the Bill now before their Lordships. He could not but feel that some compromise on that subject was still possible; and, if their Lordships would give a second reading to that measure, he believed its promoters would be glad to accept any compromise which might be proposed in Committee, provided such compromise did not violate the principle on which they took their stand, and would satisfy, in a fair and equitable manner, the claims of both Churchmen and Dissenters. He thought this was a peculiarly desirable time at which to settle this question. There could hardly be any doubt that when the new Reform Bill came into operation a large number of Dissenters would get into Parliament, and he therefore thought it would be wise, before that occurred, to have this fruitful source of contention between Nonconformists and the Church Establishment removed by a fair and equitable adjustment. No doubt, he might be told that in the present state of things there was no grievance at all to complain of in this matter — that the majority of the parishioners had a right by their acts to bind the minority — that there was no good reason for altering a system which had existed from time immemorial. No doubt, there was no grievance when church rates were first instituted; for then there was but one religion in the country, and Church and State were but different appellations of the same body. But, as soon as the State acknowledged the right of dissent from the Established Church, it became unjust to compel men to contribute towards the maintenance of a Church whose doctrines and principles they disapproved. This impost, in point of fact, was a grievance which created a great deal of ill-feeling in parishes where the Dissenters were in a minority. He had himself presented a Petition from persons who had undergone much suffering on account of their conscientious scruples against paying church rates. It would, perhaps, be said that an interference with church rates was an interference with property, and that they might on the same principle take away tithes. But there was no analogy between the two things. Tithe was a charge upon the land determined and specific, and fluctuating only with the price of corn; whereas church rates were a charge upon persons and entirely dependent on the will of the majority of a parish. Moreover, the opponents of the Bill almost universally allowed that Dissenters ought, at any rate, to be exempted from that portion of church rates which went for the maintenance of the ceremonial of the Church; and, in exempting them from any part of the rate, the ground was utterly cut from under the feet of the defenders of that impost, and it became impossible to uphold church rates as property at all. He might be told that, if church rates were abolished, our churches would be allowed to go out of repair; but he could hardly believe this would be the fact; it seemed to him very improbable that the body composed of by far the great majority of the nation, and including among its adherents the most wealthy and influential classes, would, with their very strong feeling on the subject, suffer their places of worship to fall into decay. Let them look at the vast number of parishes, especially in the large towns, where church rates were no longer collected. There a great stimulus had been given to voluntary effort, while a feeling of irritation had been removed. In 9,100 parishes in which church rates were levied only £243,000 was, at present, collected; and out of that sum £135,000 was expended on the ceremonial of the Church, and the residue, £40,000, was devoted to ordinary, and £60,000 to extraordinary, repairs; and he could not think it was wise in the Church to incur so much ill-will for the sake of so small a sum. The last argument they would hear, no doubt, would be "the Church in danger." Now, he, on the contrary, believed that the abolition of this impost would strengthen the Established Church, and render her position more secure, by making it less invidious. He did not believe that the Dissenters as a body were hostile to the Church, and if this grievance were taken away he believed they would not desire to interfere in the management of the affairs of the Church, nor be animated by any feeling of enmity towards it. This Bill would take away a mere contingent right of taxation, the loss of which he was convinced would not endanger an institution which commanded the respect, the admiration, and the support, not only of those who belonged to it, but of the entire nation. He would again urge upon their Lordships the great importance of settling a question which had caused so much controversy. He would only say in conclusion that, if their Lordships should think fit to give this Bill a second reading, its promoters would be willing to accept any compromise in the clauses which would not violate the principle of the Bill — that church rates should no longer be compulsory.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Morley.*)

LORD DELAMERE, in moving the Amendment of which he had given notice, that the Bill be read a second time that day three months, said that the simple ground on which he asked their Lordships to reject this Bill was that it proposed to perpetrate an act of signal and manifest injustice. It had been an ancient custom, exercised from time immemorial, for the ratepayers to impose a rate upon themselves for the repairs of the parish church, and the expenses of Divine service. The rate was levied at a meeting of the parishioners who were called expressly to decide whether a rate should be levied or not. If they decided that no rate should be imposed, that decision was conclusive. There was no very great hardship in this, because the same principle lay at the foundation of every other institution of the country—government by a majority. The Bill proposed to do away with church rates absolutely, entirely, and unconditionally, and without providing any equivalent. If so, a strong case must be made out for the abolition of church rates. The arguments against church rates might be summed up in a few words. It was said that they caused great bitterness and heartburning, and that there were difficulties in their collection, and the friends of the Church were asked why they made such a fuss about a miserable sum of £270,000, and whether the existence of the Church of England depended upon the levying of this impost; and they were asked, whether it was not a libel upon Churchmen to suppose that, for want of this sum, they would allow the churches to sink into decay? But it must be remembered that there was in this country a Church established by law, and it was now proposed to sweep away the only provision that existed by law for the repair of the churches and for some other ecclesiastical purposes. It was no reason, because so much had been done voluntarily for enlarging the action of the Church, that they should sweep away the sole and very inadequate provision that existed by law for the repair of parish churches. They were told by those who used this argument that if they would only do away with compulsory payment of church rates a new Utopia and a new era of brotherly love would be inaugurated; but what did the abolition of compulsory church rates, when translated into other words, really mean? It meant that the friends of the Church might have the privilege of going round the parish with the begging-box, to extort such alms as they could from those who were willing to give, and that the benefit of the funds should then be equally shared both by those who paid and those who refused to pay. Was that fair? There were two classes of Dissenters—the religious and conscientious Dissenters, whom he respected, and the political Dissenters, for whom he did not feel an equal degree of respect. The question of relieving the Dissenters from their liability had been raised more than once. Lord Althorp proposed to make the maintenance of the fabric of the parish churches a charge upon the Consolidated Fund; but the Dissenters declared that to be an insult, and said they should then pay church rates in the tax they paid on every pound of tea. They proposed, in fact, to use everything and pay for nothing. Was it fair that a man should say, "I will have my seat in my parish church" and yet pay nothing for the maintenance of Divine service? The Church of England was a national institution, and it belonged to every human being in the country; but, if so, why should not every one contribute towards its maintenance? Every other institution of the country was supported by taxation imposed by the Government of the majority. A country gentleman in Cornwall might never come to London; yet he had to contribute towards the cost of the National Gallery, the British Museum, "the Brompton Boilers," and the Parks of London. A Quaker, although he disputed the lawfulness of war, was bound to pay his share of the expense of the army and navy, the repair of ships, and the manufacture of Armstrong guns and shells. He could not conceive, therefore, on what principle Dissenters should be relieved from contributing towards the expense of the Church. In the event of the Bill passing some awkward questions must arise both in Ireland and Scotland. The support of the Established Church in Scotland was charged upon the land. He was not prepared to show from the statistics the amount of land in Scotland held by noblemen and gentlemen who were not members of the Established Church of that country; but if this measure were extended to Scotland, the Presbyterian Church, which was the Established Church of Scotland, would find itself in a very different position from that which it now occupied. They might depend upon it that if the total and unconditional abolition of all measures for the support of the Church once passed the two Houses of Parliament it would be nonsense to suppose that they would retain for Scotland what had been abolished for England. He would treat the conscientious Dissenter as he would treat his opposite extreme, the conscientious Ritualist, with the largest possible measure of Christian charity and toleration. Real conscientious difference in religious opinion cannot be too tenderly treated—

> "What's amiss
> "Let it be gently touched, when we debate
> Our trivial difference loud, we do commit
> Murder in healing wounds."

He was quite alive to the inconveniences and disadvantages attendant upon church rates, and he thought that those who conscientiously dissented from the Church should receive the largest measure of Christian toleration. He should cordially support, therefore, any Bill which met the objections of the conscientious Dissenter without committing a manifest injustice on Churchmen; but the present Bill was not one of that character. As was urged last year by a right hon. Friend of his (Mr. Gladstone), whom all would admit to be one of the most distinguished men of the age—

> "That persons who did not think fit to take part in this process of supporting the Church services and the churchyard by a voluntary rate, should likewise be excluded from taking part in any proceedings relating to the voluntary rate. —[3 *Hansard*, clxxxiii. 622.]

These were good words and wise words. I trust your Lordships will give them the weigght they deserve. I will not mar their effect by adding any more words of my own. It behoved their Lordships to hesitate before they swept away a time-honoured custom, without providing any substitute or equivalent, and before they imposed upon one portion of our countrymen the burden of supporting an institution in the benefits of which all shared.

An Amendment *moved* to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months.")—(*The Lord Delamere.*)

Lord ST. LEONARDS said, it was his intention to support the Amendment, for he objected to the removal of the legal obligation which now rested on all parishioners to maintain the fabric and services of the church. They should bear in mind that church rates were originally a charge on the land. He could not understand why there should be such a desire to get rid of the charge of church rates, and was at a loss to perceive where the great hardship could be, when it was in the power of the majority of the parishioners to impose or reject them. Was it desirable that they should get rid of the present legal obligation, and should trust to the voluntary system, which was necessarily opposed to the principle of an Established Church? At present the rich were bound to contribute to the necessities of the poor in providing church accommodation? but if this Bill were passed an entire change would be introduced, and a benevolence or dole would be exchanged for that which was now a legal obligation. A poor man now had a right to use the church, and was entitled to accommodation there without paying a shilling towards the expenses; but under the new system the poor man's worship would depend upon the benevolence of the rich. The principle of benevolences might operate for a while, but probably not very long. Before long the poor worshipper might be called upon to pay towards the repairs of the fabric in which he worshipped. The effect of the plan would be, in effect, to relieve the rich man at the expense of the poor. It seemed to him extraordinary that while Parliament were giving to the poorer classes the highest rights of citizenship they should at the same moment take from them the right of public worship without cost which they had enjoyed from time immemorial. Why should a legal regulation be turned into a mere voluntary obligation? At present, after a church rate had been proposed, the question came before the vestry, who had an estimate placed before them as to the money necessary to be applied, and who had the right of fixing on the amount. If church rates should be abolished what security had they that the funds necessary for maintaining the fabric of the church would be provided by voluntary subscriptions? It might perhaps be said that there would still be a moral obligation on the rich to contribute to the expenses of the church, and that in many parishes compulsory rates had been abandoned; but it must be remembered that the legal obligation acted as a spur and an inducement for persons to subscribe, and he doubted whether there would be equal liberality if it were removed. At no former period of our history, moreover, had the people been so well housed, and this was clearly not a time when the maintenance of the House of God should be neglected. In regard to Dissenters, he was prepared to relieve them, as far as practicable, from church rates; but when they come forward and demanded, not only to be relieved themselves, but require Churchmen to be discharged from the obligation to which they desire to remain liable, he could not too strongly express his surprise at so bold a step, or his determination to oppose it.

EARL RUSSELL, who was indistinctly heard, said, that this was a question upon which it might fairly be expected that the Government should express their opinion. It appeared to him that in anything in which the State had a paramount interest, anything which was necessary for the safety and welfare of the community, then it was fit that any objections, whether of a religious or temporal character, should give way to that necessity. Such a reply as that would be a proper one to make to any member of the Society of Friends who objected to contribute to the support of the army and navy; but when it came to a question whether he should be compelled to pay for the repairs of the fabrics of the Church, the matter was very different. Nobody could say that it was necessary to collect church rates in the same sense that it was necessary to collect taxes for the maintenance of the army and navy. But, more than that—there was on the part of the Dissenters, in his opinion, a grievance of a very practical kind. They said that they were allowed by the law to have their own chapels, that they maintained all the buildings which were necessary for the purposes of their religious worship, and paid their own ministers, and therefore it could not be right that a Church which was much more wealthy should impose rates upon them in order to maintain its fabrics. That appeared to him a fair objection, and it was a question whether it was not a matter of large and liberal expediency—he did not say of right—to relieve Dissenters from the burden. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Delamere) had quoted what was said by Mr. Gladstone last year upon this subject. He (Earl Russell) entirely agreed with that sentiment of Mr. Gladstone, which was to this effect—that it would not be fair or just, when Churchmen were ready to repair their own churches, and raise the funds necessary for public worship, for Dissenters to interfere with them in any way in the application of those funds. It would not be fair, in the application of money raised by a voluntary rate, that any person should vote with regard to its application unless he was a subscriber and paid his money. He remembered what a Member of the present Government, Lord John Manners, described as having taken place in a parish with which he was acquainted, where all the parishioners paid their money, and the Dissenters afterwards came down, appointed churchwardens of their own, and overruled the Churchmen. It appeared to him that if the Government were to give any countenance to it, such a compromise as that which had indicated might be adopted, and the effect would be to relieve Dissenters and put an end to a great deal of ill-feeling. Nothing was, in his opinion, more disagreeable than to hear of persons being put into prison for non-payment of church rates. He remembered a case in which he was so much moved by the attendant circumstances, that he himself paid the whole amount of the rate, and the cost of the law proceedings, in order to get a man out of prison. They had been told very lately that a Member of the Government had complained very much of the Opposition, on the ground that they had endeavoured to keep in their own hands a monopoly of Liberalism. He must say that they (the Opposition) had no monopoly of the kind, and, in fact, they had been lately surpassed in the direction of Liberalism by the measure which Her Majesty's Ministers had introduced. But he knew no question upon which the Liberal party were so unanimous as on the propriety of abolishing church rates; but they certainly could not expect to get rid of the mischief which was now complained of unless the party opposite showed their liberality not only by word, but by deed. If this Bill were rejected, he hoped that some such compromise as Mr. Gladstone had indicated would be adopted in a future Session.

THE EARL OF HARROWBY said, he could not accept the compromise of which the noble Earl (Earl Russell) approved, because its effect might be to put the entire management of parochial affairs into the hands of persons of extreme opinions, and to oust those who differed from them.

He urged the Government not hastily to pledge themselves to any particular mode of dealing with the question, though he joined also with those who expressed a hope that the Government would take this subject into their serious consideration with a view to a settlement. He should oppose the second reading of this Bill.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, he would not go into the various arguments against the abolition of church rates, because they had been worn threadbare. Since, however, the question of compromise had been raised, he wished to state, on behalf of the Church, that Churchmen were willing to entertain a settlement of this question by compromise; but they had never been offered terms which they could possibly accept. There was a point upon which the noble and learned Lord (Lord St. Leonards) had touched—namely, the rights of the poor. He (the Archbishop of Canterbury) unequivocally asserted that the right of the poor man to a seat in church would cease with the abolition of church rates, for his privilege of free-sitting would be thereby destroyed. He hoped that that consideration alone would induce their Lordships to hesitate in passing this Bill. It was sometimes said that Churchmen were afraid that the Church would be in danger if church rates were abolished. New he did not think that in that case the Church was in any danger. The Church of Christ was founded upon a rock and nothing could overthrow it; but the Establishment would be in considerable danger. The opponents of church rates would follow up that question immediately by depriving the possessors of their tithes, and by separating Church and State; therefore those who believed the union of Church and State to be for the benefit of the country should be very shy of abolishing church rates.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, the noble Earl (the Earl of Morley) who moved the second reading of the Bill in a very conciliatory and becoming manner, intimated that during the progress of the Bill through Committee it might be so amended as simply to do away with the compulsory character of church rates, leaving the machinery of collection in force. But the noble Earl must, indeed, be sanguine to suppose that at this period of the Session it would be possible so to alter a Bill that had come up from the other House for the sole purpose of abolishing church rates unconditionally. Their Lordships would remember that when the Bill was in the other House of Parliament it was intimated that Amendments would be introduced calculated to promote a compromise; nevertheless, the Bill had passed through that House, and had been sent up to their Lordships a bare and simple proposition for the abolition of church rates. It was not to be denied that certain evils arose out of the existing system. There were instances — usually narrated in as offensive a manner as possible — in which poor men were sued for small sums, and sometimes imprisoned for the non-payment of the large expenses attending the legal proceedings. These were cases which every one regretted and which ought not to occur. But it was not right to argue the general merits of a great question like this upon exceptional facts. He should welcome any remedy for cases of oppression; but their Lordships must consider the real object of the promoters of this measure. The noble Earl opposite (Earl Russell), who had made a speech in support of the abolition of church rates, was not always of his present opinion; for he (the Duke of Marlborough) remembered the noble Earl making a speech in favour of church rates, in which he said that it was not the part of a wise general, if he intended to defend a citadel, to surrender one of its outworks. It was precisely for that reason that their Lordships should hesitate to pass this Bill. In the inquiries of 1859 and 1860 some leading Nonconformists did not conceal that their object was not confined to church rates; that church rates afforded a convenient battle-ground; but that the question was really one of Establishment or no Establishment. This had been perfectly illustrated by the history of the question, for up to 1862 no fewer than twenty-six measures had been proposed for the settlement of this *vexata questio*, and the subject had been debated in Parliament about 100 times. During this time the Church had offered the hand of reconciliation, and the ingenuity of legislators had been taxed to devise a compromise. Why had all these compromises failed? Because the abolition of church rates was only one of a series of measures which were to culminate in the abolition of the Establishment. It was useless to talk of compromise—the object of these gentlemen was not compromise—it was complete victory they desired—as a first step to the abolition of the Establishment.

Mr. Gilpin, on one occasion, said in the other House that the difference between the Dissenters and the Church was, that the latter would only accept supremacy, but the Dissenters wanted equality. Now, he denied that Churchmen claimed supremacy—they only wanted to maintain the Church in her present constitutional position towards the State, and none of their attempts at a compromise had been met in a fair and liberal spirit. Under these circumstances it was impossible to say what would be the action of the Government. Seeing that measure after measure had been brought forward without any practical result having been arrived at, the encouragement to the Government to introduce another was, it must be admitted, very slight. The subject was, one, however, with respect to which, as vitally affecting the interests of the Church, the Government must feel anxious, and he was sure that if any means of coming to an amicable settlement could be devised—if each party would surrender something of their extreme claims—they would deem it not only a duty but a privilege to be the agents accomplishing so desirable an object. They were opposed to the present Bill on the ground that it proposed an absolute and unconditional abolition of church rates, and not only did away with the compulsory power of levying them, but with that ancient machinery which was the special right of the Established Church. The Government, under those circumstances, had no alternative open to them but to support the Amendment of his noble Friend behind him.

The Bishop of OXFORD said, he believed it was the earnest desire of every one who occupied a seat on the right reverend Bench to see such a compromise as that which the noble Duke had just described effected. If a measure of that nature should be introduced, the Bishops would give to it the fairest and fullest consideration. The idea of accepting the present Bill, however, as a compromise was one which could hardly be suggested without exciting a smile. It was, in fact, the simplest proposition in the world to preclude anything like a compromise from being carried out. It was like hanging a man, cutting down his dead body, and then setting about discovering the best way of making a compromise for his life. If a compromise were really desired by persons who took opposite views on the question, then their Lordships must begin by refusing to assent to the second reading of the measure before them. It was all very well to say that the sum involved in the issue was a small one; it no doubt was so in one sense. It was small as compared with the whole wealth of the Church of England; but it could not be regarded in that light as connected with the case of many of the rural parishes throughout the country which were able to borrow money on the security of the rates, to be repaid during a period of thirty years, and by that means restore church after church in districts where there was no resident landed proprietor, and where, if those borrowing powers did not exist, there would be no chance of the churches being restored at all. The sum raised annually by church rates was about £300,000, and if capitalized, it would amount to £9,000,000. Now, in point of fact, the result of this proposition would be to surrender the large sum to the owners of land. He, for one, objected to seeing that money swept way in the summary manner proposed by the Bill; while, at the same time, he and his right rev. Brethren around him were anxious to see every ground of ill-will between the members of the Establishment and those who unhappily differed from them removed. If the same hearty desire existed on the other side of the question, it would not, he believed, be difficult to effect a compromise.

Lord TAUNTON expressed his intention to vote for the second reading of the Bill, unless some more distinct pledge were given on the part of the Government that it was their intention to deal with the subject at an early period. But then he thought that in Committee their Lordships should propose clauses which should open up the way to a compromise. The matter appeared to him to be a very urgent and serious one; for the time would come when the great institutions of this country would be passed under review, and when those which did not recommend themselves to the reason of the public would be liable to attack. The Established Church, with her large revenues, could not expect to escape criticism, and it was, therefore, of the utmost importance that her defenders should place her on the best possible footing, in order that they might the more effectually resist the efforts of those by whom they might be assailed. Speaking for himself, he hoped to see the time when the Protestant Church of England would be strengthened by the addition of the various classes of Dissenters who were now without her pale.

The Earl of ROMNEY said, he could not conceive it possible that their Lordships should be called upon on the 8th of August to give this Bill a second reading, and to frame clauses of compromise in Committee, when it was expected that Parliament would be prorogued in a week or ten days. His own experience was that the conscientious Dissenter paid his church rates. Nine-tenths of those who objected to the payment of the charge on conscientious grounds, he might add, were tenants, and a deduction was always made from the rent which they paid. He did not see why in England the law should not be assimilated to that which prevailed in Scotland, and the rate made a charge on the land in the same way. If that were done, many of the religious scruples to the payment of the charge which now existed would be obviated.

On Question, That ("now") stand Part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 24; Not-Contents 82: Majority 58.

CONTENTS.

Townshend, M.

Abingdon, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cowper, E.
Granville, E.
Morley, E. [*Teller.*]
Russell, E.

Leinster, V. (*D. Leinster.*)

Belper, L.
Camoys, L.
Charlemont, L. (*E. Charlemont.*)
Churchill, L.
Congleton, L.
Dunfermline, L.
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Houghton, L.
Londesborough, L.
Lyveden, L.
Mostyn, L.
Romilly, L.
Seaton, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stratheden, L.
Taunton, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archbp.
Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Abercorn, M.
Bath, M.
Bristol, M.
Exeter, M.
Salisbury, M.
Westmeath, M.

Abergavenny, E.
Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Bradford, E.
Brooke and Warwick, E.
Cadogan, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Grey, E.
Haddington, E.
Harrowby, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lucan, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Mansfield, E.
Nelson, E. [*Teller.*]
Powis, E.
Romney, E.
Selkirk, E.
Shaftesbury, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Tankerville, E.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, E.

De Vesci, V.
Eversley, V.
Hawarden, V.
Melville, V.
Stratford de Redcliffe, V.

Chester, Bp.
Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Ossory, &c., Bp.
Oxford, Bp.
Peterborough, Bp.
Salisbury, Bp.

Bagot, L.
Boston, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Churston, L.
Clinton, L.
Colonsay, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L. [*Teller.*]
Denman, L.
De Ros, L.
Dunsandle and Clanconal, L.
Egerton, L.
Foxford, L. (*E. Limerick.*)
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Grantley, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Hylton, L.
Lovel and Holland, L. (*E. Egmont.*)
Lyttelton, L.
Northwick, L.
Penrhyn, L.
Rayleigh, L.
Redesdale, L.
Sherborne, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Sondes, L.
Templemore, L.
Tenterden, L.
Thurlow, L.
Vernon, L.
Wynford, L.

Resolved in the *Negative*; and Bill to be read 2ª *this Day Three Months.*

BANNS OF MATRIMONY BILL.

(*The Lord Houghton.*)

COMMITTEE. (No. 216.)

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clause 1 (Irregularity in Time of publishing Banns not to affect Marriages already solemnized).

The Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL said, he had presented Petitions from several of the clergy of his diocese against this measure. This clause contained an interpretation of the Act which was recited in the Preamble of the Bill, and which enacted—

> "That all Banns of Marriage shall be published upon Three Sundays preceding the Solemnization of Marriage, during the Time of Morning Service, or Evening Service (if there be no Morning Service), immediately after the Second Lesson."

Now the question was, whether "immediately after the Second Lesson" applied to the Morning Service or only to the Evening Service? It might be said that this was a small question, and asked why it should disturb the minds of clergymen? But it was not a small matter, for, as the Petitioners urged, clergymen were bound by solemn vows to adhere to the Book of Common Prayer, as appended to the Act of Uniformity. It might be asked whether this Bill was not putting an interpretation on the Act of 1753, which was never intended? In the Book of Common Prayer appended to the Act of 1662, the order was that banns should be published after the Nicene Creed. It was true that in some of the Books of Common Prayer the order was "after the Second Lesson;" but that change was made without any authority whatever. The opinion of high authorities—such as the late Mr. Baron Alderson—was that the construction now proposed to be put upon the Act was not the real intention and meaning. The matter was so important that a right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Oxford) had delivered a charge to his clergy recommending them to read the banns after the Nicene Creed; but if this Bill were passed as it stood all banns would have to be published after the Second Lesson at both the Morning and the Evening Service. He asked whether it was not fair that the opinion of Convocation should be taken before they legislated on that subject; and he appealed to their Lordships, in the crisis through which the Church was now passing, not to adopt a clause which by a kind of side-wind disposed of a rubric in the Book of Common Prayer. Another reason why they should pause in that matter was that the subject of the rubric must come under the consideration of the Commission recently issued; and, indeed, he thought it would be better to refer the whole question of banns, and not their mere publication, either to the Marriage Commission or to the other Royal Commission to which he had just alluded. He hoped therefore that the clause would be rejected, and the whole subject of the publication of banns, together with the present Bill, referred either to the Marriage or the Rubric Commissions.

Moved, to leave out Clause 1.—(*The Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.*)

Lord CRANWORTH said, now that attention had been called to the subject, and a doubt had been stated to exist with regard to it, it was desirable that the matter should be cleared up, and that any difficulty caused by the rubric being somewhat inconsistent with itself should be removed. The most convenient time for publishing the banns was that which had always been used. For himself, he had never heard them published at any other time than after the Second Lesson in the Morning Service, and in ninety-nine cases out of 100 that was the practice. It was said that the Act would be an alteration of the rubric without the consent of Convocation. But the publication of the banns after the Second Lesson at the Evening Service was already the law. A clergyman could not publish the Banns during Evening Service unless there was no Morning Service, and the Act of Parliament directed that on such occasions they should be published after the Second Lesson at Evening Service. The consent of Convocation was not obtained for that Act, and it was an interference with Convocation quite as great as that now proposed. He could not agree to the Amendment of the right rev. Prelate. If the clause were omitted the existing doubts would remain—indeed, he thought the Bill was such obvious common sense that he should have hoped it would pass unanimously.

The Bishop of OXFORD said, that the noble and learned Lord (Lord Cranworth) was entirely mistaken in supposing that the practice of publishing the banns after the Second Lesson was all but universal. The practice, on the contrary, was most divided. He had received letters from clergymen in almost every diocese, and they stated that in some parishes there had never been a change from the rubrical time of the publication of the banns of matrimony. The noble and learned Lord stated that the change made by the Act of Parliament in declaring that the banns should be published after the Second Lesson of Evening Service when there was no Morning Service was equally a violation of the rubric with that proposed by the present Bill. Again, he was mistaken. There was nothing in the rubric about the publication of banns during the Evening Service, and it was consequently impossible to violate that which did not exist. But if their Lordships passed this Bill, they would violate the rubric. He thought their Lordships might legalize past marriages, and then wait until the two Royal Commissions now sitting had reported, when Parliament could legislate in a formal manner, and with full knowledge on the subject. If the Royal Commission now inquiring into the Marriage Law, for example, should recommend that the publication of banns should be done away with, it would be most unwise for Parliament to do that in the meantime, which would shock the feelings of a great many clergymen througout the country. He held in his hand a letter from an Archdeacon, not living in his own diocese, who said it would be a great trial to several good and very moderate men to be thus forced into disobedience to a Church order, even in a mixed matter like the present. Another clergyman wrote to express his conviction that if this Bill passed it would add very largely to the dissatisfaction of many of the most devoted ot the clergy. Another clergyman, also of another diocese, deprecated most earnestly the alteration of the rubric, stating that the rubric had never been disobeyed in Ireland, that the Bill would call upon him to violate his most sacred engagements, and that if it became law, he should discharge his conscience in that behalf. It was needless, by a hasty piece of legislation, to forestal the Report of the Royal Commission. It was said that unless the practice were made universal there was danger lest a person interested might miss the publication of the banns. During an experience of forty years, he had never known such an instance. It was a mistake to suppose that a person forbidding the banns might lawfully interrupt a clergyman when the banns were read out. If any person did so, he was liable to be proceeded against for brawling in church. The meaning of the words "Ye are to declare it" was that the person desiring to forbid the banns was to go to the clergyman who kept the book, and raise his objection there. The book containing the banns was accessible to every one, and the practice was for a person wishing to forbid the banns to go and see the banns book, and tell the clergyman having the charge of it his objection to the marriage. To pass this Bill was to offend the consciences of men who had solemnly promised to obey the rubric, when no object was to be attained by it. It was most important at the present juncture that they should not needlessly shock the feelings of the considerable number of clergyman who objected to this Bill.

Lord HOUGHTON said, that what he asked their Lordships to do was to confirm by law the all but universal practice for upwards of 100 years. Since the time of the passing of Lord Hardwicke's Act in 1753, the publication of banns after the Second Lesson had been universal, or nearly so. What was the rubric which was on their Lordships' table, and which every clergyman had upon his desk? The clergyman who said it would be a grievance not to publish the banns after the Nicene Creed had upon his desk a rubric which commanded him to publish them after the Second Lesson. But they were told that that rubric had not been confirmed by Convocation. Here, then, came in a grave question of conflict between the law of the land and the law of the Church, in which the latter must give way. The words of the Act of Parliament were, that

> "All other rules prescribed by the said rubric concerning the publication of banns and solemnization of matrimony, and not hereby altered, shall be duly observed."

Now, the supporters of this Bill maintained that an alteration which he believed to be a convenient and a wise alteration had been established, and he called upon their Lordships to confirm it. This Bill had been brought forward at the present moment because certain persons in the Church had raised an agitation upon the question. That was a very serious thing, and meant this, if it meant anything, that there was a large body of clergy who were desirous of taking the rubric in a different sense from that which the Act of Parliament declared, and who almost clandestinely affirmed that there was a law of the Church different from the law of the land. That was a principle which he deemed to be a very serious one, and he could not for a moment assent to it.

The Earl of DERBY said, that though the precise time of reading the banns of marriage in church was, in his opinion, of no great importance, nevertheless the question was one which involved an important principle, and might give rise to very serious discussions. The two Amendments of the right rev. Prelates (the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol and the Bishop of Oxford) must be taken in connection with each other in considering this question. He was somewhat surprised to hear that there was such a great difference of opinion with regard to the proper time of the publication of the banns as that mentioned by the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol), because he could say that, during a long life, and though he had attended regularly at the Church services, he had never heard the banns published after the Nicene Creed. The two right rev. Prelates, however, who had spoken had assured the House that there were a number of clergymen, in various dioceses, who considered themselves bound in conscience to take a different interpretation of the rubric from the usual one. If there were any doubt on the subject, there ought to be no doubt whatever with regard to the validity of the marriages previously solemnized, or those which might be hereafter solemnized, until the question was finally set at rest. It seemed to him, under the circumstances, that the course advocated by the right rev. Prelate who had last spoken was the one which would recommend itself to the deliberate judgment of their Lordships. They had referred these two special questions—the one, the question of marriage, to a Commission upon Marriage, and the other, the question of certain rubrics—to a Commission specially appointed to consider those rubrics, and more especially the rubrics relating to the publication of the banns of marriage, and it appeared to him that their Lordships would stultify themselves if, previous to the Report of the Commission, they were to decide on the authority of Parliament alone in favour of that which he himself believed to be the general rule. In the meantime the Amendment to be proposed by the right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Oxford), would remove all doubt as to the validity of marriage at whatever time it might be celebrated, and would also provide against any objections being raised to it until Parliament, in its wisdom, should legislate further on the subject. If the question went to a division, he should be disposed to vote in favour of the omission of the clause.

Lord HOUGHTON said, he thought it his duty to divide upon the clause. With every respect for the opinion of the noble Earl at the head of Her Majesty's Government he would rather defer to that which had been expressed by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack the other night.

On Question, That the said Clause stand Part of the Bill? their Lordships *divided* :— Contents 8; Not-Contents 40 : Majority 32.

Clause 2 (Indemnity to Clergymen).

Lord HOUGHTON *moved*, That the Lord in the Chair do leave the Chair.

The Earl of DERBY hoped that the noble Lord would not persevere with the Motion. Having raised a doubt on a most important point, he ought not to abandon a Bill which proposed to settle that doubt.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Amendments made: the Report thereof to be received *To-morrow*, and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 311.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Eight o'clock till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, August 8, 1867.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—William Keown, esquire, *for* Downpatrick.

Public Bills—*Ordered*—Militia.*

First Reading—Militia * [308].

Second Reading—Railway Companies (Scotland)* [306].

Report of Select Committee—Metropolis Gas * [No. 520 & 521.]

Committee—County Courts Acts Amendment * [212] [r.p.]; War Department Stores * [255]; Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation * [267]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * [304]; Merchant Shipping * (*re-comm.*) [299].

Report—War Department Stores * [255]; Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation * [267]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * [304]; Merchant Shipping * (*re-comm.*)* [299].

Considered as amended—Representation of the People [302].

Third Reading—Army Reserve * [148]; Patriotic Fund * [278]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [288], and *passed.*

INDIA—SIMLA COURT-MARTIAL.

NOTICE.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he rose to give notice that on Monday next he would ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether, considering that the majority against the Motion for reinstating Captain Jervis was obtained by the votes of twenty-eight — he had been told by the votes of thirty—Members and Officials of the Government, and that therefore the independent opinion of the House would have been in favour of the Motion by a majority of ten or twelve, the Government would allow the subject to remain in its present state, so that while the professional prospects of Subordinate Officers were to be ruined, in spite of the recommendation to mercy of a General Court-Martial, the Commander-in-Chief in India, although censured by the Commander-in-Chief in England, was to remain in full possession of all the advantages of his high military appointment?

Mr. BRETT: I hope, Sir, the House will allow me to make a personal appeal to the hon. Member for Devizes, and allow me to ask him not to put the Question. I have this day referred the matter to his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, and, on behalf of Captain Jervis, I have to state that I have entire faith in leaving it in his Royal Highness's hands, believing that he will do Captain Jervis ample justice.

MOLDAVIA—TREATMENT OF THE JEWS.—QUESTION.

Mr. **DARBY GRIFFITH** said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he will distinctly authorize Consul General Green at Bucharest, and Consul Ward at Galatz, to afford a refuge at the Consulate at Galatz, or elsewhere in Moldavia, if necessary, to any of the Jews who may require that protection from the present persecution, as proposed in their Despatches of the 20th and 16th of July, 1867, respectively?

Lord **STANLEY**: I consider, Sir, that no further instructions are necessary. Mr. Green's conduct and that of Mr. Ward have been approved by Her Majesty's Government, and that approval is a sufficient authorization for like cases in the future.

VOLUNTEERS AT SHOEBURYNESS.

QUESTION.

Mr. **DARBY GRIFFITH** said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the intention of the War Office to send in a Bill, or make a demand on the Volunteer Artillery who have just held their annual meeting at Shoeburyness, for the expense of Tents and Camp Stores lent to them, for wear and tear of the same, and for the carriage of any such Stores?

Sir **JOHN PAKINGTON**: There is no occasion, Sir, whatever for the War Office to send in a Bill or make a demand on the Volunteer Artillery of the nature to which the hon. Gentleman's Question refers, because the terms on which these Government Stores are used by the Volunteer Artillery are clearly laid down and thoroughly understood. They are not charged for ordinary wear and tear of the stores, but they do pay for any damage which they may sustain, and also for the carriage of those stores to the place where they are to be used. I may add that, some time ago, I received a communication from the Volunteer Artillery requesting to be allowed to be freed from all payment in respect of these stores; but I refused that application.

DUCHY OF LANCASTER.—QUESTION.

Mr. **GORST** said, he wished to ask the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether, as the Government have announced their intention of issuing a Commission to inquire into the constitution and practice of the Superior Courts of Law, and as the Report of such Commission will probably give rise to alterations in the constitution and practice of the Court of Common Pleas at Lancaster, which is one of those Superior Courts, it is his intention, before the issuing of such Commission, to proceed with those Clauses of the District Prothonotaries, Court of Common Pleas, County Palatine of Lancaster Bill, which creates new offices and provides for the payment of fresh salaries in the Court of Common Pleas at Lancaster?

Colonel **WILSON PATTEN** replied, that he did not think it desirable, under the circumstances, to proceed during the present Session with the clauses referred to in the question put by the hon. Gentleman. Indeed, having received notice from his hon. Friend (Mr. Gorst) of his intention to move an Amendment which seemed to trench somewhat on the privileges of the Duchy, he had resolved, acting on the advice of his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General, not to proceed further with the Bill this Session. Next year, however, he should bring in another measure on the subject embodying all the improvements which would have been effected by the present Bill.

Mr. **F. STANLEY** said, he wished to ask the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, the average annual amount of Fees received by the Prothonotary of the Court of Common Pleas, Lancaster, during the ten years preceding the death of the late Sir Charles Phipps; also, the total amount of Fees received since that date?

Colonel **WILSON PATTEN** said, he could not answer the Question of his hon. Friend as to the annual amount of fees received by the Prothonotary of the Court of Common Pleas, Lancaster, during the ten years preceding the death of the late Sir Charles Phipps. Sir Charles kept his account with his deputy, and the Office had no knowledge as to the annual amount of fees received. Since his death arrangements had been made by which the office of prothonotary would in future be paid on a different footing, as proposed in the Bill above referred to; but, as that Bill could not be proceeded with this Session, he had directed that these fees should be paid into a separate fund until such time as Parliament could take the matter into its consideration, and decide how they should be appropriated.

In reply to Mr. Childers,

Colonel WILSON PATTEN said, it had been found necessary to appoint, nominally, a prothonotary, but the fees would be placed in a separate fund.

IRELAND—VALUATION OF COUNTIES.

QUESTION.

The O'CONOR DON said, he rose to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he can explain why the Returns made to this House during the last and present Session as to the cost of the annual revision of the Valuation of each County in Ireland during the years 1863, 1864, and 1865 differ from each other; and, why, as regards the County of Roscommon, the sum charged to that County for the revision of the Valuation in the year 1865 does not agree with the sum stated in either Return as chargeable to that County for that year?

Lord NAAS, in reply, said, the reason for the difference referred to by the hon. Member was that the Returns were made at different times of the year; and if the hon. Member would add the incidental expenses to the amount stated in the Return, the result would be in both cases alike.

TURNPIKE TRUSTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to the provisions of the Act 3 & 4 *Will.* IV., c. 80, s. 5, whereby he is required in each year to lay before Parliament an abstract of the statements relating to Turnpike Trusts, which, by the said Act, are to be annually rendered to him, together with his observations thereon, How it happens that no such abstract nor observations have been laid before Parliament in respect of Turnpike Trusts for the past year of 1866, nor for the preceding year 1865?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that the Return for the year 1865 would be laid on the table of the House in the course of a few days; but the Return for 1866 had not yet been received at the Home Office.

VETERINARY CONGRESS AT VIENNA.

QUESTION.

Sir J. CLARKE JERVOISE said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Whether the Report of the International Congress at Vienna on Veterinary subjects (for which the sum of £148 8*s.* 9*d.* has been voted) will be distributed; and, if so, when?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, in reply, that the Congress met in the year 1865, and the money was voted this year to pay the travelling expenses of those who attended it from England. A Report was made to the Council Office, which there would be no objection to produce if it were needed; but to do so would be to incur a useless and unnecessary expenditure, as a full account of all the proceedings had been printed in Professor Gamgee's book on the Cattle Plague.

ARMY—FORTS AT PORTSMOUTH AND SPITHEAD.—QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant GASELEE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has any objection to lay upon the table of the Library models of the Forts now in the course of erection at Portsmouth and Spithead?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that there were at the War Office models of one of the forts at Spithead, and of one of the forts at Portsmouth; and he had not the least objection to place them in the Library of the House if the House would consent to his doing so.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS.

QUESTION.

Mr. BASS said, he wished to ask the Vice-President of the Board of Trade, When the Agricultural Statistics will be ready, and if a comparison with last year's statistics can be presented?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE, in reply, said, he was informed by the Statistical Department that the time of publication of the Agricultural Returns could not be stated at present, but that every endeavour would be made to get them out as soon as possible. It was intended to give in the Returns a comparison of information obtained in the past and in the present year. He might take this opportunity of answering a question of the hon. Member for East Norfolk (Mr. Read). In the first instance, it was intended, in consequence of the opposition raised, to publish only the acreage Returns; but the occurrence of the cattle plague raised a desire for the live stock Returns, which were then collected and issued. This reason did not of course apply to horses. It might be hoped that when the advantage of these Returns was more fully recognized they would be made more complete.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has had under his consideration the case of the Majors promoted for distinguished service; and, whether he can concede their claim to be placed on an equal footing with the Lieutenant Colonels also promoted for distinguished service?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: I hope, Sir, the hon. and gallant Gentleman will excuse me if I decline to answer his Question, which is not free from difficulty. The subject has been under consideration, and I hope, therefore, that the hon. and gallant Gentleman will excuse me if I postpone making a final answer.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.—QUESTION.

Mr. KINNAIRD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, If he is prepared to name a day for the introduction of the Indian Budget?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, in reply, that he was unable then to state the day on which he would be able to bring on the Indian Budget in consequence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer not being able to name a day in consequence of the state of public business.

THE CATTLE PLAGUE.—QUESTION.

Mr. READ said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Council, If there has been an outbreak of Cattle Plague in the neighbourhood of Antwerp, in consequence of which the Belgian authorities have prohibited the holding of local markets; and, whether cattle are permitted to be imported from Antwerp into Harwich, and sent up to the Metropolitan Market after performing a quarantine of only twelve hours?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, in reply, said, he had received intelligence from a private source of the outbreak of the Cattle Plague in the vicinity of Antwerp, but his information did not say whether the Belgian Government had prohibited the holding of local markets. At present it required the authority of the Queen in Council to prohibit the importation of cattle and goods from infected countries; but in order to obviate that delay in future, power had been taken in the Bill now before the House to enable the Council to issue such a prohibition.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reference to that one of the Lords' Amendments to the Representation of the People Bill which gives a new interpretation of the term "poor rate," (page 19, line 19) what is meant by a borough rate levied as a separate rate; Whether such borough rate would include rates levied by town councils for sewerage, lighting, or other purposes; Whether such borough rates have to be paid by the £10 occupiers in order to vote; and, if not, whether it is the intention of the Government to consent to the imposition of different and greater obligations in respect to the payment of rates upon the voters admitted by this Bill than upon the present voters?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the Question of the hon. Gentleman refers to one of the Amendments made by the House of Lords in the improvement of the Bill for the Representation of the People. The hon. Gentleman, I understand, wishes to know virtually whether Her Majesty's Government are prepared to accept that Amendment.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: And also the meaning of it.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes, and also the meaning of it. Well, that appears to be a reason why this inquiry should be postponed until the regular business of the evening comes on. As the Question relates to the first business on the Paper it would not be desirable to enter now into a desultory discussion on the subject.

THE SLAVE TRADE.—QUESTION.

Mr. GILPIN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If his attention has been called to official statements that an extensive Slave Trade is carried on from the dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar to ports of Madagascar, the Islands between it and the Portuguese provinces of Mozambique, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf; and, whether any Treaty exists between the British Government and the Sultan of Zanzibar similar to that which has been entered into between the British Government and the Imaum of Muscat, which prohibits the exportation of slaves from his dominions; and, if not, whether the Sultan, as a vassal of the Imaum, is not bound by the Treaty aforesaid?

LORD STANLEY: Sir, Her Majesty's Government are aware that a considerable traffic in slaves exists between Zanzibar and the ports of the Red Sea and Persian Gulf. They are not aware, and do not believe, that any considerable traffic of that kind exists between Zanzibar and Madagascar or the islands between it and the mainland. There is now no Imaum of Muscat. On the death of the late Imaum his territories were divided between his two sons, one of whom bears the title of the Sultan of Muscat, the other of Sultan of Zanzibar. The treaties contracted with the late Imaum are binding on both these potentates.

CONSECRATION OF BURIAL GROUNDS BILL.—QUESTION.

MR. GILPIN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will appoint a Morning Sitting for the consideration of the Bill for the Consecration of Burial Grounds, or bring it forward at such an hour as may secure or permit a fair discussion of its provisions?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, the Bill referred to was not a Government Bill, although it had been intrusted to his care. It was not, he considered, of a sufficiently important character to require a Morning Sitting for its discussion. He would, however, endeavour to bring it forward at a convenient time, but considering the state of the business of the House he could not at present fix a day.

THE ABYSSINIAN CAPTIVES.

QUESTION.

MR. H. SEYMOUR said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he has received any information relating to the Abyssinian prisoners?

LORD STANLEY: The latest accounts, Sir, which I have received from Massowah are of the date of July 20th. It is represented that the King's power is greatly diminished, that rebel troops are actually in sight of his camp, and that communication between Debra Tabor, where he is, and Magdala, where the prisoners are detained, is cut off. But I cannot say whether it will be permanently cut off, and it would, therefore, be premature to assume that the prisoners were about to be immediately liberated.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL.—[BILL 302.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Secretary Lord Stanley.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Order of the Day for the Consideration of the Lords' Amendments read.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I rise for the purpose of moving that the House proceed to consider the Amendments made by the House of Lords in the Representation of the People Bill, sent down to this House on Tuesday last. I think I may congratulate the House—considering that the Bill is one of the highest political importance, and the most comprehensive measure of the kind ever passed by this House—on the fact that in the Amendments which I am now asking it to consider I cannot find that the House of Lords has challenged any of the principles upon which that measure is founded. This circumstance very much diminishes the difficulty which this House must at all times feel in considering and criticizing Amendments which may be made by the other House of Parliament, the matters dealt with being rather those of detail than of principle. In dealing therefore with the Amendments which have been made in the other House, we may come to the consideration of these Amendments without bias, and in that spirit of prudent but dignified conciliation which at all times it is advisable to cherish between the two branches of the Legislature. I would illustrate what I have endeavoured to express in describing the Amendments made by the other House of Parliament by referring to what may be deemed the main principle and the most important provision of the Bill before us—namely, that relating to the extension of the franchise. All will agree with me that, important as may be many of the other provisions of the Bill, the most characteristic and considerable feature is that which extends the suffrages of the people. Upon that subject—with one exception of an unimportant character — the House of Lords has accepted our provisions. That exception is the clause relating to the copyhold vote, upon which there was much controversy in this House, followed by a division, in which the policy recommended by the Government was not accepted by this House. The House of Lords has reversed that decision, but in no other respect has it altered the provisions fixing the qualification which should confer the franchise, In considering those provisions in Committee the House of Lords had in the first instance altered the qualification of the lodger. A noble Lord proposed that the lodger's qualification should be doubled. Another noble and learned Lord proposed, by way of compromise, that it should be placed at the figure of £15, and that proposal was carried by a large majority. It may be thought ungracious on my part to advert to that instance, considering the subsequent decision of the House of Lords with regard to the question. But in recalling that incident to the consideration of the House I am influenced by no wish to make an ungracious observation. I do it rather because I think this House may draw from the final determination of the House of Lords in that instance an inference which deserves appreciation and respect. I cannot but recognize the candid and spontaneous manner in which the House of Lords, after becoming more intimately acquainted with what had occurred in this House upon the question of the lodger franchise, proceeded to re-consider their determination, and resolved to confirm the decision which had been come to by this House, as a desire on the part of the House of Lords to show a cordial and confiding feeling in the decision of this House, and, as far as it lay in their power, to act in unison with the House of Commons. I rejoice that their Lordships took that course, and took it in a manner so consistent with the true dignity of their House. I feel that had they adhered to their original resolution it would have been a source of perplexity and embarrassment to us, for I cannot believe that this House would have consented to depart from its original Resolution, and I could not have recommended it. I trust that in dealing with the Amendments their Lordships have made we may reciprocate that cordiality and spirit of conciliation. Of the Amendments set down for our consideration this evening there are only three to which I would call particular attention. The first is the rejection of Clause 5 of the Bill sent up from this House, which reduced the amount of the copyhold qualification as settled by the Reform Act of 1832. The decision by which that clause was inserted by the House of Commons was arrived at after a division, and in opposition to the opinion of the Government. It was thought, on the part of Her Majesty's Government in this House, that it was on the whole unwise and unnecessary to interfere with the copyhold suffrage as settled by the Act of 1832. The House of Lords, expressing the same opinion, has rejected clause 5 by a large majority. It is their opinion that the copyhold and leasehold franchise as settled by the Reform Act should not be departed from. Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that it would be advisable that the House of Commons should accept the Amendment of the House of Lords in that respect, and when the occasion arises I will move to that effect. There are two other Amendments which do not trench on the provisions of the Bill as to the extension of the franchise. The first inserts a new clause and the second re-introduces a clause which was in the Bill as originally offered for the consideration of this House by the Government, and was, after deliberation, rejected by this House. Both these clauses refer to the same subject—namely, the mode in which a constituent should exercise and register his franchise. The first clause inserted by their Lordships provides that at a contested election for any county or borough represented by three Members, no person should vote for more than two candidates; and this is followed by another provision, which applies to the particular circumstances of particular constituencies. This proposal was opposed on the part of Her Majesty's Government in the House of Lords with all the authority that a Government can fairly exercise over a deliberative assembly ; but it was carried by an overwhelming majority. I must confess that it was almost unanimously carried by the House of Lords, because when the minority was told I observed that it consisted almost entirely of the Members of the Administration. Considering the spirit of cordiality with which the House of Lords has met the suggestions of this House, Her Majesty's Government think that this almost unanimous expression of opinion on the part of the House of Lords should be deferred to. Although Her Majesty's Government on principle opposed that proposal, and although I do not say that I approve it, still in deference to the spirit of compromise and conciliation in which this Bill has been carried through the other House, without the exercise of which it is impossible to believe the Bill could ever have arrived at its present state, it seems to me prudent and becoming to support the clause which their Lordships have introduced. The third point to which I wish particularly to call the attention of the House is the clause which was omitted in this House from the Bill as proposed by the Government, and inserted by a large majority in the House of Lords. I refer to the privilege of the constituency in polling by voting papers. It would be inconvenient, especially at this moment, to enter into the merits or demerits of that proposal. The House has had an opportunity of debating it, and, if necessary they may debate it again. It is a subject on which, as was frankly admitted, not only by the Government but by many independent Members of this House, when we introduced it, opinion is much divided. It is a course on which much may be said on both sides. It cannot be denied, in considering its claims, that it is a measure which, if adopted, must lead to a very great increase of the constituencies. There is no doubt that many classes who do not now record their votes would record them if this system of polling-papers were admitted. The experience of the system in other electoral matters has shown that it gives opportunity for a larger expression of public opinion than can otherwise be obtained. On the other hand, I freely admit the force of the objection, that personation and corruption might be produced. But it should be recollected that corruption and personation exist at present. It does not follow because this system is likely, in the opinion of some, to favour personation and corruption that the amount of personation and corruption would be greater than that which at present prevails. But on this point of personation and corruption, and on other matters connected with the exercise of the franchise in this mode, I would call the attention of the House to this fact. The House of Lords, in re-introducing this clause for the employment of voting papers has accompanied it with a number of regulations evidently drawn with much thought and labour, in which all possible abuses of this mode of exercising the suffrage are contemplated and provided against. This scheme of polling by voting papers was discussed in this House upon the original Bill, and was defeated by a respectable, but still a moderate majority. It was carried in the other House of Parliament, accompanied by this elaborate scheme of exercising the franchise, by a very considerable majority. Under these circumstances Her Majesty's Government will feel it their duty to recommend the House to accept the Amendment of the Lords. There are several other points on which differences of opinion may arise as we proceed to consider the Amendments, but there are none that involve any principle of importance. Generally speaking, I should say, of these Amendments, that they are prudent and proper, and I believe the House will feel that it is for the interest of the country that they should be adopted. Any, upon which a difference of views may prevail, we shall have the opportunity of considering as we go on. Before I sit down I would again impress upon the House the anxiety of the Government that in discussing the Amendments the House will bring—as I feel sure will be the case—to the consideration of these Amendments an impartial and conciliatory spirit. We must recollect that we have now passed through both Houses of Parliament, with the exception to of this final stage, a measure very largely increase the popular rights and privileges, and that we have received from the other House of Parliament no vexatious or prejudiced opposition. It was not always so. It is in the memory of some that when measures of this character went up to the other House of Parliament they have been met sometimes with eloquent invective, sometimes in a spirit of stately, I will not say of sullen, reserve. Nothing of that kind has occurred in the present instance. Although there has been no suppression of opinion in that assembly, although many noble Lords have expressed even with severity their opinions on many provisions of this Bill, it cannot be denied that the House of Lords have addressed themselves to the discussion of this measure in a frank spirit, and in a dignified manner. They have brought to the consideration of it adequate intelligence and great candour. They have considered it with an anxious desire to co-operate with the House of Commons in what they hope may prove a settlement of the most important political question of the day. I am sure that this House will reciprocate the sentiment of cordial and confiding sympathy which has been shown by the House of Lords towards them in the consideration of this measure.

With that hope and belief I now offer for their consideration the Amendments of the other House of Parliament.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I hope the House will be disposed to waive any general discussion of these Amendments. I think it quite right and proper that the right hon. Gentleman should describe the course which the Government intend to take with respect to what he considers the principal Amendments made by the House of Lords. For my own part I would not have said a word upon the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, except for the very earnest and reiterated appeals which he has made to the House, including, of course, this side of the House, to recognize in the Amendments made by the House of Lords to this Bill the existence of a highly satisfactory and conciliatory spirit. I admit that the right hon. Gentleman deserves considerable credit for taking that view of the Amendments of the House of Lords, inasmuch as those Amendments included one relating to the question of what is called the representation of minorities, upon which I, for one, was extremely glad to have in this House the right hon. Gentleman for my Leader. Upon that question the right hon. Gentleman made not only a very able speech, but a speech delivered with the animation of real earnestness. I speak with perfect sincerity when I say—I have no right whatever to blame him, and I do not blame him—that it must have cost him much to recede from the opinions he then expressed. As regards those sitting on this side of the House who followed him on that occasion, all I shall say is, I hope he will on the present occasion allow us to observe a respectful silence with regard to attempting any general description of the character of the Amendments made by the House of Lords. There were some of us so sanguine as to hope that Amendments which on this side of the House were very generally desired, and were thought quite necessary to the perfection of the Bill—I mean Amendments relating to the re-distribution of seats—would have found favour with the House of Lords. But nothing of the sort has appeared. We are given to understand that all Amendments of that description were steadily declined, with a declaration that, whatever their merits, it would be an interference with the Bill as settled by the House of Commons to introduce them. Of course, if the majority of this House think that the Bill was settled by the House of Commons in a manner satisfactory to that majority, to them there is a very fair appeal. But there are, at any rate, many of us who think that settlement was unsatisfactory, and who took every opportunity of resisting it by our speeches and by our votes. Hence, we cannot warm ourselves up to the point of enthusiasm urged by the right hon. Gentleman as to the wise and conciliatory spirit of the House of Lords with regard to these Amendments, when we find that this argument respecting interference with the Bill as settled by the House of Commons, and the authority of the House of Commons to determine points connected with its own constitution, was summarily got rid of, and did not at all weigh either on conscience, understanding, or upon voting power. Whenever Amendments were proposed which were deemed in the Upper House, and are, I think, deemed in this House to be, of a re-actionary character — such Amendments — as those with regard to voting papers, or relating to lodgers—were freely adopted. Happy as I am at the result—in the case of the lodger franchise — ultimately attained, I do not think the right hon. Gentleman was discreet in urging us to a discussion on the subject. My regard for the privileges and dignity of the House of Lords leads me to believe that the less said about the matter the better. I cordially rejoice to think that we have got rid of one most formidable subject of discussion, and I feel bound to applaud the courage and decision shown by Lord Derby at a critical moment with respect to a point of great importance. Having said so much, it may be permitted to us to pass over that portion of the subject which relates to a general verdict, whether of approval or otherwise, of the House of Lords. Time is valuable; and at this moment we ought by all means in our power to narrow the field of discussion. We should, therefore, I think, accept the invitation of the right hon. Gentleman, and, without further comment, proceed with the consideration of these Amendments.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

[Bill 302.] (The Page and Line refer to the Bill (227) as printed by the Lords.)

Clause 3 (Occupation Franchise of Voters in Boroughs).

Line 10. After ("all") insert ("Poor.")

Line 11 and Line 12. Leave out ("for the Relief of the Poor.")

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, that the Amendment though apparently only a verbal and trivial one, really was an alteraion of serious magnitude, and he should move that the House should disagree to it. This Amendment must be construed in connection with the Amendment introduced in the other House in the interpretation clause, namely, that—

> "Where a Borough Rate or County Rate is levied as a separate Rate, and not paid out of the Poor Rate, the term 'Poor Rate' shall, for the purposes of the Franchises conferred by this Act, be deemed to include such Borough Rate or County Rate."

He had hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have given an explanation of the meaning to be attached to the words "poor rate" in the Bill. In many cases it would include the rates levied for lighting, paving, &c., of the borough; in fact, the borough rates. The present voters were only called upon to pay the poor rates, and it was undesirable that a fresh condition of paying these additional rates should be imposed upon the new voters. The words inserted in the present clause were copied from the Reform Act, and he thought that the principle of that Act in respect to the definition of the word rates should be followed, because to adopt the Amendment of the Lords in the interpretation clause would place the new voters in quite a different position to those who occupied £10 houses. The effect of the Lords' Amendment would be that it would virtually disfranchise hundreds of voters. It was to be remembered that the county rate was very often not more than ¼*d.* in the pound, and it might be discovered at the last moment that that small rate had not been paid in those portions of the county which were included in the boroughs. The Amendment seemed a trivial one, but it was necessary to disagree with it in order that the House might afterwards disagree with the Amendment in the interpretation clause. In the case of Stockport an alteration of this character was of vital importance; for the borough rates stood to the poor rates as in the proportion of 2*s.* 6*d.* in the pound as to the former and 1*s.* in the pound as to the latter. The Amendment had passed with very slight discussion in the Upper House, and he hoped that the Government would not ask the House of Commons to agree to it. He did not believe that the House would be willing to draw the contemplated distinction between the new and the old class of voters, and he, therefore, moved that the House disagree to the Amendment.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the question the hon. Gentleman had raised did not arise properly on this clause, but on the interpretation clause at the end of the Bill. If this clause was passed in the exact shape in which it had come down from the Lords, it would not at all affect the question of what the voter would be called on to pay. The hon. Member was mistaken in supposing that the borough rate included the sewage and lighting rates, it only included such expenditure as took place under the Municipal Reform Act. In all cases in which parishes were conterminous with the boroughs, and not partly in and partly out of it, these rates were levied in the poor rates. But where a parish was divided, and partly in and partly out of the borough, the borough rates were levied separately, and no doubt the Amendment might be of some importance. The object, he believed, was to put those persons who lived in parishes out of the borough in the same position as those who resided within it. That was all that was done in the Amendment on the interpretation clause. But there was nothing in the Amendment in the present clause, for he could see no difference between "poor rates" and "rates made for the relief of the poor."

Mr. HIBBERT said, he objected to the insertion of the words, which would place the new voters on a different footing from that on which the old ones stood. It would lead to inextricable confusion, because the revising barristers had become accustomed to the wording of the Reform Act, and they would in future have to deal with two provisions, one referring to the £10 voters, and the other referring to those below. It would lead, moreover, to great confusion in the working of this Bill. The 7th Clause abolished the practice of compounding and released the owners from their liability to be rated instead of the occupiers to the poor rates; but, if "poor rate" was to be interpreted to include borough and county rates, it followed that the practice of compounding in Parliamentary boroughs would be abolished in the case of the borough as well as of the poor rate—a result that was never intended. The 26th Clause required notice to be given by the overseer of those persons who were in arrears; but how could this be done by the overseer, who had nothing to do with the borough rate, and could not be in a position to give the required notice? As the borough rate, when levied separately, was of course collected by persons employed for the purpose by the Corporation, that notice would be impossible on the part of the overseers who possessed no lists. A difficulty of that kind would have to be surmounted by extending the meaning of the word "overseers," so as to include "collectors of borough rates." The Amendment would, if agreed to, cause in several instances confusion of this character, and necessitate alteration. He believed the Amendment had been introduced with a view to uniformity, but it certainly would have a contrary effect to that of insuring uniformity. There were many and practical difficulties in the way of the adoption of the Amendment, and he called upon the Government not to ask the House to agree to it.

MR. CANDLISH said, that the Amendment which the hon. Member for Bradford asked the House to disagree with would introduce far greater anomalies than it was intended to cure. Inasmuch, too, as it would impose on the new voter an obligation which was not imposed on the old, he trusted that the Government would recognize the expediency of disagreeing with it. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary was wrong in assuming that nothing was collected under the term "borough rate" except what was collected under the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he apprehended that the clause as it stood was right. The question that was now raised might be settled when they came to the interpretation clause.

MR. GLADSTONE said, that from the statements of the Home Secretary and the Attorney General it appeared that this Amendment would be futile unless the House confirmed it by an Amendment in the interpretation clause. But he inferred, from the Speeches of the Home Secretary and the Attorney General, that they considered the alteration in the interpretation clause injudicious. If so, why make an alteration in this clause for the purpose of enabling them to make that injudicious alteration in the other? The phraseology of the clause as it stood in the Bill when it left the House of Commons was in precise conformity with the phraseology of the Reform Act. Let the House adhere to the phraseology of the Reform Act, and let them not introduce distinctions in that phraseology. He believed the great bulk of the House to be anxious that the franchise to be conferred by the Bill should be given to those below £10 upon equal terms with those who enjoyed it above that amount.

MR. J. B. SMITH said, that the poor rate and borough rate were, in the borough which he had the honour to represent (Stockport), two distinct and separate rates, the former amounting to 1*s.* in the pound, and the latter to 2*s.* 6*d.* in the pound. The effect of the Amendment of the Lords would, in fact, be to disfranchise a large number of persons.

MR. LOCKE said, that if they disagreed now with the Lords' Amendment it would obviate the necessity of hereafter making any further Amendment. The larger question should be settled on this clause instead of leaving it till they came to the Amendment on the interpretation clause.

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he did not think the alteration would make any change in the effect of the clause as it originally stood. Still it might be well to consider the main question upon this first Amendment, and if they were to consider that question now, he confessed that he could not think it was desirable that this Amendment of the Lords should be adhered to. It had the great evil of making a distinction between those voters who occupied premises of the value of £10 and upwards, and those who occupied premises below that amount. It would, moreover, introduce anomalies much greater than any which at present existed.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that he would not press the Amendment. It was not one for which the Government were responsible; still he thought the proper time to have discussed the question would have been on the interpretation clause.

Lords' Amendment *disagreed to.*

Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs).

Line 29. After ("House") insert ("or being one and the same set of Chambers or Rooms not separately rated.")

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER moved to disagree to the said Amendment; and said that the Amendment was introduced with the object of changing the definition of the word "lodger" as it stood in the Bill when it left that House, and of letting in, under the new definition, resident Members of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, under the idea that the House of Commons intended members of those Universities resident within the walls of colleges to vote whether they were lodgers or occupiers of dwelling-houses. He apprehended that what passed in that House did not justify any such interpretation. He would briefly remind the House of what took place. His right hon. Friend the Member for the city of Oxford (Mr. Cardwell) thought that unless certain words were introduced into the Bill, its effect might be to enable the members of the Universities residing within the walls of the Colleges, either on the footing of being held to occupy a dwelling-house, or on the footing of being held as lodgers, to obtain the franchise for the city of Oxford and the borough of Cambridge, from which they had been carefully excluded by clear words in the Reform Act of 1832. His right hon. Friend accordingly gave notice of his intention to introduce into one of the clauses of the Bill clear words so as to adhere to the policy of the Act of 1832 in that respect. The Government acceded, in the first instance, to that proposal. Other Members of the House expressed an opinion favourable to the admission of that class of persons to vote for the city of Oxford and the borough of Cambridge, provided they would have been entitled to vote under the Bill as it had been introduced. The question having been considered in a full House on the 24th June, a majority of 200 against 179 adopted the Amendment which was proposed by his right hon. Friend, and determined, with respect to the towns in which the Universities were located, to adhere to the policy of the Act of 1832, and not to throw the members of the Universities as new elements into the borough constituencies. Upon the Report, in a small House, the hon. Member for York (Mr. Lowther) renewed the question, and moved to strike out the words which his right hon. Friend had introduced. The hon. Member succeeded in carrying his Motion. But whereas on the 24th of June the question was decided one way, in a House of 379 Members; on the 12th of July that decision was reversed in a House of only 229, there being 150 more Members present on the first than on the second occasion. Although the majority was actually larger on the second occasion, yet the total number of Members who voted with the hon. Member for York was only 145, being considerably less than the minority of 179 on the 24th of June. That was not a satisfactory mode of deciding a question which, if it were not of general importance throughout the country, was of importance to the two particular constituencies of Oxford and Cambridge. In 1832 Parliament dealt only with the household and not with the lodger franchise; and, therefore, the precedent of 1832 was not of necessity applicable to the lodger franchise of 1867. The majority who voted with the hon. Member for York voted with this view:—"If the lodger franchise, as you now define it, would include these persons in Oxford and Cambridge, let them have the franchise, but do not put in words expressly to include them." He regretted that he differed from that view, but that was the view upon which the majority proceeded. Upon further consideration, however, it was ascertained in "another place" that the members of Universities resident within the walls of Colleges were neither lodgers within the definition of the Bill, nor householders, and that if it was desired to force them upon those two particular borough constituencies, a new fancy franchise must be created for the purpose. As the Bill left that House, it provided that the lodging must be part of one and the same dwelling-house. It was seen that probably that would not apply to Colleges in the Universities, and so these words were added, avowedly for the purpose of including them, "or be in one and the same set of chambers or rooms not separately rated." In support of his Motion, he must repeat to the House, as conclusive against altering the lodger franchise for the express purpose of introducing this class into the constituencies of Oxford and Cambridge, reasons which to his mind were extremely forcible in favour of excluding them, even if the definition contained in the Bill would have let them in. The Universities were not only separate corporations, but were for all practical purposes as much divided from the body of the citizens in the towns where they had their domicile, as if they were anywhere else. They had large exclusive privileges, and exercised large powers of police over the citizens. They had a distinct historical character, a separate social *status*, and a distinct *esprit du corps*. It was an accident that they were within the limits of the city and town which had the Parliamentary franchise. The creation of bad blood between the Universities and the citizens would be the infallible and necessary result of this attempt to depart from the Act of 1832, and to force upon these boroughs the resident Members of the Universities, who might be qualified under the Bill as it came from the House of Lords. Look at the inconsistency of this proceeding. Upon the same principle upon which they forced these persons upon the Parliamentary representation they ought to introduce them into the municipal corporations. But the Universities were excluded from the municipal franchise, and exempted from ordinary liability to municipal burdens, and were rated under special Acts of Parliament. The Universities were in a peculiar and exceptional position. The resident members were divided into two classes, senior and junior. As to these two classes, there were separate arguments tending in the same direction. The senior members must all belong to the Church of England. It would not be just to admit to participation in the Parliamentary and political privileges of these towns an exclusive body—deeply tinged with an ecclesiastical influence—to which all the subjects of the realm were not equally admissible. As to the undergraduates who occupied lodgings out of College, they would remain there for so short a time that their case was not worth considering. As to those within the College walls the effect of this and another Amendment would be to enable all undergraduates who were ambitious of taking part in local politics to turn themselves into local politicians, although their connection with the town or city was most transitory, and only for the purposes of education. Although they were in *statu pupillari* they were invited by these Amendments to qualify themselves to meddle with the town politics, and to interfere with, and overrule, the choice of representatives, by the citizens of the towns, just on the eve of leaving the Universities. He could not but think that these arguments afforded good reasons even for the re-introduction of the words which were omitted on the Report, but he was not proposing as much as that. He was only asking the House to reject Amendments which were introduced with the express purpose of making this class lodgers, when by law they would not be in such a position, thus giving them privileges which the House of Commons had not conferred upon them.

Mr. LOWTHER said, he would not discuss a point upon which there had been six debates in one House or the other and three divisions. It was true that the proposal of the right hon. Member for Oxford was first adopted, that after full consideration the decision was reversed, and that that reversal had been confirmed by the House of Lords. The hon. and learned Member for Richmond now asked this House to stultify itself, by taking the opportunity, upon an Amendment of the Lords, to reverse the decision at which this House had arrived. The inquiries made by the noble Lord at the head of the Government confirmed the statement he had formerly made that the highest authorities in both the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were in favour of the proposal he had succeeded in carrying in that House. The words inserted did not apply merely to the occupants of College rooms. They would also enfranchise the occupiers of chambers let furnished in other places. He trusted that the House would not agree to the disfranchising Motion of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Mr. NEATE said, he held in his hand a resolution of the town council of Oxford, declaring that the provision giving the power to resident members of the University to vote for the borough was an unjust encroachment on the rights of the inhabitants of the borough, would interrupt the friendly relations between the city and the University, and greatly prejudice the performance of the public duties they had jointly to perform. He therefore hoped that for the sake of maintaining the peace and harmony existing between the University and the city of Oxford, the House would reject the Lords' Amendment.

Mr. SCHREIBER said, he wished to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he intended to exclude these gentlemen on the ground of the peculiar nature of their qualification, or of general policy? When the subject was last before the House the latter ground was given up. It could not be contended that educated men should be excluded from the franchise, and it was not for the House to avail itself of a legal quibble.

Mr. HENLEY said, that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Cardwell) had brought the House into the present difficulty by proposing his original Amendment which was not needed. It was not likely that members of the Universities would have voted for the boroughs as lodgers, except in very few instances. He voted against the exception which the right hon. Gentleman wished to establish. But the Lords' Amendment proposed to establish another exception against which he should also vote, as he wished things to be left to the general law. If the municipalities chose to rate the University buildings, the people who occupied them ought to have the vote under the general provisions of the Act of Parliament. He did not wish to have an exception one way or the other. Let the residents of the Universities be placed under the general law of the land, and if it would allow them to vote let them do so. He did not consider it a very important matter to let about 200 persons into a constituency of 4,000 or 5,000, and it could not be supposed they would all vote one way, for in these days such bodies were inclined to be somewhat liberal. But he did not see why a special definition should be made in order to bring in parties who under no other circumstances would have the vote as proposed.

Question, " That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Property Franchise in Counties).

Leave out Clause 5.

Mr. COLVILE moved that the House do disagree to the Amendment. He said it was not necessary for him to recapitulate all the arguments which were used when that clause was under discussion in this House. The question was ably and fully debated, and after a careful consideration of its merits the clause which he proposed was carried by a majority of 47 votes, including the votes of 13 Members on the other side of the House ; his simple duty now was to ask the House to abide by its decision. He thought that the Lords' Amendment with regard to the unrepresented copyholders must have been passed under a total misapprehension of the facts of the case. It had been argued by the Peer who proposed the omission of the clause that the copyholders and leaseholders resident in small boroughs would swamp the agricultural interest in the counties ; but anyone who had read the Reform Act of *William* must know that no copyholder or leaseholder could vote in respect of his copyhold or leasehold qualification situated in a borough provided any person voted in respect of the same property as an occupier. Therefore, by the adoption of household suffrage nearly all the copyholders and leaseholders in boroughs would be disqualified. Instead of diminishing the power of the agricultural interest, the adoption of this clause would materially increase it ; and if it was desired that property should be represented, Parliament would do a great injustice by withholding the franchise from £5 copyholders and leaseholders. With what show of justice could they withhold the franchise from the £5 copyholder whose property was worth from £150 to £200, while they gave it to an occupier of £12 in the county, whose property invested in his farm might not be worth more than £50 or £60. The great fault of this Bill was, that, having lowered the borough franchise, it had not kept pace in the same direction with the county franchise. With what justice could they deny a vote to the copyholder of £9 living just outside the borough when they gave one to the occupier of a hovel inside worth 20*s.* or 30*s.*? He therefore appealed to the House to give him their support, and he appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give him his support. He begged to remind him that in 1859 he made the same proposal as was contained in this clause. The Bill which was brought in by himself, Lord Stanley, and General Peel, gave the copyholder of £5 a vote without any condition whatever. He begged to remind the Chancellor of the Exchequer of a speech he made on the 17th of May, in which he said he always scrupulously endeavoured to fulfil the engagements he made with the House ; and in the same speech he said, the House having decided in favour of the Member for Derbyshire, " we bow to that decision." The Government having accepted his Amendment, he called upon them to keep faith with the House, and he appealed to the House with confidence to adhere to the decision it has already pronounced, and moved that the House should disagree to the Lords' Amendment.

Mr. PEASE said, the arguments in favour of the copyholder could not be got over. It was an act of great injustice to leave the copyholder at £10 while the freeholder was allowed to vote for a 40*s.* qualification. It was no question of admitting a new class to the franchise, but a question of mere justice to the copyholder, who could hardly be left at £10 when the county franchise was reduced from £50 to £12 and the borough franchise from £10 to nothing. The Amendment of the House of Lords was a most pitiful and paltry paring of the franchise against a class who deserved it as much as any other.

Mr. HUSSEY VIVIAN said, he had read with great attention what had passed in "another place," and he was at a loss to understand why the lowering of the franchise had been assented to in every case by the Upper House, except in that of the copyholder. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that evening, that with this exception the House of Lords had accepted every franchise proposed by the House of Commons. He had heard no argument in support of this petty and miserable Amendment, and he hoped the House would reject it.

Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put :—

The House *divided* :—Ayes 235; Noes 188: Majority 47.

Amendments as far as Amendment in page 5, "after Clause 8 insert Clauses A and B," *disagreed to.*

Clause A (Restriction as to Number of Votes in certain Counties and Boroughs),

MR. BRIGHT : I move that the House disagree with this Amendment. I was rather surprised at the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon this point, when I recollected the speech which he delivered when the same matter was before the House some few weeks ago. He concluded his speech by admitting that his views had not changed. That I knew without his saying it. It would be impossible for any person holding the view he held on a former occasion, and seeing the subject so clearly, to have changed his mind upon the matter. If the House will permit me —though, perhaps, I am leading a forlorn hope after the desertion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer — I will recall for a moment to the House what has taken place on this point. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) proposed a mode of giving Members in these large boroughs to the minority which is alleged now to be unrepresented. The proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was different from that which has come down from the House of Lords; but although it is different it really has the same object, and, doing it in a different way, would have brought about the same result. [Mr. LOWE : No!] The right hon. Gentleman says "No." I do not say it would bring about the same result with the same amount of minority in any borough. But the result would have been the same. Whether you take Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, or Leeds, the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman would have given to minorities a representation in this House, which is precisely what in all probability will be done by the clause which has come down from the House of Lords. The right hon. Gentleman—and I ask hon. Members on this side of the House to bear this in mind—acting in precise accordance with the noble and learned Lord in the Upper House by whom this change was proposed, suggested his change as a corrective of the Liberal, or probably he would have said democratic character of the Bill before the House. He did not propose it as a portion of a grand scheme to give to every person in the country, whether one of a minority, or one of a majority, a representative in this House, but as a proposal made necessary by the extravagant and perilous character of the Bill the Chancellor of the Exchequer had introduced, and which has been supported with so much good-will by hon. Gentlemen on that as well as on this side of the House. That proposal was supported by the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Viscount Cranborne) who has been perfectly consistent in everything he has done on this question, and by all those Gentlemen opposite who differ from the Government with regard to the question before the House. It was also supported by certain Members on this side who are in favour of representation of minorities—not because it is a corrective of a democratic measure, but because they think that everybody should be represented. I understood the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Mill) took that view. He, in a long, and very able, though, I must say, arising probably from the nature of the subject, a somewhat intricate speech, explained it as the plan proposed by Mr. Hare. But that plan is by no means a plan of representing minorities. It is a plan for representing everybody, in a way peculiar to his plan, and probably not to be accomplished by any other plan offered to the country. I think we have a right to complain of the hon. Member for Westminster and his friends, not that they are in favour of representing everybody, but that they are in favour of a proposal like this, which really does not represent everybody, but strikes off a large portion of the representative power which the population of this country enjoys; and does not effect in any degree that which my hon. Friend and his friends wish to be done by the establishment of Mr. Hare's system. It appears to me they have been taken—I want a suitable word to express my contempt for the proposal without expressing in the slightest degree anything offensive to hon. Members on this side; no man can conceive for a single moment that the hon. Member for Westminster, in the view he has taken on this question, has been actuated by any but the most honourable motives, perfectly consistent with everything he has written or said on the subject—but I say they have been taken by the phrase that in these four great boroughs you are about to give to the minorities a power which they did not possess. They therefore see in it, in some small degree, an approach to, or the admission of, a principle or of a plan which my hon. Friend and friends support, in which everybody would be represented, and such things as majorities and minorities never known. I think those Gentlemen who are in favour of Mr. Hare's plan are not in the slightest degree bound to support this plan. There is no intention at present on the part of the Government, or on the part of this House or of the House of Lords, or of any one in the country, to establish Mr. Hare's plan in this country. Carrying therefore this proposal only, or anything likely to follow this, is an unmixed injustice to the boroughs thus treated, is not likely to lead to the plan of Mr. Hare being adopted, and in all probability will create so much ill-will in a large borough to which it is applied, that we may be farther than ever from taking Mr. Hare's plan into consideration. When this question was formerly before the House of Commons the division was one of a very remarkable character. There were some Members on this side voted with some Members on the other side. There was a majority of 140 against the proposal. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made a speech on that occasion more earnest and full of feeling than any other speech he has made during the protracted discussion on this Bill. But the right hon. Gentleman now says the proposal was carried by a great majority in the House of Lords. The majority there was but 90—here it was 140. A majority so large on a matter which so particularly affects us and our constituencies—a majority of 140—is much more important in a matter of this kind than a majority of 90 in the other House. I do not recollect the precise words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but I think he said it was a scheme to introduce into the House all sorts of crotchety people. I have no objection to crotchety people. I believe there must be all sorts of people in this House. I have never been in the House that there has not been at least one Member generally believed by the rest of the Members to be not quite strong—and excuses were made for his eccentric conduct because he was not as responsible as others. That will always be the case in the British House of Commons. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said he did not want the introduction of crotchety people, but he condemned the proposal on stronger grounds, on grounds of the highest policy and constitutional principles. The Gentlemen I see opposite, and those not before convinced—as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) was—accepted the arguments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I cannot presume to say that they were influenced by my arguments, although I offered them with as much force as I could. I think the arguments of the Chancellor of the Exchequer were unanswerable. Then what did Lord Derby say in the House of Lords? I presume we can speak of exalted persons who from an exalted place send Amendments down here. Lord Derby said the principle was entirely unconstitutional, and that—

> "Its mischief would only be bounded by the extent or the narrowness of its operation."

I shall not pretend to have a greater reverence for Lord Derby than hon. Gentlemen opposite have; I have often thought him rash; I have often thought him unwise; and I have often had occasion during twenty-four years of political life to be in opposition to his views. But I think when he, as Prime Minister, having considered this question of Reform minutely since last Session expresses an opinion on a point of this nature so strong, backed by the opinion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and of his friends, and backed by a vote of more than 300 — I forget how many voted, but the majority was 140—I have a right to state that his opinion as Prime Minister on a matter of this nature is one we should not lightly pass by. I think hon. Gentlemen opposite, if they will bear in mind the tone of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, will feel that he adhered to his original opinion, and would have preferred that the House of Lords had not made the alteration. I think they may feel that they will only be carrying out what is for the true interest of the country and what is the true wish of the Government if they adhere to the vote they gave, when the question was before us on a former occasion. I said I thought our vote of more importance than that of the House of Lords. I do not pretend to say the House of Lords has not full power to consider this Bill and pass Amendments upon it. They have the legal and the constitutional power to do that, and we have no right to call it in question. But in a matter affecting the fundamental principles of our representation, affecting the power of our representatives—of a considerable number of the Members of this House—affecting the status of Members of this House—the opinion and vote of the House of Commons is necessarily and must be of more weight than the vote of the House of Lords. It is a question of delicacy. It is possible that the House of Lords would not enter into any contest with regard to this, and that whatever the House of Commons decided to do would be accepted with that moderation and dignity to which the right hon. Gentleman has paid—as he believes, and as I hope—so just a tribute. What is the change you are about to make? It is a fundamental change. There is no precedent for it in our Parliamentary history. You affect by it the very foundation of what I may call the constitution of your constituencies. I have said elsewhere that the alteration proposed has never been asked for. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), I understand, presented a Petition in favour of it from Birmingham. I am sorry it should come from Birmingham—that there should be a petition from Birmingham signed by a number of persons in favour of the change. [Mr. NEWDEGATE: 4,000!] Well, I will not dispute about numbers in regard to a town of 400,000 inhabitants. That is not an overwhelming consideration, especially as the 4,000 have just smarted from a defeat—I will not say an ignominious one, for it was not ignominious. At all events, they have not been able to seat a Member for the minority, having been outvoted by their fellow-townsmen. I am sorry that men who were unable to return their candidate for Birmingham by a fair majority should come and ask this House, in obedience to the mandate of the House of Lords, to allow him to take his seat by the votes of the minority. With the exception of that case this proposal has never been asked for by the House of Commons, by any constituency, by Petition, or at any public meeting. Never has there been a minority defeated fairly—I speak not of drink, or coercion, or bribery, and corruption—who did not accept that defeat in a fair spirit, and look forward to the time when, by the growth of their opinions and of their numbers, that minority would ultimately become a majority. For 600 years—as far as our Parliamentary annals go back, and one of the learned Clerks at the table can tell us how far they go back—the principle of Parliamentary election has been this, that the majority of the voices of a constituency to which the Writ of the Crown has issued should elect a Member or Members to sit in this House, and no others. Bear this in mind. You are urged to accept this proposal of a most important character, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has denounced in the strongest language, of which Lord Derby says the mischief can only be bounded by the narrowness of its operation—when it has never come before the public for discussion. In all the discussions which have taken place this year or last year, at all the meetings which have been held, under roof or the open sky, there has been no debate, discussion, or consideration on the principle now offered to us in this clause as it has come down to this House. I would suggest, without unfairly urging my views, that the House of Commons should at least suspend its judgment in favour of this proposal until it has been a longer period before the country, and the constituencies have had an opportunity of considering it and making up their minds upon it. It is often said that we are not delegates; but if we are not delegates, we are not rulers. We are sent here to represent the general views of our constituents. We have morally no power to cut off the influence of those constituents—to make fundamental changes in the Constitution, and to vary, alter, and overthrow the practice of 600 years. This House is not in favour of it; a majority of 140 voted against it. You have no moral right, therefore, to agree to such a proposal, because a House which is not representative, which has no direct influence in the matter, and no Member of which can vote for a Member of this House, or without the infringement of our rules influence a vote at his election, chooses to suggest it. It is an unintelligible and unbelievable thing that this House should under these circumstantances agree to a proposal making this fundamental change in our Constitution, and altering and crippling the power of four of the largest constituencies in the kingdom. What are these four constituencies you are asked thus to treat? I appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer; I know some of the difficulties of his position. Still he is accessible to reason, and he has been disposed to take the House very much into his confidence. If a census were taken, those four boroughs would be found to contain a population of nearly, if not quite, 1,500,000. What was done when the Bill was passing through Committee? It was proposed that an additional Member should be given to several boroughs. First of all, six boroughs were proposed for this honour. The number was afterwards limited to four. The hon. Member for Liverpool proposed three should have an additional Member. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a moment of very good humour, got up at the table and said, "Not three, but four additional Members shall be given." He not only received the proposal handsomely but he dealt with it generously, and gave four Members to four of the largest boroughs. Look at those four boroughs. There is Liverpool, with its commercial interests, and with a port perhaps the largest in the world. Look at Manchester, with its 400,000 population, and vast manufacturing interests. Look at Birmingham, the very centre and heart of the island, also with a population of 400,000, and with interests which I need not describe, because they are well known to the House. Look at Leeds, the centre and capital of the county of York. [Mr. LEEMAN: No, no!] My hon. Friend the Member for York is quite at liberty to dispute that; still the House will not say that I have overcharged the picture in describing these four boroughs. They asked the House to grant them additional representation. They wanted more than one new Member. They said that their population was great, their interest beyond arithmetical computation, and their influence in the country large. They asked the House for greater representation. The House unanimously consented, for I will undertake to say there was as much satisfaction on that side as there was on this —when the Chancellor of the Exchequer said he would give these additional Members to the four boroughs I have named. If it were a question of minorities, I might say to my hon. Friend behind me and to others there are these 1,500,000 in those four boroughs who are now represented by eight Members only, and if this Bill passes they will have twelve Members only—I am not speaking whether they sit on that side of the House or this—I believe my opinion would be exactly the same, and just as strong, if I represented any other of the boroughs as it is representing Birmingham. As the Bill went to the Upper House these four boroughs would have twelve representatives, and when there was a great question before the country—as for example the question of the character of the administration, or the question of a further change in Parliamentary representation, or the condition of Ireland—and I might mention many other questions in which the case would arise—these twelve Members would be eight on one side of the House and four on the other, and the four on the one side would, of course, neutralize four out of the eight sitting on the other. So that, assuming party ties to be adhered to, these four boroughs with a million and a half of population would be so entirely emasculated and crippled by the proposal now submitted to the House, that only really four names would be found affecting any of those great questions to which I have referred. I do not think anybody is prepared to deny that statement. I put it the other day at Manchester in this way—that the borough of Salford, which is only part of Manchester, is to return two Members under this Bill, and that Manchester itself is to return three Members. But nothing can be more clear than this—that in all great divisions in this House henceforth, if this proposal be admitted, the voice of Manchester will be less potent than the voice of Salford. I say that is utterly at variance with all the principles of representation, and with the whole practice of the Constitution of this country. But what can the House say to these boroughs? When the Chancellor of the Exchequer accepted the proposal of the hon. Member for Liverpool, and when the House entirely agreed with him, and when these boroughs expressed the great satisfaction which they felt at the mode in which they had been treated, there was not a single syllable said that in giving these new Members you were to give them in such a manner as should not increase, but should actually diminish their power in this House. There is no case on record in the annals of Parliament in which a borough, however small in point of Members and contemptible in influence in comparision with these I have mentioned, has ever been treated in a manner so unfair, so ungenerous, and so unjust. I can speak for Manchester, and I can speak for Birmingham, and I say that the great majority of the present, and the proposed future constituents—nay, a great majority of the population of these two great towns, would have rejected, as I certainly should have voted against, the proposal that additional Members were to be given to them, if I had believed the House would only consent to give more additional Members under this crippling and injurious clause. There is one other point before I have done, and I put this to hon. Members. We have a preliminary election which is called the nomination. We have the hustings, the candidates, the electors, and the population all gathered round. The name of every candidate is submitted to the electors, and every elector who is present is called upon by the returning officer to hold up his hand in favour of the candidate of his choice. If there be no contest, and nobody demands a poll, the lifting up of the hand is made the actual and conclusive election of the Members. How are you to reconcile that constitutional practice with this unconstitutional innovation? Here is a man who can vote in Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, and Leeds at the hustings for three candidates—Three Liberals or three Conservatives—I have nothing to do with party in this matter, and I should think it contemptible to introduce a question of party into it. That man at the hustings will hold up his hand for the three candidates he wishes to be elected. When he goes to the poll should one be demanded, following out the constitutional process already began, he ought to be able to vote for all the Members to be elected, but under this system he is only to vote for two. Therefore, you establish an extraordinary and entirely novel and unconstitutional difference and discrepancy between the preliminary election at the hustings, and the subsequent and final election at the poll. What you are wanting to do is a thing which is absurd upon the face of it. You take a constituency which has always hitherto been held to be a united and compact body, and you propose that it should return two voices at one election, and that by an arrangement ordered, not by this House, but recommended by the other House of Parliament, this constituency is to speak in two voices—one end of the constituency shall be allowed to say this, and the other end shall be allowed to say that. There are jugglers whom we have seen exhibiting their clever tricks—pouring out port, champagne, milk, and water, from one and the same bottle. The proposal resembles this. The scheme is, that an electoral body, by a peculiar contrivance hitherto unknown, and I will undertake to say, if ever heard of, only despised, shall not be asked, but shall be made to do this—to return two Members to sit on this side and one on the other or *vice versâ.* We are told that the result will be admirable, because we shall put an end to animosities, contests, and the expenditure of elections—in fact, nothing is to be so charming as the tranquillity and good humour to prevail in all these boroughs. But look at Huntingdon. There has been the greatest tranquillity in that borough for the last thirty years. Ever since the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (General Peel) went there there has been hardly a single contest. In all that time nothing can be more admirable than the way things have been managed. But Huntingdon is not a centre of political life. If all the boroughs of England were like Huntingdon, the political life of the country would be extinguished—its freedom would be extinguished — and when once England's freedom has gone, I wonder what there would be left in the country worth preserving. One word of caution, if the House will permit me, before I close. You are about to give to many hundred thousands of your countrymen not hitherto possessing it, a vote for a representative in Parliament. Lord Derby said last night, or a night or two ago, in the House of Lords, that you were taking a leap in the dark, and he trusts somehow or other that the ground upon which you are about to alight will be soft, and that you will not be much injured. But you are admitting this number of persons who have never hitherto had a vote in boroughs, and you ought to be guided by the ancient principles of the Constitution, by those principles which have been laid down for us by our ancestors and forefathers. You want those you are admitting to the franchise to be guided by the ancient principles of the Constitution in all that they do when they have power, in order that they may not depart from that great chart which I hope in some degree they have studied, and which was laid down by our ancestors and forefathers in this House. Suppose you depart from it in this matter that we are now discussing, and introduce something entirely novel that cannot be defended by argument—for nobody in my opinion has ever attempted to defend it—the Chancellor of the Exchequer never heard of an argument about it which he thought worth answering—if you introduce something so entirely novel and so offensive, is it not possible that those who will have power after this Bill passes may think also that there are many fantastic things which they might do, and doing them would be as much justified as the House now are in doing this? When I have addressed great meetings of my countrymen I have always advised them to adhere strongly to that which is constitutionally and morally right. If they at any future time, whilst I am in Parliament or in any degree of prominence before the country, attempt to do things with regard to your class or order which I believe to be morally or constitutionally wrong, I shall be as firm in opposing them as I have been in supporting the rights which they have demanded. And I lament over the possibility of such a proposal as this being acceded to, because I am certain that it will afford an example hereafter to those who may wish to follow, not in this precise direction, but in some other direction which they may equally justify, but which may be very perilous and injurious to the country. I enter my protest against this proposal on all grounds. I enter it as one of the Members for a great constituency to which the other day you offered an additional Member, and from which you are now about to take one-half of their present political power. I say that constituency would prefer that the Member you are about to give it had been given to Keighley, St. Helens, Barnsley, or Luton, as first proposed, than that it should be given under such conditions as you now wish to impose. I saw 5,000 men only two nights ago in the Free Trade Hall in Manchester. It was not a packed meeting. Everybody in Manchester had a right to go. I believe about 1,000 paid to do so, and 4,000 or 5,000 went in free. They unanimously passed a Petition that has been presented to-night by my hon. Friend the Member for Manchester, and in it they prayed the House to do one of three things. They asked that either the borough might be divided as in the case of Glasgow—and why should Glasgow be in a better position as to its third Member than Liverpool, or Birmingham, or Manchester, or Leeds?—or that the majority should decide the election as at present, or, failing either of these courses, that the House should withdraw the fatal gift of an additional Member who is merely to be paired off against one of their present Members. Will you refuse that Petition? Has there ever been a case like this in the annals of the English Parliament where a great constituency besought you not to confer upon them additional representation because you were going to give it in a manner notoriously destructive of their existing political power? I say, then, as one of the Members for Birmingham, I wholly protest against this proposal. What will you do with my Colleague if I should be humiliated to sit for a borough in which I cannot say that I have been elected by the majority of the voices of the constituency? What will you say to the Member for the minority of Birmingham? Suppose we had had within the last few months three Members for Birmingham, and suppose, which is an impossible supposition, that my lamented Friend and late Colleague had been the Member for the minority. At his death there must have been a new writ issued for a Member for Birmingham. Would you, by any clause in this Bill, or in any future Bill, prevent the majority of that constituency from voting for his successor? What could you do in in such a case? Or suppose that my hon. Colleague the Member for the minority in a future Parliament, if I should be unfortunate enough to be associated with such an one, proved serviceable to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord Derby invited him to take a seat in his Government. Under this very Bill you have enacted that those who take certain offices shall be re-elected. But if he went down as Member for the minority of Birmingham who is to elect him. Do you think the two-thirds who support myself and Colleague would be so condescending as to return your minority Member to sit as a part of a Government to which they are opposed? The whole matter is so monstrous and so unconstitutional, that I feel that I am humiliating you or myself in discussing it. No, I am not humiliating you, because you do not believe in it—you believe in the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Well, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in one of the most impressive speeches ever made in this House—and no man speaks more impressively than he does when he speaks from his heart—opposed this scheme. You believed him, and voted with him. He thinks now as he thought then. He has followed my speech from beginning to end, and there is not a single word which he is prepared at this moment to contradict. This is not a question of mere convenience to the Government or of acquiescence with the House of Lords. The House of Lords has done what it thought right, and if you should disagree the House of Lords will consult, not only the interests of the country and the dignity of the House of Commons, but its own dignity, in acquiescing in the view you take. You are a responsible and representative body. You have powers. Though they cannot be written exactly, and though you cannot take a clause from the Constitution which shall strictly define them, you have powers that are far above the powers of the Monarchy or of the aristocracy in the House of Peers. Of those powers you cannot divest yourself. They spring from the very source of your existence, for you come from the people throughout the length and breadth of the country. You cannot and you dare not—I say you dare not—betray their rights and desert their interests. I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman will say I am speaking strongly and passionately, because I am one of the Members whose constituents are interested specially in this matter. I do not deny it. I should be ashamed of myself if I did not admit that it made some difference in the earnestness and warmth of my feelings with regard to it. But if I went out of the House to-night—and I would rather go out of it to-night than vote for this proposal or sit for a constituency as the representative of the minority—if I were to leave the House to-night and never to return to it, I should entertain the same feeling, and should express it with the same warmth and earnestness with which I submit my views at this moment to the House. May I ask the House to lift themselves just for a moment from any narrow view of party? It is not a question of party; let us put that aside altogether. Let us not suppose for a moment that we are going to injure or aid the Government—there is nothing of that kind in it. It will be greatly to the credit of Lord Derby and of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the historic character of their measure that it should not be defaced by a great evil like this. I am speaking in their interest as much as any can do who have supported this Bill. Let us, therefore, get rid of the feeling of party —of the feeling that we are going to vote for or against the Government. Let us get rid of all feeling except that this change has been recommended to us by the House of Lords, in which there cannot be either the same knowledge or the same interest in the matter which exists in this House. Let us look at this simply as it refers to the great body in whose names we sit and speak here. Let us look at it in reference to that grand old freedom which our forefathers struggled for and secured, and maintained, and the advantages of which, from the day of our birth till this hour, we have been constantly enjoying. If this proposal had come before this House at the time when the great men, the giants of the English Constitution, sat in this House, they would have treated it in a manner far less decorous than we shall treat it. There is no name that appears among the great men of that day, parents of English freedom, which would not have been found among the names of those who shall this day say "No!" to the Lords' proposal.

Moved, "That this House do disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment." —(*Mr. Bright.*)

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he was unable to rise to the heights of democratic Toryism which had been reached by the hon. Member for Birmingham. He did not think the hon. Member would charge him with any dislike of standing in the old ways; but when new roads were made, he was not to be blamed if he sought to have them of easy gradients and smooth tunnels. The hon. Member had drawn a gloomy picture of the humiliation which would befall the borough of Birmingham if he and his present Colleague were to be unequally yoked with a Conservative or a moderate Liberal. But, if Birmingham would be humiliated by having two Members voting on one side and one on another, what was the fate of those boroughs which had only two Members, and yet whose politics were divided? The hon. Member talked as if every borough that returned two Members returned them of the same side. But look at the borough which he (Mr. Beresford Hope) represented. It was not so big as Birmingham, but it had more than 100,000 inhabitants; and, as Birmingham was the seat of one of our great staple manufactures, so Stoke-upon-Trent was that of another. He (Mr. Beresford Hope) was the majority representative for Stoke-upon-Trent, as the hon. Member opposite was the majority Member for Birmingham, while the minority Member was his hon. Friend, whose absence from the House at that time they all must cheerfully accept, considering the event which had called him away. He believed that on every ground the Conservatives were entitled to return one Member for Stoke-upon-Trent; but he was also of opinion that, from their wealth, position, intellect, and numbers, the Liberals of Stoke-upon-Trent were likewise entitled to send their Member to Parliament. Well, one Conservative and one Liberal were returned by the borough. Would the hon. Member for Birmingham say it was humiliated in consequence of that circumstance? Would he say that it was not represented at all, but so to speak, suppressed from the difference of voting? So far was he himself from taking such a view, that he had refused to bring down a second Conservative because he believed it would be tyranny to do so. There were, say, 55,000 Conservatives and 45,000 Liberals in Stoke-upon-Trent. Now, would it be fair that either of those parties should be unrepresented? By the existing arrangement the whole population of Stoke-upon-Trent was better served in the House than if either the one which was just over or the one which was just under the entire half of the constituency were unrepresented. So much for the case of the two-handed boroughs; and, if they took the case of the future three-handed boroughs, it was a juggling with words, and a misrepresentation of facts, to say that the representation of minorities would deprive the majorities in those boroughs of a fair share of representation in that House. If, indeed, the Members which the constituencies were to send were only so many counters which the clerk could tell at the table—if, in this House, they were only to count noses—to use a vulgar but expressive phrase—that might be true; but how could they stand upon that assertion when each Member had to speak as well as vote? If the minority in Birmingham should secure a Member who would equal the hon. Member (Mr. Bright) *plus* his Colleague, in eloquence, it would give them a very great advantage indeed; and there might be, in that improbable case, some excuse for the complaint; but he denied that otherwise giving the third Member for that borough to the minority would be a political injustice to the borough as a whole, or to its majority. If hon. Members came to the House of Commons merely to be told off, there would be something in the hon. Member's arguments; but in no other sense could the influence of the two Liberal Members for Birmingham be counterbalanced, for each could speak, and each would vote; and their joint votes would mean two, neither more nor less, whether some other vote, given by somebody else on the other side, were that of a man who called himself Member for Birmingham or for Tipperary. The hon. Member, whom he was happy to see on the front Opposition Bench—(Mr. Bright was in conversation with Mr. Gladstone)—for no man had a better right to that position, and he would be on the other front Bench hereafter—had drawn a touching picture of the four towns which had, at present, eight Members, and would have had twelve, but which, if this Amendment of the Lords were adopted, would only have four; but, if he might ask the hon. Gentleman to descend from the regions of eloquence to those of plain fact, he would invite him to examine how matters really stood in these four boroughs. Manchester had two Liberal Members, Liverpool had two Conservative Members; so that those two boroughs wrote each other off. Leeds had one Liberal Member and one Conservative. Thus, its two Members wrote each other off. Birmingham, however, had the good fortune to be represented by two Liberals; so that, according to the doctrine of the hon. Member, the whole four boroughs were represented by his Colleague and himself. To what an absurdity was this principle reduced. Let them argue the question on the ground of common sense. The hon. Gentleman was the great advocate of numbers; "great is the power of King Mob" might be his motto. He never could deal with any number under thousands. He was in favour of the multitude because it was many. He had just told the House of his having addressed an assembly of 5,000 in Free Trade Hall, Manchester, as an important arithmetical fact. He would therefore argue the matter with the hon. Gentleman on his own chosen arithmetical principle. It stood to common sense that in all those big towns the minority was big because the majority was big. In Manchester, where the majority counted by thousands, the minority must be very large. It was the same in the other wide boroughs. Now, if the minorities in those boroughs should not be enabled to return a Member, many thousands of electors would be left unrepresented in every place.

Well, but the minorities of Birmingham or Manchester would amount to 10,000 at least, and so they would make as respectable a constituency as the householders of Honiton. It was in this light that he pleaded for their enfranchisement. He contended that we were re-casting the Constitution; we might admit the principle of two constituencies co-existing in the same place, and each having the right to their own representatives, just as if they were in different towns. Certainly, such constituencies represented something more intelligent, respectable, and wealthy, than some of the puny agricultural boroughs which had been left. If they were to go back to the old times of the Constitution—if they were to do all that their ancestors had done, and nothing more—as the present doctrine of the hon. Member for Birmingham commanded them to do, there was an end to the question. But they were embarking on an unknown sea—they had discovered an unknown world, which might be Paradise, or might be somewhere else—and the old ships were of no use against the steamers and the iron-clads. Could not they endeavour to find out if there might not be some new and philosophical principles of representation which it would be worth while to try? The hon. Member for Birmingham was startled at the fact that some 5,000 people had petitioned against having another Member as an unheard-of event. But, if he had read that amusing book, Sir Francis Palgrave's *Merchant and Friar*, he would have seen that it was the normal condition of boroughs of those old times, which he now so much admires, to shirk the trouble and expense of being represented in Parliament. The Government compelled the boroughs to return Members much against their will, and out of them grew the present House of Commons. The House ought to bear in mind that, by the great change now being made, the existing electoral system would be dislocated. They were enfranchising millions whose virtues and electoral excellence had yet to be shown; who had, no doubt, many merits, but who were, as a mass, loud, turbulent, and changeable, by the showing of their own advocates. In face of this vast influx, men of enlightenment, thought, and refinement, were coming forward *in formâ pauperis* and asking that they should be admitted to a share in the privileges of the franchise. The newly-enfranchised millions might have all the virtues which were attributed to them, but they had not had any political education; while, whatever might be the faults of the old governing class, that class had made England what she is—that class produced the men who had given England civil and religious liberty—who had formed the Reform Bill of 1832, and who had established Free Trade. That great governing class was now deposed; in time its members might recover their powers. He hoped that would be the case, for they were the men who had mastered the deep science of ruling commonwealths; but, for the present, there were new gods in our temples, new Sovereigns on our thrones. But the old governing classes surely had a right to some place being retained for them in that political edifice which their genius had built up. By governing classes he meant no party combination. He claimed alike for Whig and Tory the old dignity of which both had proved themselves so worthy. He equally deprecated the Tory monopoly in counties and the Liberal monopoly in boroughs. What he wanted was that all should be equally represented. A county Liberal would hold his politics from an agricultural point of view, and a borough Tory would be one from a borough point of view; and they had therefore four distinct classes — the borough Tory and Liberal, and county Tory and Liberal, moderating and mitigating each other. Let this underrating influence, then, be equally distributed by a mode of minority representation extended over more constituencies than the fortunate twelve, and the just indignation of those who find themselves disfranchised for the past services of themselves and of their predecessors to the State will be sensibly appeased. When he heard the speech of his right hon. Friend the Member for South Lancashire he could not but recollect that the right hon. Gentleman had been a Member of Lord Aberdeen's Government, by which a Bill was brought in proposing the formation of fifty unicorn constituencies, accompanied by the adoption in them of a mode of voting similar to that which had been now carried in the House of Lords. But the Parliament of those days in its blindness listened to those who were now upon the Treasury Bench, and who said that the principle was new-fangled, and so that Bill died partly from the cold-shoulder, and partly, he admitted, from the Crimean war. Had that Bill been carried, we should have heard nothing of this present measure, and we should probably have, for many years, been living under a Government formed of the great middle, constitutional class, under whose guidance we should have had good and stable policy with none of those miserable complications, and heartburnings, and suspicions of treachery and tergiversation which have precipitated an extreme change complicated by the shipwreck of honour and the bankruptcy of confidence in men and measures

SIR J. CLARKE JERVOISE said, that he represented a three-cornered constituency and could not help thinking that the minority ought to have a Member. Minorities were very important bodies. As a proof he might advert to the fact that this Bill was carried through Parliament by Ministers who did not possess a majority. He trusted that some one more eloquent than himself would do justice to the proposal.

MR. SCOURFIELD said, that if they had determined to abide by the old ways of the Constitution the representation of minorities might not have been necessary. But having by this Bill made so great a change there was some danger if they did not agree to this Amendment, of their becoming obstructive of all that was Conservative, and Conservative of all that was obstructive. He had voted for the proposal when made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe); he would therefore support it in its present form. He cordially agreed with what the hon. Member for Westminster had said a few evenings previously—that he would not desire to see oppression practised even by the side to which he was most attached. The fact was that at present the representation of many counties and boroughs was equally divided. He remembered the time when a Conservative and a Liberal (Mr. Horsfall and Mr. Ewart), represented Liverpool, and he had never heard that the inhabitants of that town regarded themselves as humiliated by the existence of such a state of things. From personal knowledge, he could bear testimony to the fact that the interests of the town itself were never lost sight of by either of the Members, who, whenever the occasion arose, made common cause in their support. When the hon. Member for Birmingham said that the liberties of England would be destroyed if there were no election contests, he could not help thinking that the hon. Member spoke as if the life-blood of all the election agents and lawyers in the kingdom were flowing in his veins. Election contests were frequently unmitigated curses, and many places had been seriously injured by their means. The hon. Gentleman considered that the freedom and glory of the Constitution was gone if they had no more contested elections. The country would be better and happier with fewer election contests. What had they done for Reigate, Lancaster, Totnes, and Great Yarmouth ? As to the representation of minorities the law attached great importance to minorities. So great indeed was the importance attached that we ran the risk of grave injury, rather than we would violate the principle of overlooking their rights and privileges. In the case of jurymen a minority of even one was sufficient to let loose upon the country the most atrocious criminals. Had there been but one dissenting juryman on Palmer's trial, he would have been let loose to poison perhaps twenty or thirty more people. The representation of minorities under this Bill only affected three or four towns and a few counties. In counties there was sometimes a little jealousy between the districts in which the Member did not reside and that in which he lived. But in boroughs which were rarely represented by residents, no such jealousy could arise. The arguments in favour of agreeing to this Amendment were of far greater weight than those which had been urged against it.

MR. BUXTON said, he wished to touch upon one point which had not he thought received the attention it deserved. Valuable as would be the other results of the adoption of the proposed arrangements, not one of them would be of greater importance than that it would call forth political vigour and life in the constituencies to which it was applied. It was curious that those who had not given the subject much consideration objected to the proposal because they said that by extinguishing contests it would destroy political vitality. Its effect would be exactly the reverse. It would be of singular use in preventing political stagnation. That would be clear if, instead of dealing with the question in the abstract, they took an example. Take, for example, the town of Birmingham, in which it was proposed to adopt the plan. Could there be a doubt that if no such arrangement were made Birmingham would henceforth return three Gentlemen of the same political hue ? The Liberal Committee would select three candidates, and the majority of householders in the borough would be certain to support them. If there ever were a contest, it would be a contest between Liberals bidding against each other. But in all human probability there would be no contest at all. The electors, a large and important body of men, who were not so numerous and who might not go so far in their political views as the mass of small householders, would be politically extinct. They would feel it totally hopeless to attempt to carry a candidate, and they would resign themselves with more or less bitterness to political death. They would feel that they were altogether excluded from any influence whatever over the destinies of their country; not merely that they could not hope to rule it, but that they could not even be represented in the council of the nation. They, accordingly, would sink into hopeless apathy. The majority, on the other hand, having everything their own way, not having the advantage of being opposed, and forced to struggle and strive, would themselves also be likely to grow at once apathetic, arrogant, and tyrannical. He was not devising this state of things out of his own imagination. They knew that exactly this had happened in many instances both across the water and in certain constituencies at home, where one party, Conservative or Liberal, had held irresistible sway. It would be invidious to do so, otherwise he could easily remind the House of boroughs close at hand, and counties in which utter political apathy and stagnation had resulted from the feeling of the minority that any exertion of theirs must be in vain. But, suppose, that instead of all the three seats being at the disposal of one Commitmittee, the arrangement now proposed were adopted. Immediately every elector in the constituency would be stirred into life. Those who belonged to the minority, instead of giving up the whole affair as a bad job, shrugging their shoulders, and feeling that although they were Englishmen they were as destitute of political influence as if they were so many Indians, would immediately begin to organize themselves as a party, they would form a committee, they would look out for a candidate and combine to carry him. Very possibly no contest would ensue. But there would be as much demand for strenuous exertions and for individual self-sacrifice on the part of the minority as if a contest were certain. Political death would be exchanged for political animation. To the majority also this change would bring no less cause of excitement and vigour. Instead of sleepily accepting their three candidates, and carrying them without an effort, the party would be driven to keep its machinery in high order, to choose the best candidates that could be found, and to strain every nerve to hold their own. Both parties would be kept on the alert. Yet, though each party would thus be compelled to be on the alert, and to maintain its vigour, actual contests would, probably, be rare. The advantage of the arrangement would be that it would give all the political activity that contests are supposed to engender, without that grievous moral injury that contests almost inevitably inflict. These eleven constituencies would contain 2,300,000 persons. If the minority should not be able to carry its candidate, no harm could ensue. But if they carried them all they must represent a body of some 600,000 or 700,000 persons. It could only be for the advantage of all parties in the State that such a body, including a large proportion of the wealth and intelligence of the country, should not be excluded from all share of influence upon their destiny. It would be for the benefit not only of the minority, but of the majority. It would be for the advantage of Parliament and the whole country, that the minority should obtain some share of political power, and have a stimulus to exert themselves when an election was impending. He believed that the advantages of the plan were so great that if it were adopted as proposed in the Bill it would commend itself to the common sense of the country, and in a short period be further extended.

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL said, that as a representative of one of the three-cornered constituencies, which under the operation of the Lords' Amendment would suffer partial disfranchisement, he trusted he should be excused addressing a few words to the House on the present question. It would lead to a partial disfranchisement of constituencies, and was inconsistent with the other provisions of a Bill the great boast of which was that it was an enfranchising measure. When suddenly the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to give a third Member to certain boroughs by way of additional representation, he voted against that proposal. Again, when the cumulative vote was under discussion, he successfully moved the adjournment of the debate. If his constituents were to be knocked on the head, he preferred that the operation should be performed in the light of day rather than they should be smothered by night. This had the effect of raising an important discussion on the subject, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer made the speech which had been so much commented on. To that speech he would rather not make too much reference, lest he should degenerate into personality, which might be wrong to the right hon. Gentleman, and which would be distasteful to himself. A division took place on the cumulative vote in a House consisting of 314 Members. The decision which the Lords' Amendment proposed to rescind was come to by a majority of 141 in the Commons, being only 1 less than the entire number who voted on the question of the representation of minorities in the House of Lords. He might be told that the two proposals were different, but he thought it was a difference without a distinction. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) whom he might call the uncle of the measure, had stated that, of course, there were different ways of accomplishing the same object. When it was said that this scheme was to be tried as an experiment, he (Sir Charles Russell) asked what need was there for an experiment, as any schoolboy with a slate and pencil could show how it would work? The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) had stated that it would be wise to give the principle a moderate application at first, until experience showed how it worked. The noble and learned Lord whom he might call the father of this measure (Lord Cairns), stated, on the other hand, that any proposal for the representation of the minority in a constituency returning two Members was open to great objection, and that his proposal had great merit as compared with the system of cumulative voting, because it could not be carried in its application beyond three-cornered constituencies. Thus, those who advocated the scheme most, differed in the interpretation and application to be given to it. It was said that the plan was only to apply to eleven or twelve constituencies. The noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Viscount Cranborne) speaking on this question, made use of an argument which was substantially merely an expression of alarm at the terrible influx of the democratic element. Did he mean to say that the eleven or twelve Members returned by minorities could by any possible arrangement be strong enough to stem this terrible tide of democracy? There was nothing in that magical number that could oppose itself with success to the rush of democratic principles. What was the argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne? He said—

> "This is the last offer that can be made before you put it out of your power to do anything to remedy the violence of the changes you are making. Woe to us if we refuse it our thoughtful attention."—[3 *Hansard*, clxxxviii. 1041.]

The arguments which had been used in support of the scheme were three phases of fear. The argument of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford was that of alarm, the argument of Lord Cairns was one of anxiety, while that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Calne was one of woe. He did not share in the nightmare of any noble army of croakers. He felt no alarm. He had no anxiety. He conjured up no woe. What he had given, he had not given in distrust, but in confidence and faith.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN: Sir, as I am about to give a vote different from that which will be given by many of those to whose judgment in political matters I am accustomed to defer, I must ask the indulgence of the House whilst I explain the reasons of that vote. And however much I may regret to differ from some of my hon. Friends near me, I have the consolation of knowing that I do not do so without the sanction of high authority. For, Sir, the scheme which we are now discussing has not only received the support of a large minority in this House—a minority taken in tolerably equal proportions from each of the two great political parties—but it has been approved by a large majority of the other House of Parliament, a majority including the names of men whose whole lives have been identified with the growth and progress of Liberal opinion in this country. And, Sir, it is to a scheme which has been sanctioned by such men as these that within the last few days the hon. Member for Birmingham has thought it consistent with his duty to apply such terms as "childish," "nefarious," "odious," "dangerous," "mischievous," "ludicrous," and I know not what beside. Sir, I shall not attempt to rival my hon. Friend in the application of hard epithets. Such expressions, according to my humble understanding, tend to irritate without convincing, and are more likely to discredit the individual who employs them than to damage the cause against which they are directed. But Sir, to-night, as the hon. Member has condescended to quit vituperation and to come to argument, I will gladly meet him upon that field. Now, what are the arguments of the hon. Gentleman. Taking Birmingham as an instance, he says this—"My Colleague and I represent the community of Birmingham—that town ought to have a much larger representation than such a borough as Arundel. But if you give a third Member to Birmingham, and allow the minority to elect him, he, paired off with one of the Members returned by the majority, will leave this large constituency practically represented by only one Member, that is, by a representation equal only to that of Arundel." But let me respectfully point out to the House what appears to me to be fallacious in this argument—that which the present Members for Birmingham really represent is the opinion—not of the whole community of Birmingham, but of a majority of some 6,000 or 7,000 electors as against some 4,000 or 5,000 other electors who differ from that opinion and are wholly unrepresented. And any comparison which may be instituted between Birmingham and Arundel—whether you try it by the test of population—or of property—or by whatever test you please—whilst it may furnish you with an excellent reason for giving increased representation to Birmingham, or for abolishing these very small boroughs, as I would have them abolished—or for grouping them, as others desire them to be grouped—really affords no argument at all for the virtual disfranchisement of that minority in Birmingham which of itself is much larger than many Arundels put together. And let us look a little further. No doubt, upon questions in which party interests were concerned, the three Members for Birmingham elected under the proposed scheme would be found two in one Lobby and one in the other. But in the numerous questions which come before us wherein the interests of party are not directly involved—in all questions affecting the local interests of their town — in all questions affecting those great commercial and manufacturing interests upon which Birmingham is especially entitled to be heard, does any one doubt that the three Members for Birmingham would be constantly found voting in the same Lobby and throwing into the same scale the undivided weight of that great constituency? The truth is, Sir, that in constituencies which return two Members the majority has more than its fair share of power, and this is only bearable because the alternative would be worse — namely, making the minority equal to the majority. But is this any reason why, when you are giving increased representation to large constituencies, you should decline to give a share of power to a large minority when you are able, in so doing, still to leave to the majority a fair preponderating power? But, Sir, in all humility and yet in all earnestness let me point out the conclusions to which the arguments of the hon. Member for Birmingham inevitably tend. Birmingham, he says, and such places as Birmingham, will not have due weight in Parliament, and then he talks about our having hitherto had united constituencies, wherein the prevalent opinion has been represented by the action of the majority. He contends that however many Members you may give to any large constituency, the representative power should not be divided in any proportion between the majority and the minority, but should be concentrated on and arbitrarily wielded by, the majority. And yet he thinks — and no doubt most of us think — that the weight of such places as Birmingham and Manchester in the Legislature should in some sort be in proportion to their wealth and importance in the country. But is that importance derived solely from the majority? For instance, do the great body of Conservative merchants in the City of London contribute nothing to the wealth and importance of that constituency? Why, Sir, if once you admit that the wealth and importance of any community is to be at all considered with respect to its representation in this House, is it not obvious that we ought to try and give representation to all the elements out of which that wealth and importance are constituted? But the hon. Member for Birmingham speaks of the population of these great towns. Does the House perceive upon what dangerous grounds we tread in this population argument? It is not sufficient to compare Birmingham and Arundel. There are other comparisons which must be made. Why, Sir, at the commencement of this Session, 200 boroughs in England and Wales returned 334 Members to this House. But of the whole population of these boroughs, amounting to near 9,000,000, more than one-half was contained in seventeen constituencies—that is to say, in the eight metropolitan constituencies (including Greenwich) and nine other large towns. These seventeen constituencies returned thirty-four Members to Parliament, but, if population is to be your test—and if it is good for one argument it is good for another—they ought to have returned not thirty-four but upwards of 160 Members, of which number about eighty-five would have gone to the metropolitan constituencies! Is the House prepared for such a step? Does not the House see that one reason of the hon. Member's opposition to this scheme is that it stands in the way of concentrating political power in these great towns? And what would the 11,000,000 of population in the smaller towns and counties say to this? Are they to be ignored because they are less concentrated than the larger town-population? I say, Sir, with all respect to the hon. Member for Birmingham that his arguments lead directly to the destruction of all the middle-sized boroughs, the establishment of electoral districts, and a total change in the manner in which electoral power has hitherto been distributed in this country, and unless the House is prepared for such a change, they must regard an opposition to this proposal which is founded upon such arguments as these, with some doubt, some distrust, and some apprehension. But, Sir, even if the objections urged against this proposal are not valid objections, I may still be asked—what are the advantages which you believe will follow its adoption? And I own—I freely concede—that we who advocate the representation of minorities are bound to show some advantages, clear and tangible, before we ask you to adopt our views. Sir, the two main advantages which I anticipate are, to my mind, of infinite importance—I take the lesser first—namely, that in times of popular excitement, eminent men will find avenues opened for their entrance into Parliament, from which, if they happen to differ from the popular fancy of the moment, they would otherwise be excluded. Is this a chimerical idea? Have we had no experience of it already? Does the hon. Member for Birmingham already forget the China vote, and his own exclusion from Parliament, and the exclusion of my right hon. Friend the Member for Ashton? Well, Sir, we may have more China votes—the popular tide may set in strongly, and able and useful men may be swept out of Parliament at the very moment when their services are most needed by their country—aye, and at a moment when thousands of their countrymen might be willing and anxious to combine in order to secure their services. Those services could be secured by that combination which would be possible under the plan of Mr. Hare, so ably advocated by my hon. Friend the Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill). They might be secured if you preserved the system of nomination boroughs. But public opinion is not prepared to accept the one alternative, and has already condemned (and I think rightly condemned) the other. Therefore we fall back upon this plan for the representation of minorities, by which we hope that this desirable result may still be secured. Do you tell me that minorities are even now generally represented in unicorn constituencies? If this be so, is it, or is it not desirable? If not, what argument do you found upon the fact? If desirable, is it not better that they should obtain representation by their own inherent right and strength, rather than by the concession of the majority, probably not obtained without much expenditure of money, time, and trouble? Well, then, I come to the second (and to my mind the greatest) advantage which I anticipate—namely, the inducement to large numbers of persons to take part in electoral matters, who, without this plan, will be indisposed to do so from a feeling that their votes will be swamped by those of a more numerous class. Sir, I know, full well the answer which is commonly made to this argument. It is said, "You want to increase the power of the upper classes," and then there are sneers about "a genteel minority," and we are told that we are "afraid of the people." Sir, it is not easy to argue against propositions which savour so much of what is commonly called "clap-trap." But, in truth, this is neither a class question nor a party question. Although the hon. Member for Birmingham spoke as if only the four great towns were to be affected by this plan, and quite ignored the seven unicorn counties to which it is also to be applied, there may be an oppressed Liberal minority in a county just as well as an oppressed Conservative or upper class minority in a town. The only thing to be said is this, that as the accident of numbers pertains to what is usually called the "operative class," it is certainly most probable that it would be the middle and more educated class voters who would generally be more likely to abstain from voting from such feelings as I have mentioned. But are these the classes whom you wish to render indifferent to the politics of the country? Sir, the real point is this—Is it, or is it not desirable to induce as large a number as possible of the inhabitants of a country to take part in its political affairs? Why, Sir, I thought that this was the very soul and essence of democracy. ["Hear!"] Has the hon. Member who interrupts me studied history? From all that I have ever read and gathered from the pages of history, I have always believed this to be the great merit of a pure democracy—that every man, feeling and knowing himself to be part and parcel of the State—assisting in framing those laws which he had to obey, threw, as it were, his own individual strength and vigour into the constitution, and so the State, resting upon the concentrated vigour and strength of the whole body of the people, became possessed of a certain inherent power and vitality which could never be obtained by a country resting upon a less extended basis. But, Sir, if this be so—how are we offending against Liberal principles—nay, how are we offending against the very principles of democracy, when we advocate a system the main end and object of which is to procure that as many as possible of our fellow-countrymen shall take an interest in the political government of our country? We sometimes hear of Americanizing our institutions, but what I complain of in the hon. Member for Birmingham is this—that whilst we are willing to take that which is good from the American system, he insists that we should also take the evil with it! And what is the evil? Have not many Members of this House conversed, as I have conversed, over and over again with Americans, who have told us that the great evil of their system is that the low suffrage which prevails, with no check upon the mere force of numbers, deters many of the more educated classes from concerning themselves at all in public and political affairs? Why, then, if we wish to copy America in an extended suffrage, should we not endeavour to avoid the evils which may therewith exist? And do we not know that in our own large constituencies many of the middle classes even now hold aloof from elections owing to similar causes? If this is an evil why not try to correct it? Sir, I thank the House for the kindness with which they have heard me. It is not without great pain that I differ from some of my right hon. Friends near me upon this question; but, Sir, I have deep and sincere convictions which I am bound to follow. It is no question between Liberal and Conservative opinions—strange to say, we who support the representation of minorities are often accused in the very same breath—first, of wishing to introduce an insidious Conservative element into this Bill, and secondly, of advocating a dangerous innovation upon the old principles of the Constitution! A dangerous innovation upon the Constitution? Why, Sir, we are accustomed to boast that England marches foremost in the van of civilization; if this be so, and if our Constitution has hitherto been an object of admiration to other lands, surely, when we are revising our whole representative system, if we can discover a plan by which the good of other representative systems can be secured and the evils avoided, why not seize at once upon that plan and so still hold up our revised Constitution as a model and an example to the other nations of the world. Let us do this, even though the hon. Member for Birmingham may tell us that the precedents of 600 years are against us! Sir, I said that this was no party question. It was lately my duty to draw up a plan for the extension of the application of this principle to some fifty of our largest constituencies — that plan, for reasons into which I need not now enter, has for the present fallen to the ground. But the inquiry showed that the Members at present returned by those constituencies are as nearly as possible divided between the two sides of the House. The balance of political parties would not have been affected. The hon. Member for Birmingham taunts us with the limited application of this principle. But it is either good or bad—if bad, reject it on its merits—if good, do not reject it because we cannot at the present moment give it more than a limited application, when you know that, if found to be beneficial, it can be easily extended hereafter. Sir, I may be told that I am speaking on the Conservative side. But, if this principle be Conservative, it is so in the best and highest sense of the word. Sir, if it be Conservative to wish to see men in communities, and not communities only represented in this House; if it be Conservative to desire that the opinions of large minorities should not be entirely overborne and shut out from representation — if it be Conservative to wish that eminent men should, in times of popular excitement, find an entrance into this House by other means than the exploded and objectionable channel of nomination boroughs—if it be Conservative to desire to interest in public affairs as large a number as possible of our fellow-countrymen —if it be Conservative to hail gladly an innovation which I believe to be an improvement—if, in one word, it be Conservative to be ready to extend electoral rights to the unenfranchised with a free and liberal hand, and at the same time to seek to provide that whilst we reap the full advantages—we shall avoid or at least mitigate the evils—of democracy—then, Sir, if these things be Conservative, I at least will not shrink from the name, and in the full belief that the vote which I am about to give, be it Conservative or be it Liberal, is a wise and patriotic, as I know it to be an honest, vote, I readily and cordially give that vote in favour of agreement with this Amendment of the other House.

MR. NEWDEGATE desired, in the first place, to pay a tribute to the spirit in which the hon. Member who had just sat down had addressed the House. Some hon. Members, whose liberality was limited to their party, had taunted the hon. Member with having spoken as a Conservative, and being about to give a Conservative vote. He accepted the hon. Member's definition as that of a true Conservatism, and he trusted he would never have any cause to change his opinion. Let him remind the Liberal party that the position of the Liberal minority in counties was far worse than that of the Conservative minority in towns, because the latter were represented through the freeholders by the county Members, whereas the former were totally unrepresented. He was surprised to hear Liberal Members complain of a plan by which Liberal minorities in counties would be enabled to obtain representation, a plan which had been approved by Earl Russell and the Leaders of their own party. But what was the position of some hon. and right hon. Gentlemen? The right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer represented a constituency of three seats, as did the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire. The hon. Member for Birmingham represented a constituency which was about to have three seats. It was very natural that those eminent persons should desire to have Colleagues of their own opinions. The speech of the hon. Member for Birmingham—an effort of eloquence which he had seldom heard surpassed—dexterous as it was, was singularly weak in argument; that hon. Gentleman almost admitted that he was actuated by personal feeling in the matter. Without wishing to disparage the position which the hon. Gentleman held in the country, he must say the manner in which he interfered in the elections for Birmingham and its neighbourhood was really quite peculiar to himself. At the last General Election the hon. Member went down to Birmingham and told the freeholders there that they should go and relieve North Warwickshire from being represented by two "dumb dogs"—an observation which aroused a strong feeling of irritation and indignation, as the hon. Member for Birmingham would have seen had he been present at the nomination at Coleshill. Again, at the late election for Birmingham the hon. Member went down when there was a contest, and in addressing the people of that borough, he said—

> "I ask you, am I henceforth to sit in Parliament only nominally as your representative? Is my authority as a prominent asserter of the rights of the people to be struck down by your yoking me with a Colleague whose voice and whose vote will destroy the force and value of mine?"

If the Conservative candidate had been returned for Birmingham on that occasion he would have been able, in point of attainments and from his position as Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, to compete even with the hon. Member for Birmingham himself. But the hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "Better far I should retire from your representation than that, by your unhappy vote, I should be condemned to sit, speak, and vote with a divided and enfeebled authority. I think I gather from this grand meeting, from the tone it has exhibited, and the voice in which it has spoken, what will be the verdict of Birmingham in the coming contest."

It was not for his own seat, but for the seat of the other Member for Birmingham, that the other hon. Gentleman was speaking on that occasion. [*Cries of* "Question," *and* "Time!"] Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to think it quite becoming that the hon. Member for Birmingham should claim absolutely to command both of the seats for that borough; and if he were to understand their motive for giving a third seat to Birmingham, it was that there should be in that House another Member sitting for Birmingham, but representing the authority of that hon. Gentleman. But was that not monopoly? Was it independence and freedom of representation? Was it not a dominion of that majority who, as that hon. Gentleman held, ought to continue to crush the minority? The hon. Member for Birmingham, therefore, had induced the House to gratify his ambition by placing at his command another seat—for that was what it came to—and then the hon. Member appealed to the Constitution of the country. He (Mr. Newdegate) accepted his challenge. They were dealing with a large question, and must remember the magnitude of the change they were making. He held in his hand a paper showing the enormous difference between the character of the representation now and that which existed prior to 1832. ["Time!"] The hon. Member for Portsmouth who interrupted him, was evidently in a very uneasy state of mind. That was a habit that hon. Gentleman had, especially when facts and arguments were going against his view of the case; and as that hon. Member was a great advocate for a further re-distribution of seats, he wished to inform him of the progress which Parliament had already made. Prior to 1832, 141 places, chiefly small boroughs in England and Wales, returned 234 Members; and the number of electors who returned them was only 8,880. How was it that the Constitution of this country worked well under such an anomaly as that? It was because those boroughs were reserved for the representation of opinions which, probably, were in the minority in large towns. And now that Parliament had swept away a great number of those boroughs which were rightly sacrificed in 1832, and when they were further trenching on the representation of the small boroughs in order to enfranchise the larger populations, he warned them that if they would not totally change the character of the Constitution of this country, they must adopt some means of representing minorities, because the difference between the Constitution of England and that of the United States was that throughout the whole of our Constitution counterpoise was the rule, and throughout the whole of our representation hitherto the utmost care had been taken to preserve that variety of opinion, of knowledge, and of interest which enabled that House to perform the mighty task which devolved upon it, not only as the representative assembly of that island, but as an Imperial assembly whose deliberations affected the interests of various races and nations scattered over the surface of the globe. Having voted, then, that additional Members should be given to these large towns, he wished the House to accept the recommendation of the House of Lords, and not to create such a monoply as the hon. Member for Birmingham desired. The hon. Gentleman talked of emasculating boroughs; but how could that be done, while they left the majority with two representatives, and only claimed that the minority, if it exceeded one-third of the constituency, should not be crushed? There could be nothing more illiberal or intolerant than the attempt on the part of the hon. Member for Birmingham; not content with avowedly commanding two seats for that borough, to grasp at the third seat; and that was the feeling which actuated the 4,000 Petitioners whom he himself represented that night in urging upon the House their prayer, that they may not be sacrificed as victims to the monopolizing spirit of the majority, as represented by the hon. Member for Birmingham. He believed, that if the measure passed it would be possible hereafter further to re-distribute the representation of the country so as to do justice to the large populations, not merely in the boroughs, or among the minority of the English people, but among the majority of the people who resided in the counties, on whose part he thanked the House for granting them ten seats in addition to the proposal of the Government, although he believed that, on the principles which the House was adopting, still more would have to be done before the anomaly in regard to the counties were fully redressed. He should give his support to the Amendment because he hoped the result of it would be to give the people, as they advanced in intelligence, fuller opportunities than had been hitherto accorded them of making their opinions known in that House.

MR. GOSCHEN said, that the opponents of the Amendment had a difficult task to perform. Although the Amendment involved consequences as important as were involved by any single clause of the Bill, it was now introduced into the House for the first time, and a decision on it would have to be given after a debate of three or four hours' duration. The principle involved in the Amendment had scarcely been discussed by the House at all on any previous occasion. It was not the cumulative vote, but an innovation wholly distinct from it. The House was to be called on to decide, after a few days' notice, upon one of the greatest innovations which could be made in the Constitution. His hon. Friend the Member for Sandwich, or rather for the majority of the electors of Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen), had said that, as a Conservative, he should vote for the Amendment, because he was in favour of personal as against local representation. It was the first time he had heard that that was a Conservative doctrine. An eminent Member of the Conservative party —the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Walpole) once stated in that House that the principle of our Constitution was "the representation of communities." If hon. Members were of the same opinion, they ought to record their votes against this Amendment. Some hon. Members who held extreme Liberal opinions were in favour of the Amendment, and strangely enough it was supported by some Conservatives too. The reason why the extreme Liberals were favourable to the Amendment was clear enough. It sanctioned to some extent the principle of personal representation, and personal representation pointed in the direction of equal electoral districts. He should have thought, however, that Conservative Members would hesitate before they voted for an Amendment which was a step in that direction. As for those Members who were advocates of equal electoral districts, they ought to wait until they had them, or, at least, had a further and better Bill for the re-distribution of seats, before they introduced any system for the representation of minorities. When there was a chance of minorities not being represented, a claim should be made on their behalf, not now, when, in the opinion of the extreme Liberals, minorities were, as it is, over-represented in that House. Hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to be favourable to the Amendment, because they thought it desirable to replace the nomination boroughs by nomination minorities in the great towns and counties of the kingdom. But how could this system of nomination minorities coincide with the argument of his hon. Friend the Member for Sandwich, that the proposal now under discussion would enable these large towns to be represented by Members connected with their own locality and society? The two theories were perfectly distinct and contradictory. To try the experiment of creating nomination minorities in some of the largest towns in the kingdom was a most visionary idea. While the experiment was being tried the power of these towns was being limited, as, indeed, was avowed by some hon. Members opposite. The House had given four additional Members to the large towns at the request of the majority, and now it was proposed to give that additional representation to the minority. They wanted to do this to provide nomination seats for statesmen who could not otherwise be elected. A Member not returned by the majority would consider himself not a representative but a delegate. The Amendment did two things. It substituted the principle of personal for the principle of local representation; and it made the representatives more dependent upon their constituencies, or rather upon election agents. It was said it would have the effect of preventing contests. But at what price would that be done? By producing apathy in the majority, and political stagnation in the entire constituency. If one of the Members of the majority should ever vote against his party, it would give the majority of Members to the minority, and be considered a greater offence than it was at present. If they desired merely to try the experiment, why try it on the largest towns and counties of the kingdom? The experiment, if successful, would result in the total extinction of political life in the large towns. Was it not a strange piece of irony that the large towns which had been so anxious for a Reform Bill, should be placed, after it had passed, in a worse position than they occupied before? It was a mistake for Liberal Members to support the Amendment, because, even if they were favourable to the principle it involved, they ought to insist that it should not be carried out until a better Re-distribution Bill were passed. It was admitted by the noble Lord at the head of the Government in "another place," that another Re-distribution Bill would be required. It would be better to defer the settlement of this important principle until next year, when the matter could be fully considered by the country. The Amendment would destroy half the satisfaction hitherto felt by the large towns in returning Members to Parliament. Its importance was as great as that of any clause in the Reform Bill. It was devising a new Constitution. While he objected to the clause as a Liberal, he objected to it also as a friend of the Constitution, as being more likely to open up new matters, and to keep the Reform question unsettled, than any other that could be submitted to Parliament.

Mr. HUBBARD said, that when his right hon. Friend (Mr. Goschen) spoke of the unfeigned dislike with which this clause was regarded, he rather mistook the source from which the objection proceeded. The objection was not so much on the part of great cities as on the part of their representatives. There was a great difference between the inclination of the city represented and that of the representatives of the city. It was said that the principle of the clause was innovation; but was not the Bill full of innovations? Was not household suffrage itself an innovation? Why should exception be taken to one of many innovations? The clause came back to that House with a special recommendation of a large and influential majority of the Upper House. When he found that the clause was recommended by so much of the eloquence and patriotism of the Upper House, he naturally sought to know the objections against it. His right hon. Friend said that, if a large town returned one or two Members of the same mind as the majority, they were representatives; but, if it returned one Member of a contrary opinion, he would be a delegate. He could not concur in that opinion. Members of Parliament were chosen from their experience, high character, and influence, and they were sent to that House in order to promote what they considered to be the best interests of the country. Was it, not, then, degrading to the constituencies which such men would represent to speak of them as delegates? The hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) had put the case of a Member of the minority accepting office as a Member of Her Majesty's Government, and asked whether, in that case, he would be returned? This, so far from being an objection to the scheme, seemed to him to be a great recommendation; because it was clear that, if this were so, the Premier of the day must not only seek men who were returned to Parliament by the voice of the people, but who were returned by the voice of the majority. The view taken by his right hon. Friend rested on this mistaken basis —that a Member of Parliament was a mere delegate instead of a representative. Therefore, all his right hon. Friend's arguments were really in favour of the proposal before the House.

MR. GLADSTONE: Sir, I lament the conclusion at which the Government have arrived in regard to the course they should take on this question; but while I lament it, I do not presume to censure it. I admit the difficulty in which they stand. They are naturally anxious for the success of a Bill which the great majority of the House wish to see pass into a law. They stand, in a certain sense, as mediators between the two Houses of Parliament, and if, in my own mind, I think they have arrived at an erroneous judgment, I must admit that they are, so far as their own course is concerned, acquainted with many elements and considerations which bear upon it, but which are necessarily concealed from our view. And I think it only fair to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to acknowledge that he has brought the subject candidly before the House of Commons, stating, on the one hand, that he retains his own opinion, the expression of which had left so deep an impression on our minds, and that, on the other, he thinks it fair, looking to the mixed considerations which govern Parliamentary proceedings, to recommend the adoption of the Amendment. Sir, I lament, but I cannot presume to censure that course. I have this consolatory consideration in the remarks that I mean to address to the House, that I feel I am expressing the undoubted opinion of a large majority of this House. The division which took place many weeks ago has placed that fact upon record. If those who were then the majority against the proposal are now to be the majority in its favour, they will be so, not because they have altered their opinions, but because, from considerations of policy, they deem it wise to waive those opinions. The question which I wish to raise and to present fairly to the mind of the House is, whether there is before us a fair and sufficient case for waiving those opinions which the large majority of the House undoubtedly entertained, and which they have recorded in the face of the country by a division of the most decisive character? I have heard the words Liberal and Conservative used by my hon. Friend the Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) during the present debate. Sir, I know of no such words in connection with the consideration of this question; or if I am to qualify that statement, I will say that I feel conscious I am arguing this question from a Conservative point of view. This is, undoubtedly, a great innovation —great in its virtual objects—great in its ultimate extension. Unless great and powerful reasons can be shown in its favour, it is you, the Conservative Gentlemen of England, who are bound to give aid to any of us who may resist a causeless change in the institutions of the country. I am an ill-calculator in such matters; but I believe the immediate operation of the proposed change would be in favour of the party to which I belong. That, however, does not alter the question, and does not in the slightest degree recommend it to me. The first form in which this change comes before the House is not its best form. If adopted at all, this proposal must be adopted with the knowledge, and with the certainty, that, whether we admit it ourselves or not, it must unfold and expand itself over the whole country, and completely re-construct the system of distribution of seats. If there be one in this House whose position would naturally lead him to take a dispassionate view of the question, I am he. I was a party to this very proposal in 1854, when, being a Minister not immediately engaged in the preparation of the Reform Bill of that year and much engaged in other matters, I failed to see on the surface of this proposal much of what it contained, and became officially responsible for its being propounded to the House of Commons. Lord Aberdeen, who was at the head of the Government at that time, possessed, among many other remarkable gifts, a singular power of laconic expression. When this proposal was first made to him he well described it in these few words—"It's a conundrum," and a conundrum in many points of view it is. Gentlemen should consider the mode in which this measure is to operate in the case of a great contested election; the manipulations that are to take place; the pressure that is to be brought to bear; how all electors are to be treated, not as rational and thinking beings, but merely as equivalents of one another, who can be made to vote A and B, or A and C, or B and C, just as thought proper by some exterior influence. If they so read it, it is a condemnation of the proposal. With regard to the influences of this scheme on contests, which, I think, are necessary to prevent stagnation, I do not say that if it discourage them it will be an evil. I believe that, on the whole, so long as Englishmen remain Englishmen we shall probably have a sufficiency of contests. It has been my fate to have as many as eight contests, and I am not prepared to deny that to avoid the necessity of contests is desirable. I adopt the opinion of the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Viscount Cranborne) who stated that he was prepared to vote for tripartite constituencies, because he thought that tripartite representation had in itself a tendency to check contests. I entirely concur in that opinion; upon that opinion we acted last year, and suggested many tripartite seats. I confess it was a disappointment among the several of that year that nobody seemed to concur in that opinion; but the proposals of the present Government were received with greater disapprobation than met that proposal. The right hon. Gentleman has stated quite consistently his former vote and his unchanged view, and has induced the House to adopt instead of tripartite representation tripartite division of counties. Still we have tripartite representation; but that is doomed if this proposal should pass. The representation of minorities which arises only out of tripartite representation is good, manly, sound and honest. There is nothing to be ashamed of in it. In that sense I am in favour of the representation of minorities principle. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire—too complimentary to myself—said that the hon. Member for Birmingham, the right hon. Member for Bucks, and the Member for South Lancashire, secure in their seats, naturally think little of contests. I join with the hon. Member in congratulating the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the hon. Member for Birmingham, but theirs is not my case. If there be one to whom this proposal would be advantageous I am that one. I am one who sits for what may be called a minority in the sense of a mere party vote; but this I will say that I am not able to realize the precise position in which I should find myself at the close of my political career as a sitting Member for a minority. It may be that the party who returned me were somewhat weaker, but I sit here as representing the majority of votes in the constituency of South Lancashire, and except as representing that majority of votes, I have no desire to sit here. My hon. Friend the Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) used an expression to which I am desirous of calling the attention of such Members of the House as may not have been in their seats when he spoke. Answering an imputation which he thought some might make against him of being unfaithful, in supporting this Amendment, to Liberal opinions, my hon. Friend said "Why this proposition is the very spirit and the essence of democracy," and he went on to explain what he meant—"We are now going," he said, "to have in England for the first time the representation of men and not only of communities." [Mr. J. STUART MILL: Hear!] I hear the cheer of the hon. Member for Westminster—one who never speaks or cheers in this House without clear and distinct meaning. I interpret his cheer on this occasion as an acceptance of the proposition that in his view this little, limited, and paltry proposal will be the means of effecting that total change to which I have referred in the whole character of our electoral system—of getting rid, in fact, of local representation, and substituting for it the representation of persons. That is the plan which has been recommended with so much power by Mr. Hare, and which has received the sanction of the high authority of my hon. Friend, with whom I agree to this extent, that if we embark upon this career we must be prepared, sooner or later, to go through with it to the end. I agree that if we are to embark in this career we must be prepared, sooner or later, to contemplate changes in our electoral system which as yet the boldest of us have not dreamt of. I wish very seriously and earnestly to bring before the House, especially that portion which has supported this Motion, a consideration of the singular manner in which a change so important has been brought before us. The intelligence of the House will perceive that the importance of this measure is not to be tested by the limited range of the present proposal. One of the many singularities attending the proposal is that those who will support it by their votes will be composed of two sections diametrically opposed in their views to each other. There will be one section—of whom I may mention as the honoured representative the clear and distinct thinker, my hon. Friend the Member for Westminster—who see what they think is valuable in the principle of personal representation as the basis of your system, and honestly pursue it. This section recommend the proposal, not because of its smallness, but because of its possible largeness. Will that majority or minority, which ever it be to-night, be a homogeneous body? How will the minority which voted for this proposal on a former occasion be converted into a majority? It will be by the acquisition of Gentlemen who agree to adopt the Amendment of the House of Lords upon the principle which has been spoken of by the Earl of Derby in a manner known to us all—namely, that if a proposal of this character of tripartite representation of one Member given to the minority were to be largely extended it would be absolutely intolerable; but he is prepared to accept it under the circumstances. The case, then, simply comes to this, that the measure is so small that the effect produced by it will be scarcely appreciable either on the one side or the other. I do not blame either of the sections to which I have referred, but I think the House should understand the absolute divergence of views that prevails among those who may be found in the same Lobby to-night, and those who are attached to Conservative views should consider what will be the consequences of their vote. Opposed as I am to the principle of representation of minorities, I feel that if we are forced into it on the basis of a plan such as that before us, the injustice that will be inflicted upon the great towns and counties with tripartite representation will be so gross as to be almost penal, on the majorities of those constituencies, and after a deliberate consideration of what has fallen from hon. Members here to-night and not upon preconceived opinions, we must not be accused of inconsistency if we go further in the choice of evils. I hope we shall not be accused of inconsistency if, in the event of this plan being adopted, we feel bound to go further than we could wish in disturbing the electoral power, and demand changes which at the threshold we would resist. I beg the House, apart from the merits of the question, to consider the position in which we are placed with respect to the time and circumstances in which it comes before us. We adopt this Session a great change in the basis of the franchise. We have now another change before us which perhaps in certain, though not yet evolved, consequences, is equally great. That change on the basis of the franchise we adopted after long consideration, after discussion to which there was no limit, but the free discretion of the Commons of England. We had the opportunity of viewing it in every light, and of applying to it every possible test of argument and inquiry. That which we adopted we embodied in the Bill, which we sent to the House of Lords, and which the House of Lords have sent back to us. Why is it that with regard to this country, apart from and beyond all nations of the world, it is a common subject of observation with every foreigner that progress in England may be achieved slowly, but that it is achieved surely? It is because these opportunities of deliberation are given. It is because great changes if they are adopted are not adopted until time and occasion have been given for all the Members of both branches of the Legislature to bring every faculty of their mind, sharpened by so many opportunities, to bear upon them, so that the nation shall have every security and every guarantee that human institutions can afford, for the wisdom of the conclusions at which we eventually arrive. Is that the case with the great matter before us? Sir, we are called upon on the night of the 8th of August for a final decision upon a change of this kind, which unless it be subject to reversal in itself—and that undoubtedly is not a desirable aspect in which to present it—must involve a much further change. And when was this change brought before the House? When did the country become cognizant of it in such a way that they had a fair opportunity of revolving it and of communicating with us upon it? It was produced for the first time in the House of Lords and became known on Tuesday week. Nine days, therefore, will have seen the birth of this scheme as the suggestion of an individual Member of the other House, and its incorporation into the Constitution of this country. Can that be a satisfactory state of things? It may be said, perhaps, that I have overlooked the Motion of my right hon. Friend the Member for Calne (Mr. Lowe) for the cumulative vote. Of course, I do not stand on the difference between his Motion and the proposal now before us, although, in some respects there is a great superiority in the Motion of my right hon. Friend. But what happened in that Motion? It was produced in this House. It was supported by my right hon. Friend with his great ability, by the noble Lord opposite (Viscount Cranborne), and by many other Gentlemen of first-rate talent and capacity; but it was rejected under the auspices of Her Majesty's Government by so commanding a majority that the country was justified in believing—nay, it could not but believe—that for this crisis the subject had been disposed of and would not be revived. This proposal, therefore, has come as a novelty upon the Members of the communities immediately affected and upon the whole country; and after nine days from its first production we are called upon to affix the stamp and seal which, beyond revocation, will make it a portion of our Constitution. There is in the minds of Members of this House such a spirit of candour, fairness, and of regard to the general and traditional modes in which great and important changes have commonly been adopted in this country, that there will be a disposition on the part of many of them to agree with us who have scruples, nay, who have objections in principle, to this great change, that due time has not been given to insure its fair consideration. If we are to approach this question with a view to some legislative determination, we ought to approach it under circumstances different from those in which, in these few fugitive hours, gathered from all parts of the country, we have to apply our minds to it. We ought to bring to bear upon it all those advantages of repeated investigation and consideration, by which alone we succeed in giving that character of solidity to the legislation of the country that has made it safe legislation. Sir, I cannot but hope that the considerations connected with the question of time will weigh with many even of those who may be disposed to favour the adoption of the principle. I have spoken strongly and decidedly against its adoption, but that is not in consequence of any foregone conclusion. I listened patiently to former debates, and since the discussion in the House of Lords I have felt it my duty to give all the time and care I could to the thorough comprehension of this question; for I have never known a proposal submitted to this House of which the surface is so entirely one thing, and the interior upon careful examination so entirely another. Having spoken on the question of time, I would ask the House to consider the principle of the measure. First of all, as regards the adoption of the doctrine proclaimed by my hon. Friend (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen), the representation of men, and not only the representation of communities. Do not let my hon. Friend suppose that I regard him as an apostate from Liberal principles for proclaiming such a doctrine. My Liberalism, however, may be more infirm than his, and I entreat him to give me a little time before I embrace the doctrine of the representation of men, instead of the representation of communities. The House of Commons—the oldest, and greatest, and most venerable Legislative Assembly in the world, and I trust, in another sense, the freshest and youngest, with the largest and richest future before it—the House of Commons has, from its first beginning to this day, been founded, and founded exclusively, upon the principle of the representation of communities, and communities alone. If this change be adopted, you ought, for consistency's sake, to alter the language of the writs addressed to the citizens of London and to South Lancashire, Manchester, Liverpool, and so forth. Those writs ought hereafter to say that the majority in those respective communities is directed to return so many Members, and the minority so many; but, according to the old and time-honoured language, taught us from our infancy, those communities are integral parts of this Constitution. Those who represent them are elected by them as a whole, and are bound to look to the welfare and interest of the whole. All this, however, is to be changed; but if it is to be changed, surely we are entitled to ask — I would almost add to demand — time for the adoption of a change so great and so pregnant as that of passing from the representation of communities to the representation of men. Time should be given us to deal with this subject, to consider whether the principle should he embraced at all, whether, if embraced, it should not be embraced upon a scale adequate to its magnitude and its depth, and whether, further, if we embrace it upon a limited scale, we do not inaugurate it by an act of the grossest injustice? Let me ask the House to look at the question in relation to the injustice which is involved in this partial and limited application of a principle totally new, most doubtful, and requiring, beyond all others, to be weighed and scrutinized before it receives the sanction of the Legislature. I noticed, on an occasion when I think we might very well, if the House had been so inclined, have adopted a more rigid frame of mind, the effect produced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he said he was anxious to keep this Bill free from the taint of disfranchisement; but will this Bill be free from the taint of disfranchisement if you adopt the present clause? I concede to my right hon. Friend (Mr. Lowe) that he did not, at any rate, upon the face of the case, make himself obnoxious to the reproach that he was about to disfranchise any portion of the constituencies; but observe the case before us as affecting, for example, the citizens of London. The constituency of London numbers, I suppose, 20,000. We have in South Lancashire a considerably larger number. The citizen of London has hitherto had the power of exercising a 1-20,000th part in the choice of four Members for the City. My hon. and learned Friend (Sir Roundell Palmer) recently told us — making us admire his electoral richness, for, if any one could bear a little disfranchisement, he is the one—that he had votes for sixteen seats. The citizen of London has now the 20,000th fractional power of electing four Members; but you are going to take away one-fourth of that electoral power. There is no denying that, to the extent of one-fourth in London, and of one-third in the tripartite constituencies, you are about to inflict disfranchisement upon the electors. It is perfectly true that, as regards the minorities in those constituencies, you are about, by a circuitous plan, which I will notice by-and-by, to give them greater power; but, as regards the majority, you, who on public grounds will disfranchise nobody, except for some electoral offence, are about to inflict a certain disfranchisement, or, at all events, a diminution of electoral power, upon men against whom you bring no charge for the use they have made of it; but that is not all; look at its bearing on the communities to which these individuals belong. That there may be nothing invidious in the selection, I take the case of Liverpool as compared with Beverley, because these two towns happen to be represented, so far as Parliamentary politics are concerned, by gentlemen of the same opinions. The charge of injustice which, apart from the novelty of the proposal, I make is this—that you are going to treat most unjustly the majorities in those constituencies which you have "selected," forsooth, to try your experiment upon. And why are the most powerful constituent bodies in the kingdom selected—those bodies which, more than any other, lead the opinion of the country? On the Slave Trade, on Emancipation, on the Corn Laws and other questions of Free Trade, on Parliamentary Reform, in what centres was it that thought was matured and elevated so as to bring the public mind to that state of maturity which enabled these great changes to be effected? It was in these great constituencies. The charge I make is this—that you are going to place those constituencies, those majorities—and I draw no distinction between majorities and constituencies, because, in the language of the Constitution, up to 1867, at all events, there is no distinction

—you are going, I say, to place them in a position of privation and penalty. In Liverpool there will be found to be, when the Boundary Commissioners have reported, probably about 600,000 people, of whom there may be a majority of 350,000 and a minority of 250,000 or 1,000, I do not mind which. You are about to give these 350,000 the power of returning two Members to the House of Commons whose voice upon political questions will be the same. Upon local questions, the three Members will be only too united. About their unity upon local questions I am rather jealous; I do not want to see their power in that way increased, because when Members on local questions—take, for instance, those of the City of London and of the metropolis — are too closely united, it becomes the House to look sharp; but, upon political questions, the two Members will be counteracted as to half of their voting power by the third Member representing the minority, leaving one Member as the real representative for Liverpool; and what is the reason alleged? You tell me that there are 250,000 electors who, by the present system, are unrepresented; that there is a large, independent, and intelligent minority of great importance and weight who, at present, have no representation at all. It is a fair statement of the argument that there are these large intelligent minorities who are of great importance, great weight, who have great claims, but who have no representation at present; but if you determine to give them representation, you recognize—without the smallest reference to mitigating considerations, such as arise out of local organization and the recognition of each community as a whole—the principle of numbers. If you determine to give representation to minorities, you recognize, I say, the principle of numbers; and, if so, you must be prepared in no long time to make that recognition consistent. And now, Sir, I put it this way—I claim three Members for the majority at Liverpool by the present Bill. You say, "No; there are 250,000 in Liverpool who ought to be represented and are not." If so, find representation for them if you will, but not at the expense of the majority, for that would be unjust in the highest degree. You say there are 5,000 in one place, 6,000 in another, 10,000 in a third, who are unrepresented. If so, seek the materials to represent them in the proper quarters. You have at the present moment a system which works for the representation of minorities—a system you never could have invented—a system which you have found it necessary here and there to check and to prune—it is your system of mixed representation, your representation of communities infinitely varying in size. If you ask me where is the representation of minorities, I tell you it is in Arundel, it is in Marlborough [Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE: "Oh!"]—yes, and in Honiton. My hon. Friend has been the representative of minorities as long as he has had a seat in this House, and I hope he will long have a seat in it, as long as it continues to suit him. You demur to my proposition that this is a representation of minorities. Can you demur to this—that if you claim for the 250,000 in Liverpool a right to representation, it is fairer, on numerical and arithmetical principles, to go to Honiton and Bridport, and obtain there the means of meeting the claims you have yourselves recognized, than to deprive and plunder the majority in Liverpool of the very small recognition you have given them by giving them three Members? If the great towns, if the great counties of South Lancashire, of Buckinghamshire, of Oxfordshire, and others, are over-represented in comparison with other places, then I grant you may fairly say, "We may take a Member from the majority." But not one of them is over-represented; on the contrary, the great bulk of them are grossly and enormously under-represented. You give to the 10,000 of Beverley a Member for every 5,000. [Sir HENRY EDWARDS: 10,500!] Well, let it be 10,500. I will not quarrel about the number; I will give the hon. and gallant Gentleman even a greater population if he likes; but while you represent Beverley by one Member for every 5,000 or 6,000 inhabitants, you represent Liverpool, with its 300,000 majority, at the rate of one for every 100,000. What right have you, in equity or justice, to take the Member you want from the 100,000 of Liverpool, instead of from the 5,500 of Beverley? I hope the hon. and gallant Member for Beverley will vote for us to-night. We contend for the representation of communities. If you depart from that principle by the recognition of this scheme for the so-called representation of minorities, you will constantly raise up claims on the part of the majorities of those communities which will be so equitable that it will be impossible to resist them. If you begin to give in to those claims, and give the majorities in those towns the right of pleading that on behalf of numbers, which you are now pleading on behalf of minorities, the end of that can only be that the principle must be equally carried out throughout the country, and that those electoral districts which have hitherto been one of the monopolies of those who style themselves Chartists in this country, will be brought before you with claims which, either in *toto* or in approximation, you will, unless you are heedful, be compelled to recognize. Sir, I must own, as the result not of factious party or personal feeling, that looking to the mischiefs that lie hid in this proposal, I regard it as most dangerous. There are two alternatives offered. We may decline to recognize those claims of minorities, or recognizing them, we may be prepared to carry the principle through. and apply it impartially as a general, if not an universal, rule throughout the country. I am very doubtful whether, if we did so apply it, we should be a bit better off than we are now—whether the representation of all parties, grades, and classes in the community, would be better than it is. There are some difficulties of machinery, and I have heard no suggestion made as to how we are to get over them. When Lord Russell in 1854 made a similar proposal, the hon. Member for Birmingham rose in his place, and, straight after the words fell from the lips of Lord Russell, asked when the Member representing the minority for Manchester died was the Member who was to succeed him to be elected by the minority. Lord Russell, though not deficient in ingenuity, found it impossible to give a satisfactory answer to the question. This is quite plain, that if we alter our representative system upon the principle of giving representation to minorities, and if that principle runs through the representation of the country, in a long Parliament there will be this difficulty—a large number of seats are vacated in the course of a Parliament, fifty, sixty, or eighty seats. All those seats for which Members have been returned by minorities at the outset will be gradually taken up by the majority, and we shall find during the course of such a Parliament a great change in particular constituencies, arising out of this cause, though the general principles and temper of the country may have suffered no change whatever. That is a difficulty which, so far as I can see, it is impossible to get over. I have only one or two more words to say, which I could not honestly withold. The Bill which we have passed is a Bill which, in respect of the borough franchise, and, I may even say, in respect to the entire franchise, I hope may be said to carry with it every promise of future durability. With respect then to the entire subject of the franchise, a sanguine man may hope that there is no disturbing cause which is likely, or at all events, which is certain to revive discussion on the subject at a very early period; but I speak of what is no secret when I say that as regards the re-distribution of seats the matter stands in a very different position. I ventured to give a very distinct intimation of my own opinion on the subject when the Bill was passing through the House of Commons. Since that time that opinion has received a remarkable confirmation. I need not commit any breach of Order in alluding to what took place elsewhere, but I may say that I myself heard the highest organ of the Government declare in his place that if in the next Session of Parliament any new and enlarged plan for the re-distribution of seats should be proposed the Government would be prepared by no means to say that the matter was settled last year, and therefore decline to entertain the question, but that they would be prepared to entertain it and give it a candid consideration. Perhaps if we were acting merely from a party point of view, we might not be dissatisfied to see more morsels thrown into the cauldron of Parliamentary discontent. If any of us were capable of allowing ourselves to be carried away by such feelings, we might rejoice to see fresh grounds created for feelings of discontent; but I act on entirely different principles. I disclaim all such intentions. I therefore entreat the House not to give to these great and powerful communities, armed as they will be with such considerations of reason and justice, as have been pointed out, opportunity and provocation to enlist their great energies and powers, and their facilities of acting on the public mind of the country —energies and powers which will be sharpened by a sense of wrong and of disparagement inflicted upon them, and of having been selected from others for that wrong and disparagement, do not let us give to them opportunity and provocation to lead on a new agitation, excited and heated, as they cannot fail to be, by asense of wrong and disappointment. Let us endeavour that this great work of legislation on which we are engaged shall be a soundand solid one. With regard to those great constitutional experiments which have passed, I grant the ordeal of the brain of philosophers of no mean order, but which have not yet taken their place in the regions of practical life, let us urge the claim we are entitled to make, that ample time, facility, and opportunity shall be given to discuss them, to turn them round and round, and to use every human instrument of being well assured of their character and tendency, before we give them a place in the constitutional law of England.

MR. LOWE: Nothing, Sir, would induce me at this late hour of the night, and after the very powerful speech of my right hon. Friend, to presume to ask the attention of the House for a few minutes, except the nature of that speech itself. I should despair of being able to answer my right hon. Friend's arguments if he had not been kind enough to save me the trouble by supplying the answers to these arguments either by his previous conduct or by the speech which he has delivered to-night. My right hon. Friend said this Motion was first heard of on Tuesday week, when it was proposed by Lord Cairns, but a little further on he was kind enough to tell us that he was a party to this very proposal in 1854. He even recollects the discussion which took place, and has described what he perfectly remembers, the conversation on this very point between the hon. Member for Birmingham and Lord Russell. My right hon. Friend says that he considers the constituency and the majority of the constituency the same thing. In those few words he has summed up the fallacy which has pervaded the whole debate. The whole of the hon. Member for Birmingham 's speech, if he will forgive me for saying so, rested on the assumption that whenever anything was true of the majority at Birmingham, it was true of the whole of Birmingham. Taking their own arguments, I wonder Gentlemen who refuse to give votes to minorities are willing even to admit the existence of minorities. But my right hon. Friend having laid down that dogma with regard to the identity of the constituency and the majority, proceeded to answer it with that elaborate analysis to which we listened with so much admiration. He divided the constituency of Liverpool into the majority and minority. He weighed them in the balance and considered their respective claims. All this of course, was superfluous if he thought himself right in saying that the majority and the constituency amounted to the same thing. So we go on—My right hon. Friend proceeds to consider the cause of this proposal, and he bids my hon. Friend the Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) to beware what he was doing, because he is going very near the doctrine of numbers. But I should like to know on what principle he acted in forcing on the Government this third Member to the large constituencies, except as a homage to numbers. I voted for it myself, because I looked forward and hoped that either in this Session or in some future Session the third Member might be obtained for the minority. But my right hon. Friend repudiates any such notion. I want to know, therefore, on what principle, except the doctrine of numbers, he supported the proposal of a third Member for these constituencies. Then my right hon. Friend goes on — The minority of Liverpool, he says, has no occasion to ask for a representative, because it is represented elsewhere. When it is asked where it is represented, I am told it is in Arundel or some such place. [MR. GLADSTONE: I did not say Arundel.] Well, in some similar place. In a small borough. [Several hon. MEMBERS: Calne.] My right hon. Friend forgets that he did all he could to destroy small boroughs during the past Session, that is to destroy the very places through which he now maintains that minorities obtain the representation. My right hon. Friend says he supports the representation of communities as distinguished from that of persons. Yet he argues that the minority in Birmingham is represented by Beverley. His idea of the representation of communities appears to be that the minority of one community should be represented by the majority of another. It is said that in introducing personal representation you are doing away with local representation. There is again the same fallacy. Gentlemen have accustomed themselves so much to overlook the existence of minorities that they will not allow them to live even in the places where they actually reside. There may or may not be more virtue in the principle of numbers, which the right hon. Gentleman now so completely disregards, than in that of locality; but I cannot in the least understand what there is in a minority that should make it less local, because it is less numerous than the majority. This observation must serve as an answer also to my right hon. Friend the Member for London (Mr. Goschen). My right hon.

Friend speaks almost with horror of the unparalleled, the gross injustice of this measure. It is right that we should recall the nature of the measure on which this enormous heap of invective has been piled. It is that where two-fifths of the constituency are willing to vote for one person they shall be permitted to return that person. That is the whole of this tremendous violation and infringement of the acknowledged principles of the British Constitution—that where two-fifths of the constituency are in favour of one person, and three-fifths of the constituency are in favour of two other persons, those three-fifths shall return two and the two-fifths one Member out of three. Was ever a moderate principle belaboured with such terms as these? I should have thought that according to the view of any plain-thinking, right-minded man, if two-thirds of a constituency were in favour of one political view, and the remaining one-third of a different political view, in any constituency so circumstanced the majority of two-thirds ought to return two Members, and the minority of one-third a single Member. That is the way the arithmetical problem would come out if you gave the cumulative vote. But withholding the cumulative vote and substituting for it this, which is not so large and drastic a measure as the cumulative vote, it encounters the determined opposition of my right hon. Friend (Mr. Gladstone). My right hon. Friend could see something in the cumulative vote which might perhaps recommend it, but he is shocked at this which is much more narrow and confined. Then this is represented as a penal measure. Instead of giving one to the minority it is said that it will take away one from the majority. But it comes exactly to the same result whether you give one to the weaker side or take one away from the stronger side. My right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) says that the Member elected by the minority will be more of a delegate than the Member for the majority. Why, I cannot conceive. It appears to me that the representation of the two portions of the constituency will represent similar classes of people in a precisely similar manner. The minority are fewer, but they are electors, and I do not know what there is in the connection between them and the person whom they elect that should make them less free to elect the Member, or the Member elected less free than in the case of the residue of the elective body. I fail to understand the connection of the idea. But I notice it because it formed a prominent part of the speech of my right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London, who spoke with great ability. The hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) says, "Look; what a dreadful thing! The whole country is going to be immolated, because, by giving an additional Member to Birmingham, you are neutralizing the other two." What does his argument amount to? Simply this—You are going to give Birmingham a representation corresponding to the state of opinion in Birmingham. If the feeling in Birmingham were unanimous, if the hon. Member had succeeded in converting to his views all the people of that town, then it would be quite right that we should have the three Members all going together. But if, as I will suppose, for the sake of argument, and as I believe is the fact, two-fifths of the inhabitants of Birmingham are opposed to the hon. Member's views, does not Birmingham under this Bill get a more fair representation in this House, when it obtains a proportion of Members corresponding in some degree to the state of feeling in the town? What ground, therefore, need there be for alarm, because this technical rule of the majority,—for, after all, it is nothing more—be departed from to the extent that one Member shall be returned by the minority, when this amounts to two-fifths or thereabouts? But so horrified was the hon. Member for Birmingham at the bare prospect of a Member for the minority being returned by his own constituency, that I am not sure that he did not threaten to abandon the borough altogether, and he indulged in some dark threats of leaving the House of Commons altogether. This puts me in mind of the troll—

"But should some other claim a part
In that which I adore,
And call a synod in thy heart,
I'll never love thee more."

This is the sort of argument with which the proposal is met. Then it is said that this is a small measure, and therefore very unjust. If it had been larger it would have been said that it was very rash. You cannot possibly please persons who are determined not to be pleased. But it is said that the proposal is absurd—that there can be no argument in favour of it. It appears to me that the argument is as strong as anything can possibly be. But there is a worship of the majority which is a mere political superstition. True representation, the idea of true representation, is to leave no portion of the constituencies unrepresented. If a constituency were unanimous it would be perfectly represented. We have a specimen of the old and rugged way of doing things in the case of juries. We require these to be unanimous, and as that is not in the nature of human things, we shut them up in durance vile till they come to an agreement. That system not having been found practicable under all circumstances mankind hit upon the plan of representation by majorities as a better mode of settling their differences. But there is no absolute reason for stopping there. The art of representation, like other arts is progressive. If means can be found for increasing the number of members for a constituency, and then adapting your system to that increase by the cumulative vote, so as not to disfranchise minorities, and to give some representation to the whole of the constituency, so far from regarding that as an innovation on the Constitution, I think we ought to hail it as an advance in the science of government. The great difference between ancient and modern societies lies in the invention of the principle of representation. It was from the want of that power of representation that the Roman empire was reduced to place itself under the tyranny of a Cæsar. It is only by the existence of that power that large free governments have become possible. This is just an instance of the advantageous changes which may be produced by the use of the most simple expedients. Instead of regarding this principle with hatred and jealousy, I think we should act more wisely if we calmly sat down to investigate its nature, see what it will do, and ascertain whether it does not offer us the only refuge from that tyranny of numbers adored by my right hon. Friend, and forced upon us by this Bill. I will not detain the House at any greater length, and will only now offer them my thanks for the kindness and patience with which they have listened to me after such an orator as the right hon. Gentleman we have just heard.

Question, "That the House do disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 204; Noes 253: Majority 49.

Mr. Lowe

AYES.

Acland, T. D.
Adair, H. E.
Adam, W. P.
Agar-Ellis, hn. L. G. F.
Allen, W. S.
Armstrong, R.
Ayrton, A. S.
Barclay, A. C.
Barnes, T.
Barry, C. R.
Bass, M. T.
Baxter, W. E.
Bazley, T.
Beaumont, W. B.
Berkley, hon. H. F.
Biddulph, Colonel R.M.
Blake, J. A.
Bowyer, Sir G.
Brady, J.
Brand, rt. hon. H.
Bright, Sir C. T.
Bright, J.
Briscoe, J. I.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Bryan, G. L.
Buller, Sir A. W.
Buller, Sir E. M.
Burrell, Sir P.
Butler, C. S.
Calcraft, J. H. M.
Candlish, J.
Carington, hon. C. R.
Castlerosse, Viscount
Chambers, M.
Chambers, T.
Cheetham, J.
Cholmeley, Sir M. J.
Clay, J.
Clement, W. J.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colvile, C. R.
Cowen, J.
Crossley, Sir F.
Dalglish, R.
Davie, Sir H. R. F.
Denman, hon. G.
Dilke, Sir W.
Dixon, G.
Duff, M. E. G.
Dundas, F.
Edwards, C.
Edwards, H.
Eliot, Lord
Enfield, Viscount
Erskine, Vice-Adm. J.E.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, H. E. Crum-
Fane, Colonel J. W.
Fildes, J.
Forster, C.
Forster, W. E.
Gaselee, Serjeant S.
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gilpin, C.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W.E.
Gladstone, W. H.
Glyn, G. C.
Glyn, G. G.
Goldsmid, Sir F. H.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gower, hon. F. L.
Gower, Lord R.
Gray, Sir J.
Grove, T. F.
Gurney, S.
Hadfield, G.
Hamilton, E. W. T.
Hankey, T.
Hardcastle, J. A.
Harris, J. D.
Hartington, Marquess of
Harvey, R. B.
Hay, Lord J.
Headlam, rt. hn. T. E.
Henderson, J.
Heneage, E.
Henley, rt. hon. J. W.
Henley, Lord
Hervey, Lord A. H. C.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hodgkinson, G.
Hodgson, K. D.
Holden, I.
Horsfall, T. B.
Howard, hon. C. W. G.
Hughes, W. B.
Hurst, R. H.
Hutt, rt. hon. Sir W.
Jackson, W.
Jackson, H. M.
Jardine, R.
Kearsley, Captain R.
Kennedy, T.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kinglake, A. W.
Kinglake, J. A.
Kingscote, Colonel
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Knox, hon. Colonel S.
Labouchere, H.
Layard, A. H.
Lawrence, W.
Lawson, rt. hon. J. A.
Lee, W.
Leeman, G.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lewis, H.
Locke, J.
Lusk, A.
M'Lagan, P.
M'Laren, D.
Maguire, J. F.
Marshall, W.
Martin, C. W.
Martin, P. W.
Milbank, F. A.
Miller, W.
Mills, J. R.
Mitchell, A.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moffatt, G.
Moncrieff, rt. hon. J.
Monk, C. J.
Moore, C.
More, R. J.
Morris, W.
Murphy, N. D.
Neate, C.
North, Colonel
Norwood, C. M.
O'Beirne, J. L.
O'Brien, Sir P.

O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.
Onslow, G.
Osborne, R. B.
Otway, A. J.
Packe, Colonel
Padmore, R.
Palmer, Sir R.
Parry, T.
Pease, J. W.
Peel, A. W.
Philips, R. N.
Platt, J.
Potter, E.
Potter, T. B.
Powell, F. S.
Pritchard, J.
Pugh, D.
Rearden, D. J.
Robertson, D.
Roebuck, J. A.
Rothschild, Baron L. de
Rothschild, N. M. de
Russell, Sir C.
St. Aubyn, J.
Samuda, J. D'A.
Seely, C.
Seymour, H. D.
Sheridan, H. B.
Sherriff, A. C.
Simeon, Sir J.
Smith, J.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, J. B.
Stacpoole, W.
Stanley, hon. F.
Stansfeld, J.
Steel, J.
Stone, W. H.
Sullivan, E.
Sykes, Col. W. H.
Taylor, P. A.
Tite, W.
Tomline, G.
Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Tottenham, Lt.-Col. C. G.
Trevelyan, G. O.
Vanderbyl, P.
Verney, Sir H.
Vernon, H. F.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vivian, Capt. hn. J. C. W.
Watkin, E. W.
Western, Sir T. B.
Whalley, G. H.
White, J.
Whitworth, B.
Wickham, H. W.
Williamson, Sir H.
Woods, H.
Young, G.
Young, R.

TELLERS.

Crawford, R. W.
Baines, E.

NOES.

Adderley, rt. hn. C. B.
Amberley, Viscount
Andover, Viscount
Annesley, hn. Col. H.
Archdall, Captain M.
Arkwright, R.
Aytoun, R. S.
Baggallay, R.
Bagge, Sir W.
Bailey, C.
Baring, hon. A. H.
Baring, T.
Barrington, Viscount
Barrow, W. H.
Barry, A. H. S.
Bass, A.
Bathurst, A. A.
Beach, Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Beecroft, G. S.
Biddulph, M.
Bingham, Lord
Blennerhasset, Sir R.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bourne, Colonel
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Brett, W. B.
Bridges, Sir B. W.
Brooks, R.
Bruce, Lord C.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Buxton, C.
Buxton, Sir T. F.
Calthorpe, hn. F. H. W. G.
Campbell, A. H.
Capper, C.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Cartwright, Colonel
Cave, rt. hon. S.
Cavendish, Lord E.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chatterton, rt. hn. H. E.
Clinton, Lord A. P.
Clinton, Lord E. P.
Cobbold, J. C.
Cochrane, A. D. R. W. B.
Cole, hon. J. L.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Corrance, F. S.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Courtenay, Lord
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Cowper, rt. hon. W. F.
Cox, W. T.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cremorne, Lord
Cubitt, G.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dent, J. D.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dick, F.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, R.
Disraeli, rt. hon. B.
Dodson, J. G.
Doulton, F.
Dowdeswell, W. E.
Du Cane, C.
Duncombe, hn. Colonel
Dunne, General
Dutton, hon. R. H.
Dyke, W. H.
Dyott, Colonel R.
Eaton, H. W.
Eckersley, N.
Edwards, Sir H.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, E. C.
Elcho, Lord
Eykyn, R.
Fawcett, H.
Fellowes, E.
Fergusson, Sir J.
Fitzwilliam, hn. C. W. W.
Floyer, J.
Forde, Colonel
Forester, rt. hon. Gen.
Fort, R.
Fortescue, hon. D. F.
Freshfield, C. K.
Garth, R.
Gaskell, J. M.
Gilpin, Colonel
Goldney, G.
Gooch, Sir D.
Goodson, J.
Gorst, J. E.
Grant, A.
Graves, S. R.
Greene, E.
Greville-Nugent, A. W. F.
Gray, Lieut.-Colonel
Grey, hon. T. de
Gurney, rt. hon. R.
Gwyn, H.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, Viscount
Hardy, rt. hon. G.
Hartley, J.
Hartopp, E. B.
Harvey, R. J. H.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Hayter, A. D.
Heathcote, hon. G. H.
Heathcote, Sir W.
Henniker-Major, hn. J. M.
Herbert, hon. Col. P.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Hodgson, W. N.
Hogg, Lt.-Col. J. M.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hood, Sir A. A.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Hornby, W. H.
Hotham, Lord
Howes, E.
Hubbard, J. G.
Hughes, T.
James, E.
Jervis, Major
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
Jones, D.
Karslake, Sir J. B.
Karslake, E. K.
Kekewich, S. T.
Kelk, J.
Kendall, N.
Kennard, R. W.
Keown, W.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knox, Colonel
Lacon, Sir E.
Laing, S.
Laird, J.
Lamont, J.
Langton, W. G.
Leader, N. P.
Lefroy, A.
Legh, Major C.
Lennox, Lord G. G.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Leslie, C. P.
Liddell, hon. H. G.
Lindsay, hon. Col. C.
Lindsay, Colonel R. L.
Long, R. P.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Lowther, Captain
Lowther, J.
M'Kenna, J. N.
Mackie, J.
Mainwaring, T.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Manners, Lord G. J.
Marsh, M. H.
Meller, Colonel
Mill, J. S.
Montagu, rt. hn. Lord R.
Montgomery, Sir G.
Morgan, O.
Morgan, hon. Major
Morris, G.
Morrison, W.
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Naas, Lord
Neeld, Sir J.
Neville-Grenville, R.
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Noel, hon. G. J.
Northcote, rt. hn. Sir S. H.
O'Conor Don, The
Paget, R. H.
Pakington, rt. hn. Sir J.
Palk, Sir L.
Parker, Major W.
Patten, rt. hon. Col. W.
Paull, H.
Peel, rt. hon. General
Pelham, Lord
Pim, J.
Pollard-Urquhart, W.
Portman, hn. W. H. B.
Price, W. P.
Read, C. S.
Robartes, T. J. A.
Robertson, P. F.
Royston, Viscount
Russell, A
Russell, F. W.
Samuelson, B.
Schreiber, C.
Sclater-Booth, G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scourfield, J. H.
Selwyn, Sir C. J.
Severne, J. E.
Seymour, G. H.
Smith, A.
Smith, S. G.
Somerset, E. A.
Stanley, Lord
Stock, O.
Stuart, Colonel W.

Stucley, Sir G. S.
Sturt, H. G.
Sturt, Lt.-Col. N.
Surtees, C. F.
Surtees, H. E.
Sykes, C.
Thorold, Sir J. H.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Tollemache, J.
Torrens, R.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. Hanbury-
Treeby, J. W.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Verner, E. W.
Verner, Sir W.
Walcott, Admiral
Walker, Major G. G.
Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Walsh, Sir J.
Waring, C.
Warner, E.
Waterhouse, S.
Welby, W. E.
Whitbread, S.
Williams, F. M.
Wise, H. C.
Woodd, B. T.
Wyld, J.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Wynne, W. R. M.
Wyvill, M.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.

Taylor, Colonel T. E.
Whitmore, H.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause B. (Restriction as to Number of Votes in the City of London).

MR. CRAWFORD said, the result of the division which had just taken place was not encouraging to a Member for the City of London rising with the object which he had in view. But there was a considerable difference between the constituencies affected by that division and the constituency which he had the honour to represent. That fact was admitted by the House of Lords because they had dealt with London in a separate Amendment. The decision which they would have to come to would not be a trivial or an unimportant one. They were about to deal with the first constituency in the Empire. It was a constituency which returned four Members, and in that respect if in no other it was entitled to be considered the first constituency in the Empire. It was not his intention to go into the question of the representation of minorities which had been so fully discussed. What he desired to point out was that there were some peculiarities connected with the City of London which deserved the consideration of the House. The first fact to which he wished to call the attention of hon. Members was that the legislation now about to be adopted by Parliament was experimental legislation. Surely the philosophic views or crotchets put forward with respect to the representation of minorities might be tested sufficiently by means of the constituencies already selected for the purpose. There was no reason for extending the experiment to the City. Eleven constituencies had been selected for the experiment. Surely it was enough. London was made the subject of a separate clause. Lord Cairns in introducing the subject of three-cornered constituencies said that he thought the experiment ought to be confined to places returning three Members; so that it was evidently not intended originally to extend the experiment to London, which returned four Members. Of all the constituencies in the kingdom, London would be the least affected by this Bill. So far as the City of London was concerned, no danger to the Constitution was to be apprehended from the democratic tendencies of the Bill. At the outside it would not add more than about 200 to the number of occupation electors in the City. He asked the Members of the Liberal party—even those who had voted for the Amendment just carried—to bear in mind that there was no constituency better entitled to considerate treatment on their part than the constituency of London. Of late years it had returned to Parliament supporters of all great Liberal measures. He should ask the House to go to a division if for no other reason than that there should be on the records of Parliament the names of those—especially if there should be Liberals among them—who were disposed to vote for the partial disfranchisement of the City of London.

Moved "That the House do disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment." —*Mr. Crawford.*)

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, he wished to ask the House, as it had now affirmed the principle that minorities were to be represented, when it would be prepared to affirm the principle that the minority of that House should have some share in the government of the country? It seemed that if the principle of the representation of minorities was to be applied to these constituencies it ought to be applied more extensively. If fully and fairly carried out the party who happened to have a majority of ten or twenty in that House ought not necessarily to have the whole of the patronage, and to administer the whole of the affairs of this great Empire.

MR. BRIGHT: I think it would be judicious on the part of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer if his Government and if the House agree to the proposal of my hon. Friend the Member for the City of London. I think I can understand a little of what it is that has brought us into the position we are in, in regard to this question. There are many Members of this House who think it wise to make a concession to the view of the House of Lords on a point on which, in reality, they do not agree with the House of Lords. That I know to be the feeling, because I have heard it from various quarters to-night, and I am quite sure it prevails. A concession of great magnitude has been made in the late division. What the hon. Member for the City of London says is perfectly true. The cases are not the same. I believe the City of London has enjoyed the representation of four Members—I do not know that it has been entirely without interruption—from the time of Henry the Eighth. It appears to me that the right hon. Gentleman, having carried into execution the decree of the House of Lords with regard to these other boroughs, might—and the House might—fairly consent to accept the proposal of my hon. Friend. I am not a Member for the City of London, and have no interest in this matter more than any other Member has; but if we assent to the proposal of my hon. Friend, it will be received, no doubt, in the City of London with great satisfaction. I shall not go into any argument upon the matter, because the arguments which have been laid before the House in the different speeches which have been made to-night will to-morrow be in the hands of most persons in this country who can read, and we must leave those arguments to produce their own effect. I am giving this advice, or rather expressing this opinion, with no hostility to hon. Gentlemen opposite, and with no hostility to the right hon. Gentleman and his Government, of which he is so distinguished a member. I think the House would do wisely, and the Government most wisely, in accepting the proposal of my hon. Friend the Member for the City of London.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 188; Noes 252: Majority 64.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendments, as far as Amendment in Page 10, "after Clause 27 insert Clauses C, D, E, F, G," *agreed to.*

Clause C (Power to Vote by Voting Paper).

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am desirous to induce the House to come to a unanimous vote upon this subject. As this is a new clause we can make Amendments in it. Therefore I move to omit the words "or borough," and so leave the clause applicable only to counties.

Amendment proposed in Line 1 of the Clause, after the word "County" to leave out the words "or Borough."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or Borough' stand part of the Clause."

MR. GLADSTONE: Of course, in point of form it would be competent for the House to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman without anyone hereafter losing the right to vote against the clause. But that would not be to act in the spirit of the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. He has made a proposal which deserves to be fairly dealt with, and I am sorry to say I cannot accede to it. If I could accede to a compromise at all I would much rather strike out the word "county," and leave in the word "borough." The vote of this House was taken on the principle of the optional use of voting papers, and strong opinions were expressed upon it. It was well debated at the time, and we are under obligation to detain the House by discussing it now. I can take no course but to disagree to the Lords' Amendment.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: It is a considerable sacrifice on the part of those who approve the principle of voting papers to leave the boroughs out. I am rather inclined to agree with the right hon. Gentlemen opposite. The argument for voting papers applies very strongly both to counties and boroughs, but more strongly to boroughs than to counties. I think so for this reason. In counties it would mainly have the effect of stopping travelling expenses; in boroughs it would have the effect of protecting voters who dislike violence and outrage from the brutal mob who always surround polling-booths. Therefore in assenting to this proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I assent to a modification which I would rather not see made. The plan has been tried in the case of the Universities, and has been found to work well. ["No!"] I am not going at this time of night to argue the question. I trust the House will carry out the principle. I merely press the dominant fact that the arguments against it are merely arguments against the machinery, not against the principle. You say the machinery is capable of great abuses. Those abuses are as revolting to us as to you, and any modifications to prevent them, which can be now or hereafter suggested, will be gladly accepted by us. There is a great evil to be redressed. Large numbers of our fellow-countrymen are practically disfranchised by the present system. If abuses should attach themselves to the machinery of this clause, it will be easy to introduce such Amendments as may be needed. It is not retrogression, but true progress, truly in harmony with the civilization of the present day, and with the requirements of our century, that you should adopt some method of this kind in place of the barbarous method soon, I trust, to become obsolete, to which you compel all electors at present to have recourse.

Mr. DODSON said, that in principle he had no objection to voting papers, provided they could devise safe machinery for the use of them. But they could be more easily adopted in the case of boroughs than in that of counties. One of their uses would be to give facilities for polling, and to reduce travelling expenses. Those were advantages which were applicable to counties and boroughs in common, although their force would be greater in the former. Voting papers would have, however, one advantage in boroughs which they would not have in counties, and an advantage which would be incalculable. They might be made the means of preventing the state of the poll from being made known from hour to hour, and thus place a check upon the bribery which prevailed during the last hours of the poll. In counties they would have the great disadvantage, which would not exist in the case of boroughs, that they would afford facilities for the creation of faggot votes. As it was, non-residents might obtain a 40*s.* franchise, but the necessity of personal attendance at the poll very much limited the exercise of the privilege. No man would take the trouble of qualifying for a county unless it was one in connection with which he had some local association or personal tie. But if a system of voting papers were adopted, it was perfectly conceivable that a band of devoted partizans might qualify themselves for every county in England in such numbers as materially to affect the result of elections. That danger, unless means could be found for guarding against it, would be a strong objection to the adoption of voting papers in counties. With him, however, the question of the advisability of the adoption of voting papers was essentially one relating to the necessary machinery. The machinery provided in the present Bill was fraught with every kind of danger and difficulty. What were the dangers to be guarded against in employing such a system? The extortion of a voting paper from a weak voter, increased facilities for bribery, the accumulation of these papers in the hands of a few wire pullers, forgery, the falsification of papers, and the tampering with them generally. How did the Bill propose to guard against these evils? It contained a great apparatus of securities, but it was an apparatus which was most fallacious. The returning officer was to have a book of voting papers. To each voting paper was to be attached a counterfoil, and the paper was to be sent to the voter by the returning officer, only upon a written application by the voter, containing the name of the voter. The returning officer was, moreover, to take the precaution of entering on the voting paper the name and number on the register of the voter, and on the counterfoil, and he was to send it addressed to the voter. Thereby, he would, of course, have the security that when the paper come back at the poll he would know it was the paper which he had issued. But what would he know of the applicant? The application might apparently come from John Jones, number 200. The paper would come back in the name of John Jones, number 200. But the supposed applicant might be dead or abroad, or intend to vote in person, or delay applying for his voting paper. The paper was, however, to be returned, signed by John Jones, and countersigned by John Smith, a justice of the peace. But what did the returning officer know of John Smith? Supposing he knew there was a justice of that name, he did not know his handwriting. But the election might be in Devonshire, and Jones and Smith might date from Doncaster, and then the returning officer would not know whether there was such a justice at all. What security was there that the voting papers might not have been applied for by some keen partizan living in the neighbourhood of the returning officer, who might sign John Jones with his right hand and John Smith, justice of the peace, with his left. The question was one involving matters of minute and intricate detail, and the machinery provided by the Bill was, so far as he could see, totally inadequate for its purpose. The machinery adopted in the case of the Universities was inapplicable to that of counties and boroughs, yet not as much so as that contained in this Bill. If the plan were to be carried into effect at all, it should be made the subject of a separate Bill, brought in after careful consideration at the commencement of the Session, when it could be fully discussed and referred to a Select Committee, and the details afterwards considered by the whole House. He believed that it would be found, when the matter came to be considered, that counties and boroughs required very different machinery, and that it might be necessary to have one machinery for resident voters in counties, and another for non-resident voters. The machinery now proposed was totally inadequate for the purpose, and if adopted would only lead to every kind of deception and fraud, to disappointment to themselves and injury to the country.

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he hoped the House would well consider the question. It was only six weeks ago that by a majority of 38 this clause was rejected. He agreed in thinking that the proposed machinery was defective. But the question was one, not of machinery only, but of principle. The greatest authority who took part in the discussion elsewhere pronounced the idea inadmissible that the identity of the voter should be attested in the presence of one magistrate sitting alone, and suggested that the presence of two magistrates should be required. That suggestion was discarded. The proposed plan would only lead to deception and fraud. It was said that the system of voting papers would lead to a large number of votes being recorded. In a recent election for Poor Law Guardians in one of the largest parishes in Islington the plan was tried. In that parish there were 10,000 assessments, and 5,500 voting papers were issued; only 1,500 of the papers were recorded. That circumstance was a sufficient proof that this system would not add to the number of the persons who voted. The proposed plan would make the magistrates before whom the voting papers were attested a sort of political banker. Votes would be turned into paper which they might hold in their hands, and thus show their influence and importance. There was this other evil attending the scheme, that if a voter desired to alter his vote after delivering the voting paper to the magistrate he would not be able to do so.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that he was ready to discuss the proposed provision both on its principle and its details. Upon the principle of the measure he agreed with the noble Lord the Member for Stamford (Viscount Cranborne). With regard to the election of guardians, in the case of a contest where matters of interest were involved almost every voter voted, but very few did so if the election was one of no great interest. He presumed that the election to which the hon. Member for Finsbury had alluded was of the latter character. The objection urged by the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Dodson) would apply to every power of attorney. It would be supposed that forgery was resorted to in connection with these voting papers; but forgeries did not happen in that way now, and he did not think they would be more frequent under the new system. The person must go before a justice that knew him, and there was every means of detecting him if he was guilty of fraud. What they had now to vote upon was the principle of voting papers, and he hoped the House would agree to the Lords' Amendment.

Mr. C. P. VILLIERS said, the right hon. Gentleman had referred to the little excitement that occurred under this system, upon the election of Guardians. This was the case, no doubt, when there was no interest taken in the election; but how was it when there was interest taken? He could speak from his connection with the Poor Law Board, that in such cases there was every sort of practice that could not be justified. He wrote to one of the inspectors a few days ago to know the result of an inquiry he had made upon this subject, and he would read to the House the reply. It was in these terms—

> "I was certainly directed by the Poor Law Board to institute an official inquiry into the election of Guardians for the wards of the town of ——. I did so, and I was obliged to report to the Poor Law Board that every sort of trickery, of forgery, of theft, of destruction of voting papers was practised, and indeed the collectors of voting papers were allured into pot-houses, and were either plundered or were a party to the demolition of those papers. The whole affair was disgraceful."

[*Cries of* "Name, name!"] The right hon. Gentleman might make inquiry as to whether he was accurate or not in the statement he had made. Wherever there was political feeling in connection with the election of Guardians, the use of papers must be distrusted. There was every abuse and every facility for abuse. That he took to be the fact, and he believed the right hon. Gentleman himself, when at the Poor

Law Board, heard complaints made to him on this subject that induced him to issue a General Order to vary the system. But the system of voting papers was recommended to the House by its being confined to the counties. Why, it was precisely in the counties that all the danger was to be apprehended. The only check now on all kinds of fraud and mal-practice with reference to the non-resident voters was that they must attend and shew themselves at the poll. They must go down to vote. But here was a scheme devised to meet that difficulty. They might qualify any number of persons. Persons might create rent-charges, give them to their servants, put them on the register, and they might send down their papers to tell for whom they voted. He believed if this scheme were adopted one Member of Parliament—he would not say of what House—could vote for fifty-two places in one morning. A man might get himself qualified for every county in England and send his papers and those of other persons without moving a step from London, showing only for whom they voted. The Reform Bill of 1832 was totally varied in its operation by the Chandos clause; and as the £50 clause no longer existed, this appeared to be a device to recoup the great proprietary for their loss of influence on that account. He could not support such a system.

Mr. BRIGHT: I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a question. When a voter comes up to the poll can he be asked to take the bribery oath? I am not in favour of the bribery or any other kind of oath; but I do not see any provision of this kind with regard to those persons who vote by voting papers. A man could fill up his paper 200 miles off, and send it to the poll, he having received a bribe; and it would be impossible to put the oath to him. Whatever security we take with regard to the other voters we ought to take with respect to those who vote by voting papers. I will state a fact communicated to me since the last discussion on this subject. Immediately after that discussion I received a letter from a gentleman stopping in London, the son of one of the most eminent lawyers in the United States, and known to every eminent lawyer in this House. He said that at the last great Presidential election in the United States a law was passed to enable soldiers in the field to vote for the different States from which they came, and the law was passed with every guarantee possible. The papers were to be given in presence of the colonel or some officer of the regiment. The result was that the amount of forgery was positively appalling. Thousands of votes were sent up that were fraudulent. The exposure was so complete that my correspondent stated that there was no public man who, under similar circumstances, would recommend such a proposal again to Congress. I believe that that which was done by wholesale in the United States would be done to a very large extent by many parties in this country. I hope the House will agree with the proposal that the Amendment of the Lords be disagreed to. I doubt if anyone has been heard out of doors expressing approval of this proposal. I think it bad in every way. It is impossible to amend it, and I shall therefore be glad to vote against it.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I understand the hon. Gentleman's chief objection to this clause is that it gives no power to put the bribery oath.

Mr. BRIGHT: I did not say it was my chief objection—I merely suggested that the provision as to the oath was omitted.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Then it was your objection.

Mr. BRIGHT: Not at all.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The argument comes to the same. I only rose to answer the hon. Gentleman, and to state that the power of putting the bribery oath no longer exists.

Mr. J. STUART MILL: It is scarcely possible that the House will be induced to pass, or that the Government will attempt to force upon the House, this really monstrous proposal. The vast mass of fraud to which it would give birth has been shown, but it will produce effects worse than even that mass of fraud. If the House have the smallest desire to diminish bribery and intimidation — if they do not wish to increase it to an enormous extent, they will refuse to assent to this Amendment. If it passes, every tenant may be taken to the drawing-room of his landlord and there compelled to sign his voting paper. Do not we know what electioneering agents will do? Will they not take the voter before the magistrate who has the greatest power over him? This will become the general rule of the country. I do not say that bribery will be as universal as intimidation. But the voting papers are to be signed before a magistrate, and, recollect, Mr. Churchward is a magistrate. When I heard that the Upper House had adopted this principle, I did expect something decent would be done to place checks and restraints on its consequences. I could not have believed that any serious person pretending to the character of a politician would have brought forward such a set of rules, which are apparently constructed to aggravate instead of diminishing the mischievous operation of the system. I should prefer that no Reform Bill should be passed, rather than that this monstrous scheme should be carried into effect.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, that the county franchise was much higher than that for the boroughs, and that the higher the franchise was the more absolutely necessary it was that the non-electors should know how the electors voted. Then, with respect to fraud, it was within his knowledge that the United States of America had been obliged to establish a system of registration before the election, at which the voter had to appear, and which was equivalent to appearing at the poll. That had been been the experience of several at least of the States in America. It might be thought the scheme of voting papers would save the candidates from many inconveniences, but that was an error, and he implored hon. Members not to give their support to a proposition which would inevitably terminate in disappointing every favourable anticipation indulged in by those who had brought it forward.

Question, "That the words 'or Borough' stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Motion made, and Question put, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Clause as amended."—(*Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens*).

The House *divided*:—Ayes 258; Noes 206: Majority, 52.

AYES.

Acland, T. D.
Adair, H. E.
Adam, W. P.
Agar-Ellis, hon. L.G.F.
Akroyd, E.
Allen, W. S.
Amberley, Viscount
Andover, Viscount
Antrobus, E.
Armstrong, R.
Ayrton, A. S.
Aytoun, R. S.
Baines, E.
Barclay, A. C.
Barnes, T.
Barry, A. H. S.
Barry, C. R.
Bass, A.
Bass, M. T.
Baxter, W. E.
Bazley, T.
Beaumont, W. B.
Berkeley, hon. H. F.
Biddulph, Col. R. M.
Blake, J. A.
Blennerhassett, Sir R.
Bonham-Carter, J.
Bouverie, rt. hon. E. P.
Bowyer, Sir G.
Brady, J.
Brand, rt. hon. H.
Bright, Sir C. T.
Bright, J.
Bruce, Lord C.
Bruce, rt. hon. H. A.
Bryan, G. L.
Buller, Sir A. W.
Buller, Sir E. M.
Butler, C. S.
Buxton, C.
Buxton, Sir T. F.
Calcraft, J. H. M.
Calthorpe, hn. F. H. W. G.
Candlish, J.
Cardwell, rt. hon. E.
Carington, hon. C. R.
Castlerosse, Viscount
Cavendish, Lord E.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Cavendish, Lord G.
Chambers, M.
Chambers, T.
Cheetham, J.
Childers, H. C. E.
Cholmeley, Sir M. J.
Clay, J.
Clement, W. J.
Clinton, Lord E. P.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Coleridge, J. D.
Collier, Sir R. P.
Colvile, C. R.
Cowen, J.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Cowper, rt. hn. W. F.
Crawford, R. W.
Cremorne, Lord
Crossley, Sir F.
Dalglish, R.
Davie, Sir H. R. F.
Denman, hon. G.
Dent, J. D.
Dering, Sir E. C.
Dilke, Sir W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dixon, G.
Dodson, J. G.
Duff, M. E. G.
Dundas, F.
Eckersley, N.
Edwards, C.
Edwards, H.
Eliot, Lord
Erskine, Vice-Ad. J. E.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, H. E. Crum-
Eykyn, R.
Fawcett, H.
Fildes, J.
Fitzwilliam, hn. C. W. W.
Forster, C.
Forster, W. E.
Fortescue, rt. hon. C. S.
Fortescue, hon. D. F.
Gaselee, Serjeant S.
Gaskell, J. M.
Gibson, rt. hon. T. M.
Gilpin, C.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, W. H.
Glyn, G. C.
Glyn, G. G.
Goldsmid, Sir F. H.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gower, hon. F. L.
Gower, Lord R.
Gray, Sir J.
Greville-Nugent, A. W. F.
Grove, T. F.
Gurney, S.
Hadfield, G.
Hamilton, E. W. T.
Hankey, T.
Hardcastle, J. A.
Harris, J. D.
Hartington, Marquess of
Hay, Lord J.
Hay, Lord W. M.
Hayter, A. D.
Headlam, rt. hn. T. E.
Henderson, J.
Heneage, E.
Henley, rt. hon. J. W.
Henley, Lord
Hibbert, J. T.
Hodgkinson, G.
Hodgson, K. D.
Holden, I.
Howard, hon. C. W. G.
Hughes, T.
Hughes, W. B.
Hurst, R. H.
Hutt, rt. hn. Sir W.
Jackson, H. M.
Jackson, W.
James, E.
Jardine, R.
Jervoise, Sir J. C.
Kearsley, Captain R.
Kennedy, T.
King, hon. P. J. L.
Kinglake, A. W.
Kinglake, J. A.
Kingscote, Colonel
Kinnaird, hon. A. F.
Knatchbull-Hugessen, E
Labouchere, H.
Layard, A. H.
Lamont, J.
Lawrence, W.
Lawson, rt. hon. J. A.
Leader, N. P.
Lee, W.
Leeman, G.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Legh, Major C.
Lewis, H.
Locke, J.
Long, R. P.
Lusk, A.
Mackie, J.
M'Laren, D.
Maguire, J. F.
Marshall, W.
Martin, C. W.
Martin, P. W.
Milbank, F. A.
Mill, J. S.
Miller, W.
Mills, J. R.

Mitchell, A.
Mitchell, T. A.
Moffatt, G.
Moncreiff, rt. hon. J.
Monk, C. J.
Moore, C.
More, R. J.
Morris, W.
Morrison, W.
Murphy, N. D.
Neate, C.
Newdegate, C. N.
Norwood, C. M.
O'Beirne, J. L.
O'Brien, Sir P.
O'Conor Don, The
O'Loghlen, Sir C. M.
Onslow, G.
Osborne, R. B.
Otway, A. J.
Packe, Colonel
Padmore, R.
Palmer, Sir R.
Parry, T.
Pease, J. W.
Peel, A. W.
Pelham, Lord
Philips, R. N.
Pim, J.
Platt, J.
Pollard-Urquhart, W.
Portman, hn. W. H. B.
Potter, E.
Potter, T. B.
Price, W. P.
Pritchard, J.
Rearden, D. J.
Robartes, T. J. A.
Robertson, D.
Roebuck, J. A.
Rothschild, Baron L. de
Rothschild, N. M. de
Russell, A.
Russell, F. W.
St. Aubyn, J.
Samuda, J. D'A.
Samuelson, B.
Seely, C.
Seymour, H. D.
Sheridan, H. B.
Sherriff, A. C.
Simeon, Sir J.
Smith, J.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, J. B.
Stacpoole, W.
Stanley, hon. F.
Stansfeld, J.
Steel, J.
Stock, O.
Stone, W. H.
Sullivan, E.
Sykes, Colonel W. H.
Taylor, P. A.
Tite, W.
Tomline, G.
Tracy, hon. C. R. D. Hanbury-
Trevelyan, G. O.
Vanderbyl, P.
Verney, Sir H.
Vernon, H. F.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Vivian, Capt.hn.J.C.W.
Waring, C.
Watkin, E. W.
Western, Sir T. B.
Whalley, G. H.
Whitbread, S.
White, hon. Capt. C.
White, J.
Whitworth, B.
Wickham, H. W.
Williamson, Sir H.
Woods, H.
Wyvill, M.
Young, G.
Young, R.

TELLERS.

Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Enfield, Viscount

NOES.

Adderley, rt. hon. C. B.
Annesley, hon. Col. H.
Anson, hon. Major
Archdall, Captain M.
Arkwright, R.
Baggallay, R.
Bagge, Sir W.
Bailey, C.
Baring, T.
Barrington, Viscount
Barrow, W. H.
Bateson, Sir T.
Bathurst, A. A.
Beach, Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Beecroft, G. S.
Biddulph, M.
Bingham, Lord
Bourne, Colonel
Brett, W. B.
Bridges, Sir B. W.
Brooks, R.
Bruce, Sir H. H.
Burrell, Sir P.
Campbell, A. H.
Capper, C.
Cartwright, Colonel
Cave, rt. hon. S.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chatterton, rt. hn. H.E.
Clinton, Lord A. P.
Cobbold, J. C.
Cochrane, A. D. R.W.B.
Cole, hon. J. L.
Corrance, F. S.
Corry, rt. hon. H. L.
Courtenay, Lord
Cox, W. T.
Cranborne, Viscount
Cubitt, G.
Curzon, Viscount
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dick, F.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Dimsdale, R.
Disraeli, rt. hon. B.
Doulton, F.
Dowdeswell, W. E.
Du Cane, C.
Duncombe, hon. Col.
Dunne, General
Dutton, hon. R. H.
Dyke, W. H.
Dyott, Colonel R.
Eaton, H. W.
Edwards, Sir H.
Egerton, E. C.
Elcho, Lord
Fane, Colonel J. W.
Fellowes, E.
Fergusson, Sir J.
Floyer, J.
Forde, Colonel
Forester, rt. hon. Gen.
Fort, R.
Freshfield, C. K.
Garth, R.
Gilpin, Colonel
Goldney, G.
Gooch, Sir D.
Gore, J. R. O.
Gorst, J. E.
Grant, A.
Graves, S. R.
Greene, E.
Gray, Lt.-Colonel
Grey, hon. T. de
Griffith, C. D.
Gurney, rt. hon. R.
Gwyn, H.
Hamilton, Lord C.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hamilton, Viscount
Hardy, rt. hon. G.
Hartley, J.
Hartopp, E. B.
Harvey, R. B.
Harvey, R. J. H.
Hay, Sir J. C. D.
Heathcote, hon. G. H.
Heathcote, Sir W.
Henniker-Major, hon. J. M.
Herbert, hon. Col. P.
Hervey, Lord A. H. C.
Hesketh, Sir T. G.
Hodgson, W. N.
Hogg, Lieut.-Col. J. M.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hood, Sir A. A.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Hornby, W. H.
Horsfall, T. B.
Hotham, Lord
Howes, E.
Hubbard, J. G.
Hunt, G. W.
Jervis, Major
Jones, D.
Karslake, E. K.
Karslake, Sir J. B.
Kekewich, S. T.
Kelk, J.
Kendall, N.
Kennard, R. W.
Keown, W.
Knight, F. W.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knox, Colonel
Knox, hon. Col. S.
Lacon, Sir E.
Laing, S.
Laird, J.
Langton, W. G.
Lefroy, A.
Lennox, Lord G. G.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Leslie, C. P.
Liddell, hon. H. G.
Lindsay, hon. Col. C.
Lindsay, Colonel R. L.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowther, Captain
Lowther, J.
Mainwaring, T.
Manners, Lord G. J.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Meller, Colonel
Montagu, rt. hn. Lord R.
Montgomery, Sir G.
Morgan, hon. Major
Morgan, O.
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Naas, Lord
Neeld, Sir J.
Neville-Grenville, R.
Newport, Viscount
Noel, hon. G. J.
North, Colonel
Northcote, rt. hn. Sir S. H.
Paget, R. H.
Pakington, rt. hn. Sir J.
Palk, Sir L.
Parker, Major W.
Patten, rt. hon. Col. W.
Paull, H.
Peel, rt. hon. Gen.
Powell, F. S.
Pugh, D.
Read, C. S.
Robertson, P. F.
Royston, Viscount
Schreiber, C.
Sclater-Booth, G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scourfield, J. H.
Selwyn, Sir C. J.
Severne, J. E.
Seymour, G. H.
Simonds, W. B.
Smith, A.
Smith, S. G.
Somerset, E. A.
Stanley, Lord
Stopford, S. G.
Stuart, Lt.-Col. W.
Sturt, H. G.
Sturt, Lt.-Col. N.
Surtees, C. F.
Surtees, H. E.
Sykes, C.
Thorold, Sir J. H.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Tollemache, J.
Torrens, R.
Tottenham, Lt.-Col. C. G.
Treeby, J. W.
Turner, C.
Vance, J.
Verner, E. W.
Verner, Sir W.
Walcott, Admiral
Walker, Major G. G.

Walpole, rt. hon. S. H.
Walsh, Sir J.
Waterhouse, S.
Welby, W. E.
Williams, Colonel
Williams, F. M.
Wise, H. C.
Woodd, B. T.
Wyld, J.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Wynne, W. R. M.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.
Taylor, Colonel T. E.
Whitmore, H.

Several Amendments *disagreed to;* some *agreed to.*

Clause 46 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery).

In Page 16, Line 41, on Question that the Lords' Amendment leaving out "corruptly' be agreed to,

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, he objected to leave out the word "corruptly."

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, he thought the House ought to disagree with the Lords on this Amendment, and retain the word "corruptly."

MR. RUSSELL GURNEY said, he hoped that the word "corruptly" would be left out, and the Lords' Amendment agreed to.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, he thought it of great importance to disagree with this Amendment.

On Question, Amendment *disagreed to.*

On the Amendment of the Lords, providing that any returning officer acting as agent at an election should be guilty of misdemeanour.

Clause I (Returning Officer, &c., acting as Agent guilty of Misdemeanour).

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that it had been argued with considerable force that the effect of such a clause would be to confine the selection of returning officers to not the most respectable class of professional men. He thought, therefore, it might be as well not to agree to the Amendment.

MR. AYRTON said, he thought the Amendment a good one. The law ought not to remain as it was in respect of those returning officers.

On Question, Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 54 (Construction of Act), in Page 18, Line 35, after "Act," insert,

"Provided that so much of Clause 78 of the last-mentioned Act as provides that nothing in that Act contained shall entitle any Person to Vote in the election of Members to serve in Parliament for the City of Oxford or Town of Cambridge in respect of the occupation of any Chambers or Premises in any of the Colleges or Halls of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge shall not apply to the franchises conferred by this Act."

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER said, that this Amendment virtually repealed the provision of the Reform Act by which persons were not permitted to vote at the borough elections in respect of their occupation of any chambers or premises in any of the Colleges or Halls at the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge. If this clause was introduced with that intention the word "insidious" was a very mild term to apply to it. If without that intention it was but right to point out the effect which it would have. He moved that the House disagree to the Lords' Amendment.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that he should abide by the Amendment of the Lords.

Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Sir Roundell Palmer*)—put; The House divided:—Ayes 188; Noes 164: Majority 24.

Clause L (Saving Clause as to Dissolution of Parliament).

SIR ROBERT COLLIER said, he wanted to know why the operation of the new constituencies was to be postponed till the 1st of January, 1869?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, there was no intention to postpone the action of the new constituencies, but it would be that time before the new register would be in force.

MR. AYRTON said, that there were two propositions involved in the clause, one with regard to the franchises created, and the other with regard to the distribution of seats. As regarded the latter proposition the Bill might come into operation at the end of this year, but as regarded the new franchises it could not come into operation till the end of next year.

MR. WALPOLE said, that there could not be any registration until next summer, and therefore no part of the Act could come into operation until after that time.

MR. CANDLISH moved the insertion of words providing for the case of the vacation of a seat.

Clause amended and *agreed to.*

MR. AYRTON said, it would be found that there was now no Schedule F in the Bill.

Mr. CHILDERS said, that as there were to be no voting papers there would be no Schedule G.

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed :"—Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Villiers, Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Colvile, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens, Viscount Enfield, Mr. Moncreiff, and Sir Colman O'Loghlen.

MILITIA BILL.

On Motion of Sir John Pakington, Bill to consolidate and amend certain Laws relating to the Militia in England, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir John Pakington and Colonel Herbert.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 308.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, August 9, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading—* Army Reserve* (320); Expiring Laws Continuance* (321); Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation, &c.* (322); Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* (323).

Second Reading—Factory Acts Extension (296); Courts of Law Fees, &c.* (286); Railways (Ireland)* (316); Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* (289); Turnpike Acts Continuance* (307).

Committee—Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act (1865) Amendment* (247); Master and Servant* (248); Admiralty Court (Ireland) (273 & 326); Guarantee of Government Officers* (297); Public Health (Scotland)* (306); Sewage* (285 & 328).

Report—Master and Servant* (248 & 325); Poor Law Board, &c.* (303); Banns of Matrimony* (311); Guarantee of Government Officers* (297 & 327); Public Health (Scotland)* (306).

Third Reading—Barrack Lane, Windsor (Rights of Way)* (295); District Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)* (272); Militia Pay*; Indemnity* (274); Bank Post Bills (Ireland)* (275); Customs Revenue* (284); Inland Revenue* (287); Dominica Loan* (288).

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—(No. 293.)—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS TO LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

The Earl of DERBY said, that this Bill had been returned from the Commons with several of the Amendments made by the Lords *agreed to;* One Amendment *agreed to,* with Amendments, and several other Amendments *disagreed to,* for which they assigned Reasons. He therefore proposed to ask the House to take into consideration on Monday next the course pursued by the House of Commons; and he would then take the opportunity of stating the course which Her Majesty's Government would recommend their Lordships to adopt in the matter.

Then it was *ordered,* that the said Reasons and Bill, with the Amendments, be *printed,* and to be taken into consideration on *Monday* next. (Nos. 317 & 318.)

GENERAL POST OFFICE—POSTAL CONVENTION WITH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INDIA, AND CHINA.

CONVENTION PRESENTED.

The Duke of MONTROSE: I beg, my Lords, to lay upon the table of the House a copy of a Convention which has just been entered into between this country and the United States. By the provisions of this Convention, the postage of letters passing between the two countries will he reduced from 1*s.* to 6*d.* We also hope that we shall be able to have in future more frequent communication with America, and I have no doubt that we shall in a short time arrive at that which has never hitherto been expected, daily communication with that country. By means of another Convention we hope also to effect a very considerable reduction in the postage of letters to Canada, going through the United States—a reduction from 1*s.* to 8*d.*, and to secure at the same time great facilities for communication with the new colony of British Columbia. We shall be able to send letters to that colony in a much shorter time than now, by the Isthmus of Panama, at a very reduced cost and much more frequently. I think your Lordships will be of opinion that these arrangements will be extremely satisfactory to the country at large. I must add, my Lords, that the Government of the United States has acted in this matter with the greatest cordiality, and has displayed the greatest anxiety to facilitate the communications to which I have alluded. I am also desirous of taking this opportunity to make a few remarks on the postal arrangements which have been entered into for India and China. After long consideration of the subject in a Committee of the House of Commons it was resolved by them to recommend to the Government that they should give notice to determine the existing contracts, have open tenders for future contracts, and establish more frequent communication with India. It was proposed, in fact, by these arrangements, that we should have a weekly mail to Bombay, and from Bombay by railway to Calcutta and Madras. We have followed these recommendations of the Committee, and have given notice to terminate the existing contracts, and also for the sending in of the tenders for new contracts for the service both from Marseilles to Alexandria, and from Brindisi to Alexandria, and from Alexandria to Bombay, China, and Australia. A very curious misapprehension has got abroad among the public, and it has been alluded to in the other House of Parliament and in many of the newspapers, to the effect that in taking a course really and truly following out the recommendations of the Committee we were intending to give up the control of the postal communication with India which we possess by keeping it in our own hands, and to throw it entirely into the hands of a foreign Government. My Lords, that is an entire and most gratuitous mistake. Such an idea never entered my mind or that of any Member of the Government; and the only ground there could be for this suspicion was that in giving notice for our tenders we did not state that we would not contract with any foreign Government. From this the notion has been taken that we were going to contract with the Societé Messageries Impériales of France, and to give up the entire control of the English communication by our own vessels. There is no ground for that notion; and I can only imagine that it originated because in the Committee of the House of Commons it was suggested that we should avail ourselves of the assistance of the Messageries Impériales in certain cases; and it was also suggested by some that the service should be thrown into the hands of the Messageries Impériales, if the contract would be taken cheaper than by any of our own countrymen. That is wrong; but I do not mean to say that we ought not to avail ourselves in certain cases of the Messageries Impériales; and at present we do so, because we send letters to Marseilles and to China by those boats; but that is only a supplementary arrangement, assisting the service which we have under our own control. I say that to throw everything into the hands of a foreign country would be extremely impolitic, although we might in the first instance do these duties at a cheaper rate; and it is an entire mistake to imagine that it was our intention. Such a course was suggested, if it has been suggested at all, by the very persons who are now finding fault with our supposed arrangement. They said that we should not keep up the contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Company, and that we should give notice and throw it open; and now they find fault with the Government for doing what has been recommended by the Committee, saying that the Peninsular and Oriental Company have some very fine ships, and have done the work satisfactorily. I would not have troubled your Lordships with this statement but for there having been an entire misconception on the part of the public, of which it was necessary that they should be disabused.

PARLIAMENT — ARRANGEMENT FOR THE REPORTING OF SPEECHES IN THIS HOUSE.

MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH, who had given Notice to move—

> "For the appointment of a Committee to consider the Arrangements for Reporting the Speeches of the Members of the House, and with special Reference to certain proceedings in the Reporters' Gallery on Thursday, the 11th of July,"

said, that his Notice had appeared on their Lordships' Minutes for a considerable time, but the pressure of public business had necessitated its postponement until now. That Notice had reference to a charge he had made that the reports of the debates in their Lordships' House were not dealt with in a manner which, probably, their Lordships would approve. It was not particularly with regard to the disparaging language which had been used with respect to himself—and he had stated when he previously mentioned the subject to their Lordships that there was a respected gentleman who was ready to come forward and prove before any tribunal, on his oath the statements that he had made—it was not with respect to that language that he brought this subject forward, because he should not have thought himself justified, in a matter personal to himself, in troubling their Lordships by bringing it before them; but it was because it was connected with a threat made at the time by the person who used that language that he would not report anything that might fall from him in public discussion in that House. That circumstance was the more remarkable because the subject which was dealt with was one arising from the public Papers on their Lordships' table—relating to the proceedings on the proposed abolition of the Transubstantiation Declaration; and he had to remark, as a matter of fact at the time, that not one syllable of what he stated on that occasion was reported in the public press, which generally reported the discussions of that House. It was on that ground, and on that ground solely, that he had brought the subject before their Lordships. His Motion was that a Committee should be appointed to look into that matter. At an earlier period of the Session, supposing the matter was one which their Lordships would think it right to take up and pursue, to arrive at a knowledge of the facts before a Committee might be all very well; but at that late stage of the Session he confessed that he should not wish to persist in that Motion, and more especially because he did not wish it to be supposed for a moment that personal feeling had influenced him in the matter. With these few words he would now leave the matter entirely in their Lordships' hands.

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Arrangements for reporting the Speeches of the Members of the House, and with special Reference to certain Proceedings in the Reporters' Gallery on Thursday, the 11th of July.—(*The Marquess of Westmeath.*)

THE EARL OF DERBY: I am glad to hear that the noble Marquess does not intend to persevere with his Motion for the Committee of which he has given notice. Your Lordships could hardly at this time of the Session—if there were no other objection—deal with such a question, and I therefore think the noble Marquess has exercised a wise discretion. My noble Friend's Motion itself consist of two parts. First it suggests "the appointment of a Committee to consider the arrangements for reporting the speeches of the Members of the House." Now, I must confess, it appears to me that such an inquiry is quite uncalled for, because it is a matter of astonishment how accurately and carefully the speeches made in this House are generally reported by the press; and I must say that I have never found on any occasion, in comparing the reports of the various papers, any indication that the least partiality or partizanship have been exercised. I must also say that I do not think it would be any improvement, or anything on which we could justly congratulate ourselves, if the reporters were to take down and give to the public our speeches in a *verbatim* form. I am quite convinced on my own part that though what we say may sound very well when spoken, yet if our words were taken down literally our speeches would not in all cases stand the test of critical examination; and, on the whole, I believe your Lordships may congratulate yourselves on the wonderful accuracy, correctness, and fairness with which our debates are generally reported. With regard to the particular complaint made the other day by my noble Friend, I must say that if it really appeared that there was anything like an agreement on the part of the members of the press that his speeches or those of any individual Peer should be systematically suppressed, I am sure your Lordships would be of opinion, and the members of the press themselves generally would be of opinion, that such a systematic suppression would be a gross violation of the permission under which they are enabled to report the proceedings that take place in this House. I think, however, that my noble Friend is not disposed to sustain that view of the case, or to entertain the belief that there is any such agreement among the Members of the press to deal unfairly by him. Still less do I think there is any ground for the imputation that any deeply laid scheme not to report the noble Marquess has been concocted on account of a large number of Jesuits being connected with the public press. I believe that any such idea is entirely confined to the mind of the noble Marquess, and that none of your Lordships share it. But my noble Friend also complained, as I understood, that in the Reporters' Gallery there was language made use of with regard to himself which was, to say the least of it, most disrespectful. Certainly, if such language as that was made use of by any person, I think it was most reprehensible, and that it ought to be visited with censure. At the same time I do not think my noble Friend owes any thanks to his confidential friend for reporting to him the very unflattering language alleged to have been so used concerning him. I am sure that the noble Marquess will not deem it worth while to inquire who the individual may be who made use of that language, nor, even if he had ascertained who it was, to press the matter further upon your Lordships with a few to any proceedings being taken. Whoever the person may have been, I trust he will have been convinced of the gross impropriety of the expressions he uttered, and that the feeling which your Lordships and the public generally must entertain in regard to such conduct will be a sufficient warning to him, and to every one in the position of a reporter, that they are expected to treat the Members of this House with due consideration and respect. I am sure therefore that the noble Marquess will rest satisfied with this expression on the part of your Lordships as to the extreme impropriety of the language used on the occasion in question, and, at the same time, of your conviction that there is no such general conspiracy or agreement not to report his speeches as he seems inclined to think.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH said, that the judicious remarks of the noble Earl had, he hoped, cleared his respected friend (Mr. Harper) from any appearance of impropriety in reporting to him the language that was used personally to himself. That language was spoken at the same time that the threat was used not to report anything that he should say. He trusted that the House would not suppose for a moment that his friend (Mr. Harper) did an act otherwise than friendly to him, in letting him know what seemed calculated to injure his position as a public man.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

FACTORY ACTS EXTENSION BILL.

(*The Earl of Devon.*)

(No. 296.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Earl of DEVON, in rising to move that the Bill be now read the second time, said, he felt that the duty and privilege of recommending such a measure to their Lordships belonged much more properly to the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Shaftesbury), whose name had been so long and so honourably associated with his exertions on behalf of the factory workers, and by whose philanthropic exertions so large a portion of the population of this country had been benefited. The object of the Bill was to apply the provisions of the Factory Acts to various descriptions of factories and trades not yet within the operation of those Acts, and it extended the provisions of those Acts to certain manufactories where upwards of fifty persons were employed. Various Acts had been passed between the years 1833 and 1850—mainly through the exertions of the noble Earl—having for their object the moral and physical well-being of children, young persons, and women employed in particular trades and manufactures. In addition to these Acts, there were various special Acts dealing with particular works, containing modified provisions analogous to those contained in the Factory Acts. The first of these was an Act regulating bleaching and dyeing works; in 1861, an Act was passed for the regulation of lace works; in 1864, the Factory Acts Extension Act was passed, which took a large and beneficial step in advance on the previous enactments. The provisions of the Factory Acts, which it was now sought to extend, were originally limited to factories in which machinery was employed in manufacturing textile and other fabrics, and in which steam, water, or other motive power was employed in propelling the machinery. The provisions of the Acts regulated the hours of labour and the time of the day in which children, young persons, and women might be employed. They provided for the education of children, making it necessary, in order to their legal employment, that they should receive instruction during a certain number of hours. They also applied to the fencing off of dangerous machinery, and to the cleanliness of factories. They made due provision for regular inspection; and they imposed certain penalties for the infringement of the regulations of the Act. Although legislation had dealt before 1862 with manufactures and a class of employment which required special and supplementary Acts, it was felt that a very large number of cases still remained in which children, young persons, and women did not possess that protection which was given to other classes by the Factory Acts, and which was so much needed for their employments. The noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury) in that year brought the subject before their Lordships, and the result was the appointment of the Children's Employment Commission to inquire into trades and manufactures not yet regulated by legislation. That Commission occupied four years in its inquiry. It examined witnesses belonging to near 160 trades, and the results of its inquiries were embodied in five different Reports. The first recommended immediate legislation in the case of children and women employed in the manufacture of lucifer matches, certain species of earthenware, percussion caps, cartridges, paper staining, and other trades; and in all these cases it would be agreed by those who read the evidence adduced, that there was abundant need for legislation. The legislation which had been adopted in consequence, enforcing provisions for regulating the hours of labour, cleanliness, and the ventilation of factories, had exercised a most beneficial influence on the establishments to which it had applied, and had conferred great advantages on a large number of persons. The subsequent Reports of the Commission showed, however, that there was ample need of further legislation, and they made certain recommendations in regard to different branches of manufacture, which were carried out by the present Bill. It was introduced into the other House of Parliament; it underwent a most careful revision by a Select Committee, which examined, or was in communication with the representatives of all the trades concerned, and the result was that the Bill passed through the other House of Parliament. The 3rd Clause enacted that the provisions of the Bill should apply to blast furnaces, copper mills, mills or premises where iron was converted into malleable iron, steel, or tin plate, iron, copper. and brass foundries, premises where steam, water, or other mechanical power was used; and also to paper, glass, and tobacco factories; and to premises were printing and bookbinding were carried on. It likewise—and this was a most important provision—enacted that the Bill should apply to any premises were fifty or more persons were employed in any manufacturing process, or in manual labour. It should be borne in mind that there was another Bill before the other House regulating the hours of labour; and the two Bills would carry out the recommendations of the Commissioners. The 4th Clause incorporated certain Acts, particularly the sanitary provisions of the Act of 1864; and the 5th Clause provided that the Bill should not apply to any trade which had been already dealt with by existing Acts. The 7th Clause prohibited the employment on Sunday of any child, young person, or woman in any factory, the employment of females or boys under twelve years of age in any part of a glass factory were glass was annealed or melted; and the employment of any child under eleven years old in grinding metals. The 8th Clause, which was of greater importance than it appeared at first sight, directed that no child, young person, or woman should be allowed to take meals in any part of a glass factory, arsenic being used in that manufacture, and deleterious consequences having resulted from floating particles of it becoming mixed with the food of the workpeople. The 9th Clause gave extended powers for securing effective ventilation, and also dealt with another very serious subject. It appeared that the average age of the men employed in grinding, glazing, or polishing on a wheel did not exceed forty years, this being partly the result of frequent accidents from portions of the grindstone becoming detached, but mainly of the dust which was generated getting into their lungs. To meet this serious state of things, there was a provision that fans should be introduced to blow away the dust, and prevent its being inhaled by the workmen. These were the principal provisions of the Bill, and in the Schedule were various modifications suspending the full operation of those provisions for a limited period, and under certain conditions. Communications had been carried on with persons interested in the various trades, and it appeared that in many cases serious loss would be caused by the immediate enforcement of some parts of the Bill. When the Bill went into Committee there would a favourable opportunity of considering any objections that might be entertained. He thought any noble Lord who had acquainted himself with the facts contained in the Commissioners' Report would be satisfied of the necessity of this measure, the importance of which might be judged from the statement of the Commissioners that the number of young persons, women, and children on whom it would confer great moral and physical benefits, amounted to 1,500,000. This was a consideration which could not but recommend the measure to the minds of their Lordships. He therefore ventured to ask their Lordships to assent to this Bill as the complement to the new legislation which had been pursued with respect to factories, and which had proved so beneficial to multitudes of the labouring classes of the country.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Devon.*)

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, he was unable to express the deep sense of gratitude he entertained towards Her Majesty's Government for having introduced this Bill. Two years ago he had to thank the late Government for the care taken in examining other Reports that had been presented, and for embodying their recommendations in a Bill. The value of the measure exceeded his powers of description, for, as had been mentioned by his noble Friend, it concerned the welfare of no less than 1,500,000 women and children and young persons, in whose cases it was manifest that an immediate remedy was required. Its apparent intricacy was accounted for by the large surface over which it extended, and by the number of trades it affected. It was perfectly true that the early efforts of legislation were directed almost exclusively to the manufacture of textile fabrics where steam or water power was employed. That legislation was comparatively easy; but it was a much more difficult task to regulate a great variety of trades differing in their hours of labour, and in almost every other respect. The principle which had been acted upon had been to apply the provisions of the Factory Acts as far as possible to the varying circumstances of the various trades. The first Commission on this subject was appointed in 1842, and it led to several remedial enactments, such as the prohibition of the employment of women and children from mines and collieries; but the public mind was not then ripe for more comprehensive measures. In 1862, however, when everybody had become satisfied of the beneficial results that had accrued from such legislation, and that the time had come for making further inquiry with a view to additional legislation, a Commission was again appointed and their Report led to the Factory Extension Act of 1864, which applied to several important branches of industry. The Government had now brought in a measure which, taken in connection with the measures introduced by the late Government, would embrace as nearly as possible all the remaining branches of manufacture, so that there would shortly be not a single department of manufacturing industry which was not placed under legislative regulation. Their Lordships had not long ago given a second reading to a Bill for the regulation of agricultural labour and the education of the children employed in it. That Bill had been withdrawn, but he trusted it would be passed next Session. He could not sit down without expressing his thanks to a great many persons who had laboured to promote the object he had at heart — to Lord John Manners in particular, the First Commissioner of Works, who, as Chairman of the Committee on this subject, had devoted a great deal of time and ability to the task; and also to Mr. Bruce, the Member for Merthyr Tydvil, to whose exertions they were in a great measure indebted for success. It would not be necessary for him to go into details to prove the necessity for legislation, or to describe the deleterious effects, social, physical, and moral, produced by the present system. All that might be taken as conceded; and all seemed to be of one mind, not only that legislation would be useful, but that it was absolutely necessary, and would be most beneficial. They had had the strongest evidence in the other House of Parliament in support of that view from the masters engaged in textile manufactures, and the heads of great establishments, all of whom, without exception, testified to the great social, physical, and moral blessings which had been the result of factory legislation. He believed that they might ascribe in no small degree to that legislation, the noble conduct of the Lancashire operatives during the cotton famine, who, supported by the feeling that they were really cared for by the Legislature, had endured with unparalleled heroism the suffering to which they had been subjected. The legislation of 1864, short as the time had been for its operation, seemed to him to have produced the most manifest benefits. He himself had been particularly struck in going over the Potteries—a district which had formerly been in a most degraded state — to find the great improvement that had taken place. The lads and girls there were elevated to a degree which could only have been expected when the beneficent legislation of Parliament had been in operation for many years. He visited the schools last year, and the universal testimony of the schoolmasters and all who had to do with them was that the most wonderful improvement had been wrought. He remembered going among the fustian cutters also, and the testimony of mothers, fathers, and employers was uniform to the effect that there was the greatest improvement in the moral, physical, and social condition of the employed. He was informed by all the inspectors that the value of education in those districts was quite understood, as would be shown by the fact that within the factory districts alone there were now nearly 70,000 children under tuition, whereas, at the time when the Act was passed, there were not, he believed, 1,000. Returning to the Potteries, the legislation which had taken place with respect to them had proved the greatest boon. Mothers declared that their children devoted all the time they had to learning what might be useful to them hereafter. He had been informed that in every instance, whether of textile fabrics, potteries, or fustian cutting, the work done was both greater in quantity and improved in quality, and that was simply because the employed brought untired limbs and minds to their work; while, simultaneously, wages had risen without any loss to the employers. With regard to this Bill, it was no doubt very intricate and important, and had come up to their Lordships at a late period of the Session. He would impress upon their Lordships, however, that this Bill had been elaborated before a Select Committee of the House of Commons by men of the greatest experience, themselves proprietors of works, and conversant with all the details of the subject — very much more conversant than their Lordships could be. He trusted, therefore, that their Lordships would give it a second reading, and pass it through Committee without any material alterations, because, at this period of the Session, it would not be well to send it down to the House of Commons with any Amendment which would be likely to give rise to difference of opinion. He begged to thank their Lordships for the manner in which they had received the Bill. He was certain that by passing it they would be doing that which would carry comfort and peace to the hearts of thousands. By showing this interest in the welfare of the people, and by endeavouring in this way to advance their moral, social, and physical improvement, they would be doing more for their happiness than even by the great measure of Reform which they were now passing to enfranchise the great mass of the people, and they would make that Reform more easy and more successful in its operation. This was a great work—a work that would bless the whole nation, and, as had been said by the noble Earl who had moved the second reading, by such a measure they would be carrying joy, comfort, and peace, to the hearts and the homes of 1,500,000 of their fellow countrymen.

The Earl of HARROWBY said, that his noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury) had expressed his thanks to many persons who had given their assistance to this great work. He hoped it would not be out of place to say a word about the part his noble Friend himself had taken. It was now some thirty or forty years ago since he had the pleasure of co-operating in a very small degree with his noble Friend in those early struggles in the House of Commons on the subject of factory legislation, when his noble Friend had enormous difficulties to contend with in overcoming the not unnatural opposition of the employers. He well remembered the statements that were made of the fearful state of moral and physical suffering to which the children were then exposed in factories. At last, his noble Friend's perseverance, his powerful and simple eloquence — an eloquence not merely of words, but of acts—the eloquence of earnestness and truth, succeeded. To this great cause his noble Friend had sacrificed his whole political life, for he had from time to time resisted solicitations to public employments that he might devote himself entirely to this great cause, and he hoped that, in the gratitude of the country and the approval of a good conscience, his noble Friend would find an ample reward for the exertions and sacrifices which he had made.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

ADMIRALTY COURT (IRELAND) BILL.

(No. 273.)—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Moved, That there be laid before this House, Correspondence between the Irish Government and The Lord Chancellor and The Lord Chancellor of Ireland relating to that Judge.—(*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that inquiry had been made, no such correspondence could be found, and the belief was that no such correspondence existed.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Clause 4 (Repeal of 23 & 24 G. 3. c. 14. ss. 1, 2, & 3 (Irish), and so much of 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 116. s. 1., as relates to the Salary of the Judge of the Admiralty Court of Ireland, and of 20 & 21 Vict. c. 79. s. 14).

Lord CRANWORTH said, that the Judge of the Admiralty Court in Ireland held office under an Act of Parliament which made him irremovable, except upon an Address from both Houses of Parliament; his tenure was therefore the same as that of the Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench; yet, for the first time in the annals of English history, the enactment which fixed his tenure on this footing was to be repealed by this clause, in order that he might be immediately removed. If this gentleman was an unfit person to discharge the duties of the office, it would be proper to say so; but the Judge defied anybody to show this. There had been a constitutional safeguard against the removal of Judges, and it was now proposed to take it away. He had stated the case, and he appealed to their Lordships to consider whether they ought not to pause in what they were doing.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, when his noble and learned Friend spoke to him on this matter he stated that he felt placed in a position of the greatest embarrassment, because he was desirous of sparing the feelings of the gentleman who was involved. He believed there was no such correspondence as the noble Marquess alluded to in reference to the conduct of this gentleman with regard to a will and acquitting him of any impropriety, nor indeed was there in the minds of those who had considered this subject any suspicion in regard to his conduct. He quite admitted that this was an exceptional case, and it might perhaps be the first in which it had been necessary to act in the way proposed by this Bill. The late Government introduced a Bill upon this very subject, and there was in it a clause with respect to this gentleman which was much more offensive than the clause of this Bill, for it actually removed him by name from office. This clause provided that in case the gentleman should not be re-appointed he was to retire upon his full salary which was as far as he was concerned, a little improvement in the way of dealing with him. He took upon himself the responsibility of saying it was absolutely necessary this gentleman should be removed, or it was impossible the Bill could be allowed to pass. The Bill would introduce great improvements into the Court, extend its jurisdiction and bring within its cognizance matters connected with the Common Law, of which this gentleman had had no experience; therefore he would not be competent to perform the large duties which would be thrown upon him. There was a little mistake about this gentleman having given up a large practice to accept the office of Judge. He gave up the position of stipendiary magistrate at £600 a year for that of Judge of the Admiralty Court at £500 a year, making a sacrifice for an advance of position. However distressing it might be to him, it was absolutely necessary he should take upon himself the responsibility of dealing with the question in the manner proposed by the Bill, and it was done in the least offensive manner, because the gentleman was to retire upon his full salary. Let it not be understood he held out any hope that the gentleman would be re-appointed for there was no intention of re-appointing him. It was considered that this was a better way of dealing with him than that proposed by the late Government. He was most anxious to avoid saying anything which might hurt the feelings of this gentleman, but he must insist on the clause being retained in the Bill, or the Bill must be given up altogether.

THE MARQUESS OF CLANRICARDE said, that if no correspondence such as that referred to did exist it made the case of this gentleman much stronger, because it showed the Irish Government had not been consulted on the question whether he ought to be removed or not. Both he and his predecessor in the office of stipendiary magistrate had had private practice, and clearly he would not have given up his office and practice for an office with less salary but that he believed his new office was a patent one for life. He relied upon the Acts of Parliament and the Act of Settlement, which, having been extended to Ireland, placed Judges on the same footing that they occupied in England, and he knew that he could not be removed except upon Addresses from both Houses of Parliament. This was a constitutional point of the highest importance. If the objectionable clause of the Bill were agreed to, it would be a precedent for introducing into any Bill to amend the practice, procedure, and jurisdiction of the Court of Queen's Bench, a similar clause removing Judges of that Court. The course proposed was totally at variance with all previous practice, and its adoption in this case would have the worst possible effect in Ireland. In all other respects the Bill was an excellent one. In the Report of the Commission which inquired into the Court of Admiralty it was distinctly stated that the office of Judge was a patent office, and that the Judge could not be removed, except upon an Address to the two Houses of Parliament; and there was a precedent of proceeding in the constitutional and lawful mode, in the case of Sir John Barrington, who, in 1829, was removed from this Judgeship for malversation of suitors' money. If this gentleman was incompetent, as was alleged, the matter could have been settled by private arrangement. There was one aspect of the case which was not a good one, and that was that this gentleman was to be pensioned at his full salary, and that another gentleman was to be appointed at £1,000 a year. At all events, the change, if necessary, ought to be made in a more regular manner. The gentleman was not aware of this Bill until it was actually read a first time in this House. The Bill of the late Government was a very different measure. By it the Court was to be united with the Court of Probate, and one Judgeship was to have been done away with; and the removal of this gentleman in that manner would have been a constitutional mode of proceeding. He had no alternative but to move the omission of so much of the fifth clause as related to this matter.

An Amendment *moved*, to leave out from ("Act") to ("so.")—*The Marquess of Clanricarde.*

Lord CRANWORTH put it to his noble and learned Friend the Lord Chancellor, whether he would really insist upon this strong measure. This gentleman might be removed in a proper manner if there were a good reason; but he could not imagine why the security for the independence of Judges should be sacrificed. At any time this would be an extraordinary proceeding, and it was especially so in the last days of the Session, when there were few except the Members of the Government in attendance. He put it to his noble and learned Friend whether the course proposed was a proper one. The reference to the Bill of the late Government was an argument *ad hominem*, but his "withers are unwrung," for he never heard of such a Bill.

Lord ROMILLY was understood to support the clause, and to assume that the gentleman to whom it referred had been guilty of no misconduct, but that his removal was contemplated entirely because it was believed that he would not be equal to the performance of the new duties.

Lord CRANWORTH said, that since he had last spoken he had received, he presumed from the gentleman to whom this matter referred, a card, on which was written, "I demand an inquiry into my conduct." If the Government thought he was not competent to perform the functions of Judge they should have stated so on the face of the Bill.

The LORD CHANCELLOR maintained that the course contemplated in this Bill was a much preferable one to that which had been contemplated by the Bill of the late Government. The clause had been framed in the way least offensive to the gentleman's feelings—it would have been most offensive to have stated on the face of the Bill that he was incompetent. It certainly was the impression that this gentleman would not be equal to the new duties, although he might be, and no doubt was, fully competent for those at present assigned him.

The Marquess of CLANRICARDE said, that whether the object proposed were right or wrong, there could be no doubt that by the mode of removal which was now proposed the security for the independence of the Irish Judges was struck at. Such a thing would not, he would venture to say, be attempted in England.

On Question, that the Words proposed to be left out stand Part of the Clause? their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 25; Not-Contents 5: Majority 20.

CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Haddington, E.
Malmesbury, E.

Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]

Bagot, L.
Churston, L.
Clinton, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Crofton, L.
Denman, L.
Redesdale, L.
Romilly, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford.*)
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cranworth, L. [*Teller.*]
Foley, L.
Lyveden, L.

Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*) [*Teller.*]
Stratheden, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 326.)

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, August 9, 1867.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Woodhouse Collection. [No. 521.]

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art—Foreign Potentates.

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *First Reading* — Agricultural Gangs * [310].

Second Reading—Naval Knights of Windsor * [300].

Committee — Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2) [285].

Report—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2) [285].

Considered as amended—Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation * [267]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * [304]; Merchant Shipping * [299]; War Department Stores * [255]; Increase of the Episcopate * [307].

Third Reading—Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation * [267]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances * [304]; Merchant Shipping * [299]; War Department Stores * [255]; Increase of the Episcopate * [307], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Industrial Schools (Ireland) * (*re-comm.*) [102].

The House met at Two of the Clock.

MEMORIALS OF POLITICAL PRISONERS.

QUESTION.

MR. MAGUIRE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If the prisoners in the Government Prisons under sentence of penal servitude for political offences have the right of making complaints through memorials, and if it be the duty of the authorities of those prisons to forward these memorials to the Home Office; if any such memorials have been made by such prisoners, and forwarded to the Home Office, since the publication of the Commissioners during the present Session; and, whether the Government have it in contemplation to authorize or propose any difference in the mode of treating prisoners convicted of political offences from that of treating prisoners convicted of such crimes as robbery with violence, burglary, forgery, or murder?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, the general course is that in the cells of prisoners in the Convict Department notice is given that they will have permission to memorialize as to any complaint which they have to make, and these memorials when made are forwarded to the Home Department. With respect to the second Question, I have to state that no such memorials have been forwarded since the publication of the Commissioners, with one exception, to which I shall refer in answering the Question which the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Blake) is about to put to me. The Government have not in contemplation to make any change in the treatment of political offenders such as that which has been suggested. I may, I apprehend, be allowed to refer on this point to the Report of the Commissioners, which says—

> "As convicts we found them, and thought of them, and have spoken of them throughout. Viewed in this light we are satisfied that they have been treated with exceptional kindness and forbearance."

That has been so: and I believe any Gentleman who will take the trouble of reading the Report of the Commissioners upon the treason-felony convicts will see that, with the exception of some few who have been rebellious and insubordinate, the great majority are in robust health, though they have been in confinement for a long time.

MR. BLAKE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he can state why John M'Afferty, now undergoing his sentence for treason-felony at Millbank, has not been permitted to sign a document necessary to enable his counsel to make an effort to set aside his conviction; and, whether it is the intention of Government to preclude the prisoner from having any further legal steps taken in his behalf by not allowing him to attach his name to the instrument essential for that purpose? With a view of saving the right hon. Gentleman the trouble of coming down again at the Evening Sitting, he would beg to ask him now, Whether there is any objection to produce Copies of a Petition to this House and to the House of Lords, transmitted to the Governor of Millbank Prison for the signature of John M'Afferty, a convict confined in that prison; of letter of Mr. John Lawless, his solicitor, to the Governor, accompanying said Petition; and of any Correspondence between Mr. Lawless and the Home Office in reference to the same?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, the hon. Member is mistaken as to what took place. There has never been any impediment to John M'Afferty signing any document with reference to his legal position. It is necessary that there should be an application to the Attorney General for leave to bring a Suit of Error; that is a matter entirely for his decision, and he thought there was no case for it, and declined to assent to the application. But the question which arose was whether John M'Afferty should be entitled to sign a Petition to this House and the House of Lords. Whenever petitions are sent to prisoners from persons outside the walls they are always forwarded for approval to the Home Department; but when they are made up by the prisoners themselves within the walls they came at once from them as memorials or petitions. In this case the Petition coming from without the walls was sent to the Home Office, and referred, as a matter of course, to the Irish Department; as soon as it was returned to me, I gave the authority required to John M'Afferty to sign the Petition to the Houses of Parliament. With reference to the Correspondence asked for, it contains nothing beyond the letters forwarding the Petition to the Home Office, and that conveying the Answer which I have now given to the hon. Member.

IRELAND—LUNATIC ASYLUMS. QUESTION.

Mr. BLAKE said, he now rose to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the regulation which he lately stated would be introduced into the Privy Council Rules relative to Lunatic Asylums, giving a preference for the office of Medical Superintendent to persons who had made themselves practically acquainted with the moral and medical treatment of insanity, will take immediate effect; and, whether such rule will define that the candidate must produce a certificate of having attended for a certain time at an institution for the treatment of the insane; and, whether, with a view of having such persons thoroughly qualified to take charge of patients afflicted with insanity, he will take into consideration the desirability of taking steps to give effect to the recommendation of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of the Lunatic Asylums in Ireland with regard to "clinical instruction," contained in their Report, pages 17 and 18?

Lord NAAS replied, that he must repeat the statement which he had made on a former occasion, that he thought it very desirable to obtain, if possible, the services, as medical superintendents of lunatic asylums, of persons who had devoted a considerable portion of their time and attention to the subject of mental disease. But it was very difficult to lay down any general rule on the subject. As regarded the second Question of the hon. Member, there was greater difficulty attendant upon giving such instruction as that suggested in lunatic asylums than in any other hospital. The matter, however, was well worthy of attention, and he would see what could be done.

ALLEGED MURDER OF CAPTAIN SPEER.—QUESTION.

Mr. CUBITT said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he has received from Her Majesty's Minister at Washington any account of the death of Captain Wilfred Speer, a British subject, who was alleged to have been murdered on the night of June 7th by a soldier of the United States' Army on board a steamboat on the Missouri; and, whether he can inform the House what steps Sir Frederick Bruce is taking in the matter?

Lord STANLEY: Tho only account, Sir, received at the Foreign Office of the death of Captain Speer, is that forwarded by some member of his family in a letter dated the 11th of last month. A copy of that letter was sent to Sir Frederick Bruce on the 12th, with instructions to him to report in answer, and to take any such steps as might be necessary. To that Instruction no answer has yet been received at the Foreign Office, and considering that the occurrence took place on board a steamboat on the Missouri, there has hardly yet been time for such an answer to be received.

TURKISH BONDS.—QUESTION.

Sir JOHN SIMEON said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is aware of the dissatisfaction felt by the holders of Turkish Bonds at the mode in which the drawing of those Bonds is conducted; and whether he will endeavour, by representation to the Turkish Government, or otherwise, to apply a remedy to the grievances complained of?

Lord STANLEY: I cannot say, Sir, that I am aware of any general dissatisfaction being felt. The only communication which has reached me with regard to it is a letter from a single individual. I did not think that sufficient to act upon;

but of course if there is any general feeling on the subject, and parties make application to me, their complaint will be taken into consideration.

HOLYHEAD AND LONDON RAILWAY FARES.—QUESTION.

Mr. VERNER said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, If the Government have noticed the increase which has recently taken place in the Railway Fares between Holyhead and London; and if it is intended to make any remonstrance on the subject to the London and North Western Railway Company, who obtained so large a subsidy for the carriage of the Mails, and for giving increased facilities for the passage traffic between England and Ireland?

Mr. HUNT said, his own attention had not been called to the increase of charge. He could not speak for other Members of the Government, but probably only those had their attention called to it who made use of the line. The arrangement with the Company was a Post Office arrangement, relating merely to the carriage of letters, and in no way whatever to passenger fares.

THE NEW LAW COURTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. PEASE said, he wished to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether the Judges of Designs for the new Law Courts have forwarded to the Treasury any recommendations as to the selection of architect; and, whether they have done so without waiting for the Report of Mr. Gardiner, the surveyor appointed by the Treasury, at a high fee, to test the cost of the several designs?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: I believe, Sir, the Judges of Designs have made some recommendations to the Treasury with respect to the selection of the architect for the new Law Courts; but whether this was done without waiting for the Report of Mr. Gardiner I really cannot say. I would suggest that the proper quarter to address on such a subject would be the Chairman of the Judges—namely, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Hertford (Mr. Cowper).

POLICE—CONSTABULARY REPORTS.

QUESTION.

Mr. WHITWORTH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If there are any reasons why the Statistical Tables of the Reports of the Inspectors of Constabulary should not be alike in form; and, if not, whether he will give instructions for the Reports from the Northern and Southern Districts to contain similar Tables to the valuable ones supplied by the Inspector for the Eastern Counties, Midland, and North Wales Districts?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that no instructions had ever been issued from the Home Office as to the form in which inspectors should report. There was no good reason why they should not adopt an uniform system, and he would take the subject into consideration.

ABYSSINIA—ENGLISH CONSUL AT MASSOWAH.—QUESTION.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he does not consider that it would facilitate the release of the Abyssinian Captives to have an English gentleman of position and experience to perform the duties of English Consul at Massowah, instead of a German gentleman, who acts as agent both for the French and English Governments?

Lord STANLEY: Apart, Sir, from this Question of the prisoners, there are really no consular duties to be performed at Massowah. The only object of having an agent there is to keep up communications with these unfortunate gentlemen. As the hon. Gentleman and the House know, the conduct of affairs relating to their liberation has been left very much in the hands of Colonel Merewether, the Resident at Aden, and I believe he is perfectly satisfied with the qualifications of the present Consul, and the manner in which he has performed his duties.

CRETE—ENGLISH VICE CONSUL AT KHANEA.—QUESTION.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he would also beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If his attention has been called to the position of the English Vice Consul at Khanea in Crete, who has been thirty years in the service, receives no salary from Government, and has now very arduous duties to perform?

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, before the noble Lord answered the Question, he wished to ask, Whether he is aware that this gentleman, Mr. George Moon, is a person of very great merit, who has been frequently appointed to assist the Consul during this period of thirty years, receiving nothing except an occasional £100 a year, paid him by his superior?

LORD STANLEY: Sir, I know nothing personally with regard to the merits of Mr. Moon. But I am informed that he has been employed by successive Consuls at Crete, and, I believe he has done very good service in that capacity. In 1861 the then Consul called attention to his services, and suggested that he should have the rank of Vice Consul; but that was simply an honorary appointment, for he continued to receive his pay as consular clerk. In March of last year Mr. Dickson, the present Consul, reported that Mr. Moon's actual remuneration was insufficient, and that the amount which he himself received from the Foreign Office was not sufficient to allow him to increase the pay of Mr. Moon. Taking these considerations into account £20 a year has been added to the income of Mr. Dickson to allow him to remunerate the services of Mr. Moon.

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES ACT.

QUESTION.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he wished to put a Question to Mr. Speaker on a matter in respect of which the Rules of the House had not been complied with. Three days were usually allowed to witnesses for the correction of Evidence given before a Select Committee. The time had been extended to six days; but some of the Evidence taken a month ago by the Committee on the Ecclesiastical Titles Act had not been returned to the printer yet, and the last of the Evidence taken by that Committee ought to have been returned a week ago. He wanted to know, Whether all the Evidence ought not to have been printed and put in the hands of Members? He believed it would be inconvenient to allow any further delay in the matter. He therefore wished to know, if Mr. Speaker would take measures to expedite the return to the printer of the Evidence?

MR. SPEAKER said, the statement of the hon. Member as to three days being the usual time for the return of evidence sent to witnesses for correction was correct. Owing, perhaps, to the witnesses living at a distance from London, or to some other such cause, the period was sometimes extended; but the time referred to by the hon. Member as that of the delay in the

case of the evidence taken by the Committee on the Ecclesiastical Titles Act was certainly in excess of anything that was customary. He should therefore make inquiries on the subject.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he would postpone till Tuesday next the remarks which he had intended to make to-day on certain circumstances connected with the Select Committee.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. LIDDELL said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will fix the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill for a Morning Sitting on Tuesday next?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER replied, that it was the intention of the Government to bring on the Parks Bill at a Morning Sitting on Tuesday. The Bill referred to by his hon. Friend would be put on the Paper for Monday evening after the Indian Budget. Some progress might be made with it then. If not, he would see what arrangement could be made.

REMOVAL OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN.

QUESTION.

In answer to Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS,

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that he was very sorry that the Return for which the hon. Gentleman had moved, relating to the transfer of Roman Catholic School Children in workhouses to District Schools, was not yet ready, but it was in course of completion, and would be presented without delay.

TURNPIKE EXPENDITURE.—QUESTION.

MR. WHALLEY said, he rose to inquire, Why the Return of the Income and Expenditure of the Turnpike Trusts for 1866 was not yet published?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that he was really unable to inform the hon. Member why no more recent Return than that for the year 1864 had yet been issued. He had already informed the hon. Member that the Return for 1865 would soon be laid upon the table of the House. The Returns for 1866 had not yet come in, but he did not know what had caused the delay.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

OBSERVATIONS.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: With the permission of the House, I wish to make an appeal respecting the conduct of the public business. The Orders commence to-day with three measures, the stages of which will be taken, perhaps, without much discussion. After those Bills have been disposed of, it is proposed to go into Committee of Supply; but there are several Notices on that Order. I appeal to the hon. Gentlemen who have given those Notices to postpone them. What I ask is not for the convenience of the Government, but for the general advantage and convenience of the House. It is of great importance that the Committee of Supply should be closed. I can only say that if any of the Motions of which hon. Members have given notice are such as they believe to be of pressing importance, I will do all in my power to give them a speedy and satisfactory opportunity of bringing those Motions forward.

MR. FAWCETT said, that on Thursday week he put a question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the right hon. Gentleman gave what, in the opinion of many hon. Members, was a somewhat extraordinary reply. He asked whether the Government would give a promise that nothing should be done on the vital and important subject of University education in Ireland till the House had had an opportunity of passing an opinion on any change which might be proposed. The right hon. Gentleman replied that nothing should be done contrary to the Constitution, and then he added the unusual statement that he must refuse to do anything at his bidding. The last thing he had wished to suggest was that the right hon. Gentleman should should do anything at his bidding. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer would merely say that nothing should be done during the recess on the subject of University education in Ireland he would cheerfully withdraw his notice of a Motion on going into Committee of Supply. If no such promise was given he must persevere with his Motion.

Captain VIVIAN, Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH, Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, and Mr. REARDEN said, that they would postpone their Motions in order that the House might go into Committee of Supply.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I shall be happy to meet the views of the hon. Gentlemen who have expressed their willingness to postpone their Motions. It appears to me that the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Devizes (Mr. Darby Griffith) respecting the difficulties in which Chairmen of Election Committees are sometimes placed, is one which he might bring forward with advantage to the House next Session. It does not seem to be of a very pressing character. The hon. Member for the Potteries (Mr. Beresford Hope) will no doubt, on a future day, bring forward the subject of which he has given notice respecting the removal of the statue of Canning, with the taste which always distinguishes his treatment of such subjects. With regard to the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett), I am sorry I misapprehended his inquiry, and that he misapprehended my answer. We do not contemplate bringing forward any scheme regarding education in Ireland without consulting Parliament.

MR. FAWCETT said, the answer of the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly satisfactory, and he cheerfully withdrew his Motion.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) £162,387, to complete the sum for Department of Science and Art.

GENERAL DUNNE said, that he did not wish to object to a liberal outlay for the purposes of science and art. But he complained that the people of Ireland, who had to contribute their proportion to the expenditure, did not receive in return a fair share of the public money for similar establishments in Ireland. In the department of art the people of Ireland would make even more rapid progress than was made in this country, considering the few opportunities afforded. The Irish in this respect, as in all others, were treated with great jealousy; but he contended that they had claims on the Government for greater liberality. There had been a lavish expenditure in this country. Even during the present Session, for purchases of works of art large sums were demanded of that House. Several collections—the Blacas and Woodhouse Collections—had recently been bought for England; and now a very large sum was asked, with which it was proposed to make purchases at the Paris Exhibition, but nothing was done for Ireland. Even the Irish antiquities and records were neglected, the building recently erected for their reception being very badly constructed for the purpose. A Report had been made with reference to proposed expenditure in connection with the South Kensington Museum, and other objects in the metropolis. Mr. Cole had stated that £100,000 might well be laid out in Bethnal Green, and he thought that Ireland had at least as much right to a grant as that classic locality. There were also in this Report proposals which seemed most absurd—one was to make collections of clothes—he presumed from fig leaves to long robes; and yet it was not possible to obtain a small grant of £2,300 for the Museum in Dublin attached to the Royal Dublin Society. With respect to works of art proposed to be bought by the department at the Paris Exhibition, he objected to an item for what was called "democratic jewellery;" few people could understand what was meant by "democratic" jewellery; but the name was attractive to ardent reformers, and he supposed as the franchise was to be given to what the highly liberal Gentleman the hon. Member for Birmingham styled the "residuum" of the people, it was thought necessary to improve their tastes by adorning them with "democratic jewellery." When the Government came into office they professed to be animated by a liberal spirit towards Ireland, and he had been almost inclined to trust these professions; but when any requirement involving a grant for the advantage of that country (however essential) was required from the Treasury, he found the present quite as unwilling to assent to it as the last. They proposed spending sums on any absurdity in England, and could not even make up their minds how the new Record Office was to be established, nor to publish the numerous manuscripts now useless, if not mouldering, in the repositories of this country. The manuscripts at Lambeth, now in the Bodleian, were edited at the instance of the last not the present Government. Ireland had never been less liberally dealt with as regards science and art than during the last three years.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he hoped the House would not be misled in regard to the recommendations of the Committee for making purchases at the Paris Exhibition.

Mr. BRUCE said, he rose to Order. There was no Vote in these Estimates for purchases at the Paris Exhibition. There was a recommendation of the Commission on the subject, but it was altogether improper to introduce the matter at present.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he wished to refer to the Art Vote for the Museum of Edinburgh, amounting to £5,828. He complained that while the institution in Dublin for the cultivation of science and art was erected and properly established, the Edinburgh institution was not. The whole of the land, except what was given by the corporation gratuitously, had been obtained by the Government. The site was there, and all that was wanted was the building grant. When £5,828 were voted for Edinburgh, and £26,333 proposed to be voted for Dublin, the people of Scotland had good reason to expect that an Estimate would be brought forward next Session to complete the Edinburgh building. He was the more emboldened to make this appeal when he saw that so large a sum as £74,800 was proposed to be voted for public buildings in Ireland in addition to £7,000 for building the Queen's University, making a total of £81,000, besides the £26,000 for the Science and Art Department in Ireland; but only £5,800 was voted for Scotland. Under these circumstances, he hoped the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) would assure the House that, in the next Session of Parliament, something like a measure of justice would be introduced for Scotland in this respect. The object of this institution was to improve the University by giving facilities to the students, the building being contiguous to the University, and joined to it by a covered way. Notwithstanding all the large sums voted for Universities and Science and Art Departments in Ireland, there were more students in the single University of Edinburgh than in all the Queen's Colleges in Ireland. Yet the whole sum voted for Edinburgh was about £7,000, while those enormous sums were given to Ireland.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he deprecated any feeling of jealousy on the part of Irish or Scotch Members. It was the earnest desire of the Government to do equal justice to both nations. The sum asked for the Science and Art Institutions in Ireland was £26,000, while for those of England and Scotland only £37,000 was asked. The Science and Art Collection at South Kensington was equally available for Irish students as for those of England and Scotland. Works of art from the Loan Collection at the Museums were sent over to the various art schools of Ireland. Those schools were established by voluntary efforts; if the people of the North of Ireland did not choose to establish these schools, and so put themselves in a position to avail themselves of the advantages offered by the South Kensington Museum, it was their own fault.

MR. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, that while Ireland received £34,000 under this head of the Estimates, Scotland only received £18,000. With reference to some remarks that had been made, he was anxious to bear testimony to the excellent taste and judgment of Mr. Cole. He hoped that next Session the Government would see the propriety of asking for a grant to enable them to finish the new permanent buildings at South Kensington. The entire sum necessary was £195,000, and it was proposed to take this year £32,000. He believed it would be—when finished—one of the most admirable things to be found in the city. He was sorry that Parliament would not at once vote the whole sum necessary for its completion. He asked the Secretary of the Treasury to take the matter into consideration, and to complete the building as soon as possible.

MR. BRUCE said, he did not think Ireland had been neglected, seeing that out of a total sum of £1,500,000, Ireland had £400,000, or upwards of one-fourth, her share being only one-fifth. She would receive upwards of £40,000 of the present Vote. Some efforts should be made to acquire for that country Dr. Petrie's Collection of Antiquities. A sum not exceeding £1,000 might be most usefully expended in acquiring the collections of Dr. Petrie, who had re-constructed the archæological history of Ireland. The hon. Member for Edinburgh had naturally enough contrasted the small demands of Scotland compared with those of Ireland, but the hon. Member omitted to mention the fact that, in the course of the last few years, £40,000 had been expended, under the auspices of the Treasury of the Science and Art Department, in the erection of a Museum at Edinburgh. That Museum, though unfinished, contained collections of the greatest value. It was an admirable institution. With respect to the Vote for the completion of the building at South Kensington, it was considerably in excess of the sum taken in any previous year. Up to this year the department had been in reality merely feeling its way, and it was difficult to form plans. A recommendation was made by the late Lord President, that money should be voted, in order to complete the building as soon as possible. That proposal, however, was demurred to, and it was eventually determined that the completion of the building should extend over four years. Personally, he was strongly in favour of completing the building within the shorter period. The Estimate of the Government this year, £32,000, was £12,000 in excess of the sum voted in any previous year.

MR. GOLDNEY said, that altogether we were spending on science and art nearly £500,000 a year, exclusive of the sum spent on the British Museum. Yet throughout the country very little was known of the articles purchased, and the places where they were deposited. Science and art had been appropriated very much by a small body of individuals, who had failed to make widely known the great advantages the country possessed. The Commission of 1864 strongly recommended that the distributions of prizes in connection with schools of art should be discontinued, because they cost a very large sum of money, and were productive of very little good. Notwithstanding this £3,700 was asked for this year for medals. It was a curious circumstance that of the 6,800 persons examined at these schools last year, Plymouth furnished no fewer than 503. That showed that the advantages were not generally known, but that where persons of influence in particular localities exerted themselves, and made applications for grants they did a great deal of good. The President of the Council should endeavour, by circulating catalogues and other means, to diffuse throughout the provinces a knowledge of the great advantages possessed by the country in reference to science and art. In the British Museum, there were 246 attendants; but anybody who visited the Museum was unable to obtain any information from any of them with regard to the various objects collected there. There were no lectures, or anything of that sort, from which the uninformed public might derive instruction. The same thing was observable at the National Gallery. The Commissioners in 1864 very strongly recommended also that the collection of works of decorative art at South Kensington should be made more generally useful to the country, especially in connection with the local museums. Works of art and paintings, &c., might be sent occasionally into the country to exhibitions with great benefit and without having any harm done to them.

Mr. BRUCE said, that plan was adopted now.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, he did not think it was the case with regard to pictures.

Mr. BRUCE said, the department had not the necessary power in the case of pictures.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he must defend the British Museum and the National Gallery against the charges made by the hon. Member (Mr. Goldney) though he was not altogether satisfied with the system of administration in either of those institutions. He thought there might be something like unity in our national collections, and that the Kensington Museum might be in some way placed in connection with the British Museum. Both of them, however, did their work admirably, and rendered their collections very useful. As to the British Museum, on those days which the public generally imagined were closed days, persons who really wanted to study were admitted, and the eminent men, the keepers of the various collections, devoted much of their time to explaining to *bonâ fide* students the objects exhibited. Then, again, South Kensington could not be fairly charged with neglect in not sending works of art to different parts of the country. In proof of this he might refer to the exhibition at Brighton this year, and that which would be held next year at Leeds. If there was a fault on that point to be alleged against the South Kensington Department, it was that they were sending them in excess to places where they did no good. He ridiculed the idea of a knowledge of art and science being disseminated by a "Professor Pepper" lecturing by the hour to nursery-maids and their infant charges. On the whole he thought the money they were called upon to vote was very well disposed of.

Mr. POWELL said he was glad that the Directors of South Kensington Museum had at last formed a plan with regard to their new buildings. The beauty and excellence of the building would not be exceeded by any structure in the metropolis, or surpassed in any part of the United Kingdom. That the South Kensington Museum was rapidly growing in public estimation was evident from the largely increased number of visitors, as well as of pupils in the schools of science and art. The number of visitors to it last year was 756,000, which was 170,000 in excess of the annual average. There were last year 6,842 pupils at the science schools, and 105,480 pupils at the schools of art. So that the money spent upon them could not be said to be wasted or spent in any exclusive spirit. He wished to ascertain from the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) how far he thought the public appreciated the advantages of the art loans from the South Kensington Museum, and whether he found the applications for them increasing or not? He also wished to know, with regard to the auxiliary museums to be established in other parts of London, who were to be the trustees, whether they were to be under the control of the department, or of people living in the districts in which they were established, and whether they were to be furnished by a sum granted in an annual Vote or by voluntary offerings. Where towns had failed properly to appreciate the loan of art collections it was due chiefly to restrictions imposed locally and not by the department. One new feature he rejoiced to see. That was the removal of the auxiliary museum to the East End of London. where it was calculated to exercise a most beneficial effect. The progress of matters relating to science and art this year he considered as eminently encouraging, and there was now a golden opportunity for the South Kensington Museum. Having been called into existence and having laboured for years in advance of the public taste, the department was now ready to carry on art education upon a large scale just at the moment when the public had begun to cry out for this very education. A debt of gratitude was due to those who had foreseen this demand, and public recognition of their labours. These labours had not always been very handsomely treated or very fully appreciated.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he had to complain that the Papers, which were intricate and inconvenient, had been thrown down upon the table without one word of explanation from the noble Lord at the head of the department. Personally, he had no aptitude for science or art, and living in the centre of a population of 50,000 or 60,000 persons, he could undertake to say that there was not a single individual in the whole of that population who ever heard of or realized to themselves what large sums of money were expended under this head — £200,000 a year! For half that sum they could get rid of half the turnpike trusts in the country. A large proportion of this outlay went to Ireland; eight or nine times as much as to Scotland. He did not grudge the money; but what were the results of this disproportionate outlay? In that country the liberty of the subject was suspended, and we were threatened with continued disaffection. It was due to the House that the Minister having charge of the Vote should state what effect this munificence had had upon the loyalty or upon the disaffection existing in that country. The House ought to know how far the Vote was calculated to increase the disaffection in Ireland. That seemed to be the result of all that we did to conciliate Ireland. Was the grant calculated to diminish it, and to produce a state of things more creditable and more safe to this country, and more for the benefit of the people of Ireland?

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, that in days before the Flood, when men lived 1,000 years, there was time for discussing everything at length; but, in these days, remarks must necessarily be brief. It appeared to him that the charge for the school of naval architecture at South Kensington Museum was unnecessarily large.

Mr. ACLAND said, he had reason to believe that the school of naval architecture was working extremely well, and that the salaries of the professors were very moderate. The facilities afforded by the South Kensington Museum for the promotion of science and art were highly appreciated throughout the country generally. At the recent agricultural meeting of an agricultural society in the West of England, no articles excited so much interest among the great mass of the visitors as those which had been sent from the South Kensington Museum. People must not find fault because the advantages of the Science and Art Department were not spread more through the country, when they neglected that local co-operation by which alone that object could be attained. The time was not far distant when the whole of these questions of elementary education, middle-class education, and science and art, must be dealt with in a more serious and systematic manner than they were at present. Nothing could exceed the courtesy, intelligence, and sound judgment exhibited by the Lord President of the Council and the Vice President. He hoped their successors would show the same good sense, and receive the same encouragement from the country. He looked forward to a full statement with respect to these matters; and trusted that the whole question of science and art would be considered in company with the question of elementary instruction and middle-class education, which was looming in the future.

Mr. OSBORNE said, he had seen this Vote gradually growing up from a small sum till it now reached £260,000, which was an increase of £32,000 over the Vote of last year. This was a project for instilling æsthetic ideas into the minds of the people of this country. Whatever were the merits or virtues of the people of this country, they were essentially a people impalpable to the influences of science and art. Whatever might have been done, and whatever money might have been spent, the great proportion of the money, instead of improving the taste of the people of this country, found its way into the pockets of people who were deriving a very snug income from the scheme. He was against any grant for purposes of science and art. He had never known in the history of the world that any people had ever acquired a taste for science and art through a Government grant. In the ancient Republics, they had no Government grants, nor had they Government grants in Rome; yet look at the Greek and Roman sculptures, and the horrible specimens to be found in London. There was but one decent piece of sculpture in the metropolis, and that was the work, not of a sculptor, but of Sir Edwin Landseer. We could not even build a lodge. Look at the hideous building at Stanhope Gate! We vote these enormous sums, and then go to the Continent for designs. His hon. Friend (Mr. Acland) spoke of the great excitement caused at a show in the West of England by the objects lent from Kensington. Wombwell's Menagerie would have created equal excitement. As to improving the taste of the country, he defied any one to point to a single building or monument of art set up during the past few years not infinitely inferior to the productions of 100 years or so ago. Had he been aware that the Vote was coming on he would have endeavoured to get some fuller information of the increase for this year. The House could not conceal from itself that the Science and Art Department was a conglomerate of everything, begun by a few bits of china, and ending, as far as we had arrived at present, with a school of shipbuilding. It would not surprise him if the House were to meet there some day, and very fine specimens of science and art would it produce! It was of no use protesting at the end of the Session. The Votes were always brought in when everybody was heartily tired of everything. There was an inspector general with a salary, and occasional inspectors at £3,000; there was a grant for taking the Brompton Boilers to the East End of London, in order to improve the architectural taste of the people of Whitechapel. Then came Ireland's College of Science and Museum of Industry. He would not follow the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley), the Paganini of the House, who had been playing on his one string, — the Irish priest. He found £2,500 set down for professors. From his experience of professors in the House, he had acquired a great horror of them. He wished to ask a question with regard to one of those professors. Not satisfied with £2,500 a year for professors, the department had put down an additional £100 a year for a professor who gave his services as dean. He should like to know what were the services which the dean had to perform? He had only had time to take a bird's-eye view of those items, because, before coming down to the House, he did not know that they would be brought on. He had no hope; that House would vote anything. He spoke to the future and reformed House of Commons; he hoped they would be a little more industrious in looking after Votes, if they did not knock the whole thing on the head; he doubted whether they would not knock a great many things on the head. There were a few men in the present House to whom he would appeal to look a little sharper after these matters. He would ask his hon. Friend the Member for Dublin (Mr. Pim), who was a man of business, to examine the whole of this Vote. How far was Parliament to go with these enormous grants for implanting taste in people who had no taste? [Colonel SYKES: What?] He was not speaking of the Scotch. They had taste;—they showed their good taste by leaving their own country and not going back. He protested against these Votes, which, instead of promoting science and art, went into the pockets of a set of men who were fattening on taxes paid by the people.

COLONEL SYKES said, he was much surprised to hear that doctrine laid down by the hon. Member for Nottingham. Ever since the time of Louis XIV. France had been cultivating a knowledge of art among the French people by means of museums and schools. The consequence was that an æsthetic taste prevailed among that people. The same course was now being pursued in other countries. Did the hon. Member for Nottingham wish that we should behindhand in such matters, and that the fact should be thrown in our teeth by continental nations that their æsthetic feeling was superior to that of our own population? This very last year the museum at Paris acquired more than 31,000 objects of art, and they distributed more than 5,000 in loans to different museums. There were a vast number of institutions and schools of art in France, which received liberal subventions from the Government, and the Government of that country sent forth expeditions for scientific exploration, one of which was on the point of proceeding to Persia. If we had not those elevated sentiments and tastes which as a nation, we ought to have, we should not grudge the moderate assistance given to a few scientific associations. If the money voted by Parliament for the promotion of science and art were not properly expended that would be good ground for complaint and examination; but if these Votes were applied properly, Parliament ought not to grudge the money.

MR. LIDDELL said, that his hon. Friend the Member for Nottingham was unjust to the institution, unjust to its officers, and unjust to the illustrious Prince Consort, who had originated the scheme. [Mr. OSBORNE: I never said a word about his Royal Highness.] His hon. Friend had objected to the whole expenditure. It was a useful expenditure. His hon. Friend said that the public taste in this country was so bad that one could not raise a public building worth looking at; but, if our taste was so bad, that fact afforded an additional reason why we should endeavour to improve it. The South Kensington Museum was a very valuable institution. The machinery could not be understood at a glance; but there was not a poor man, nor a poor man's child, who, through the valuable medium of the institution at South Kensington, might not acquire a high standard of education at a low rate. As for the officers, it would be difficult to speak too highly of them. Mr. Norman MacLeod was as talented as accomplished, and as courteous a gentleman as could be found in any department.

Mr. GOLDNEY said, the hon. Member who had just spoken would confer a great favour on him and other persons if he could furnish him with a key to the valuable machinery of which he had spoken. He should like to know where the naval school was, who applied to the school, and how many pupils were in it?

Mr. BRUCE said, that his hon. Friend the Member for Nottingham, in his observation with respect to South Kensington Museum had shown the most complete ignorance of the objects of that institution. The hon. Member for Oldham, if he were in the House, could bear testimony to the value of the services which the Museum rendered to the cause of art and science in this country, and could inform his hon. Friend that through its means thousands of people had been able to obtain at the lowest possible cost a most admirable scientific education, including a knowledge of mechanical drawing, geometry, and chemistry. A vast amount of good was, moreover, done by the drawing schools in connection with the Science and Art Department, there being about 100,000 children at present in attendance upon them. It was a very important thing that every carpenter and mason had it within his reach, through the medium of these schools to acquire the principles of drawing, and thus to lay the foundation of future excellence in their industries. He quite agreed with the suggestion that the money at present voted for this purpose should be considered a nucleus, and that the further extension of the system should be looked forward to. He admitted that there was some difference as regarded the success of the science and art schools in different districts of the country. In some places they were much more successful than in others. In Lancashire, for example, they found between 200 and 300 pupils in attendance upon instruction, whereas in the West Riding of Yorkshire the schools were not nearly so popular. On the slightest hint from any locality persons were sent down to see if a school of science would be useful in the place, and to explain the objects of the institution and the means of obtaining assistance. All that the institution could do was done. The House should remember that a good deal of the money voted to this department was spent in places like Edinburgh and Dublin, where buildings had been erected for the reception of the treasures of art collected in those capitals. The expenditure for these buildings was one that reflected honour upon the judgment and liberality of the country.

Mr. OSBORNE said, he wished to explain. The hon. Member for Northumberland had charged him with inconsistency, but it was somewhat difficult to discover how the charge had been substantiated. He (Mr. Osborne) did not mention the respected name of Prince Albert. The Kensington Museum was founded by that Prince to serve a very simple purpose. But since his death it had monopolized everthing, and like a sponge it was gradually sucking up everything in the metropolis. He advised the House to take note of what had fallen from the right hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil. That right hon. Gentleman had let the cat slip out of the bag, by remarking that the sum now asked for was only a nucleus for further extensions. He hoped the House would be on its guard, and see that the public money was not squandered needlessly. It seemed as if every one connected with the department became steeped in the influence which pervaded it. These science and art schools were not so universally popular as many tried to make out. They might be very successful at Oldham, but they were not so at Nottingham. [Lord Robert Montagu: They are.] If they were he was misinformed. The school building at Nottingham was at present in such a dilapidated state that he had been asked for a subscription to help to restore it, and that subscription, having regard to purity of election he had no intention of giving. He trusted the House would consider how rapidly this Vote was increasing. If he had the honour of a seat in the next Parliament—which was very improbable, considering the constituency he would have under the new Reform Bill—he should always resist these Votes. The greater part of the money was misspent. The public money ought not to be given for these objects.

Mr. HENLEY said, that after the very amusing speeches they had heard from the hon. Member for Nottingham he must crave leave to make one or two observations. That hon. Gentleman told them that the whole of this money which they were now asked to vote was wasted.

Mr. OSBORNE: I said a great deal of it was wasted; not the whole.

Mr. HENLEY said, the last of the two speeches of the hon. Member was rather singular. The hon. Gentleman seemed to infer that because the people of Nottingham had the bad taste to let their science and art school go to pieces, that therefore the whole of the people of the country were so deficient in ability that it was quite needless to strive to improve them by teaching. A proposition must be universal to possess any soundness. The position of the hon. Member for Nottingham was about as sound as saying that because there were a great many people without brains therefore you should not teach one to read or write. [Mr. Osborne: Not at the public expense.] They could not tell till they gave people the opportunity of learning whether they possessed taste or not. By teaching, however, they would evoke and cultivate that taste if it were lying latent. The hon. Member for Nottingham complained that much taste was not shown in the public buildings of this country. That hon. Gentletleman evidently expected architectural changes to be effected by the wand of a harlequin. The Science and Art Department, it should be remembered, had only been existence about fifteen years, and it was not to be expected that its influence should in so short a period have created a revolution in public buildings. He agreed with the hon. Member that this Vote had attained great magnitude, and that it required careful consideration. He thought that the Minister who had charge of this department was bound to inform himself thoroughly of the business connected with it, so as to give the public satisfactory information how this large sum of money was spent. He believed part of it was spent in meeting local expenditure. It would, moreover, be well carefully to consider the class of persons who took advantage of the science and art schools. They could not endow men with taste by teaching, but teaching would cause latent taste to blossom. We might be more or less fortunate than other parts of the world with respect to the quality of taste, but he believed that if we gave our people fair play, and afforded them the opportunity of availing themselves of the best instruction that could be obtained, great benefit would be conferred upon the country, and our industries might be considerably improved. He should be sorry to see any attempt made suddenly to strangle this science and art system, because he did not believe it had been long enough in existence for a correct judgment to be formed with respect to its working. It had already developed a great deal, and he hoped it would be continued.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, the hon. Member for Nottingham and others had charged him with introducing this Vote without an explanation, but he must remind the hon. Gentleman that he did offer an explanation when he moved the first Education Vote; he had therefore thought it was not necessary to trouble the House a second time upon the matter. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) complained that there was a great increase in the Vote for the present year. One element in that increased expenditure was the additional number of schools established. The greater the success of the system the greater of course would be the expenditure. Another element of the increase was £12,500 for new buildings. It was fair to mention that many were of opinion that a much larger sum should be voted for this purpose, so as to complete the buildings at once, and not spread the expense of their erection over a number of years. Then there was a small increase of £2,200 for the establishment of a college of science in Dublin in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission presided over by Lord Rosse. The hon. Member for Nottingham asked who was the professor who received £100. The professor was Sir Robert Kane, who was made Dean of Faculty, and received that honorarium yearly. With regard to the Brompton Boilers the question of their removal to the East End of London had been before Parliament and fully considered. He believed that the science and art building to be erected in that part of the metropolis would be very useful and instructive to the people living at the East End, who could not go so great a distance as to Kensington. The correspondence had all been laid before Parliament. The land had been provided by local subscriptions, the largest contributor being, he believed, Mr. Antonio Brady. The museum there contained merely the superfluities of other collections, and surely it was not too much to contribute to the intellectual amusement of the inhabitants of an extensive and not very opulent district. There was a sum of £7,500 for the completion of the geological survey of England, Ireland, and Scotland, which had been proceeding slowly, and which, on the recommendation of Sir Roderick Murchison, it was thought desirable to hasten forward. The hon. Member for Nottingham had condemned the science and art schools, but in doing so he differed in opinion from the great majority of his constituents, for the school in that town was attended by about 1,800 pupils. If the managers of the school in that place made an application next year for a grant to put their school in proper repair, he had no doubt that, if the necessary conditions were fulfilled, it would be given.

General DUNNE said, he had not meant to oppose the Vote.

Vote *agreed to.*

(2.) £5,711, to complete the sum for the University of London.

(3.) £13,918, to complete the sum for Scottish Universities.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he wished to ask, if the Government intended to assist Glasgow in the erection of the new University buildings?

Mr. HUNT said, Lord Derby had already stated that the Government were favourably disposed to that object; but the question was still waiting for further consideration It was the intention of the Government before the Estimates were framed next year to go carefully into the question.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £1,515, to complete the sum for Queen's University in Ireland.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he wished to ask the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland, whether he would give the House some explanation regarding the present state and prospects of that institution?

Lord NAAS said, there had already been considerable discussion upon that matter. He had stated the opinion of the Government the other night, as well as the condition in which the University was. He had nothing further to add.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £2,265, to complete the sum for Queen's Colleges in Ireland.

Mr. WHALLEY said, the hon. Member for Nottingham (Mr. Osborne) had twitted him with being the Paganini of the House. He accepted the comparison as a great compliment. Paganini played better upon one string than other musicians did upon four, and the inference he supposed was that he (Mr. Whalley) played better upon his one string than other Members upon their many strings. At the risk of again laying himself open to the comments of the hon. Member for Nottingham, he wished to ask the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland, whether he would give the House any information regarding the Colleges mentioned in this Vote?

Lord NAAS said, Government did not propose to make any change in these institutions. If any were contemplated the House would receive due notice, so as to have time to discuss the subject fully.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £700, Royal Irish Academy.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that a portion of this sum was devoted to the collecting and indicing of ancient manuscripts, upon which he should like some explanation.

Lord NAAS said, that the selection was made by the Committee of the Royal Irish Academy, composed of all parties.

Mr. OSBORNE: Dr. Graves, the gentleman appointed to make the search, is not a Roman Catholic, but Bishop of Limerick.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £2,183, National Gallery of Ireland.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, that the vote of £1,000 granted last year for the purpose of purchasing pictures for this institution had not been expended, but had been returned to the Treasury. It seemed shabby and was unfortunate that when so small a sum was voted for this desirable purpose it had not been expended.

Lord NAAS said, that the sums granted for this purpose were only used to meet a corresponding sum raised by private subscription. No sum having been so raised last year, the money voted had been returned to the Treasury.

Mr. CHILDERS said, there was an explanatory note to this Vote last year, but it seemed to have been omitted this year.

Vote *agreed to.*

(8.) £1,500 to complete the sum for Belfast Theological Professors, &c.

(9.) £11,895 to complete the sum for National Gallery.

Lord ELCHO said, that in the absence of the hon. Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck), who had a Notice upon the Paper relating to the subject of this Vote, he wished to remind the House that fourteen years ago he had been instrumental in obtaining the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the subject of cleaning the pictures in the National Gallery. That Committee reported that the pictures were being seriously injured by the mode in which the cleaning process had been conducted. The result of that inquiry was that, until the death of Sir Charles Eastlake, a year or two since, the cleaning process had been discontinued. He regretted to say that since the appointment of the new Director of the institution, the practice had been resumed with a most important result upon the pictures. One very fine landscape by Rubens, (the Beaumont Rubens) which had attracted general admiration, having undergone the process, had been scarified from a glowing Rubens to a cold blue picture, a mere hard outline. A Belgian artist who had seen the picture since this operation told him that he should not have known the picture to have been the work of his countryman. By cleaning a picture, even though no paint were removed, the mellowness that time alone could give was destroyed. He hoped, therefore, that the practice would again be discontinued, and that in 1867 the Vandalism of a former period would not be renewed. As to the prices that had been given for certain pictures that had been recently purchased for this institution, that was a matter upon which he was always shy of giving an opinion. But he had been informed that a picture called a Rembrandt, for which £7,000 had lately been given, would fetch literally nothing if put up for sale at a public auction.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he hoped that before this Vote was agreed to the Committee would receive some assurance from the Treasury Bench that some steps would be taken towards the erection of a fit building in which these pictures might be placed. The question of the rebuilding or the enlarging of the National Gallery was like the siege of Troy—it was never ending.

Mr. OSBORNE said, that an item of £700, which belonged to the "eternal South Kensington," appeared in this Vote.

Mr. COLERIDGE said, he did not pretend to be a connoisseur, but he had devoted much time and care to the subject of painting. All the artists with whom he was acquainted, and every one of competent skill whom he met, had but one opinion as to the cleaning of the national pictures, and that opinion was, that the cleaning was thoroughly successful. It seemed, therefore, that he and the noble Lord did not meet the same persons. As to the landscape of Rubens (the Beaumont Rubens) referred to by the noble Lord, Mr. Leslie, in his *Handbook for Young Painters*, especially noticed how much that particular picture would be improved by cleaning, and what an outcry on the part of ignorant persons the cleaning of it would probably produce. In the days of Sir George Beaumont it was fancied that the trees and grass in a landscape should be of the colour of a Cremona fiddle. He supposed that something of that taste had survived to the present day. He thought that any unbiassed person who carefully studied the works of the Old Masters in the National Gallery would come to the conclusion that they resembled nature much more closely than they did when they were seen through the cloud of linseed oil and varnish which it was formerly the fashion to put upon them. Every one who knew Mr. Boxall, the Director of the National Gallery, must be aware that he was a most conscientious, careful, and reverent worshipper of the works of the Old Masters, and that no one would be more unlikely than he to do anything that would injure them intentionally; and no one, not even excepting the noble Lord himself, knew more thoroughly what would injure them and what would not. His appointment had been in all ways greatly to the benefit of the National Gallery. As to the picture by Rembrandt, to which allusion had been made by the noble Lord, its pedigree was well authenticated, as until it was purchased by the English Government it had remained in the collection formed by the nobleman for whom Rembrandt painted it. There might be a difference of opinion as to its being a good picture, but there could be none as to its being a genuine one: and here again he could not but think that a great and learned artist was as likely as a picture dealer to know whether a work, purporting to be by a great master, was or was not a genuine production. He protested against these random attacks, which crippled the usefulness of a valuable public servant, and did great and unmixed mischief.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, it had been suggested during a former discussion that the trustees of the National Gallery should put themselves in communication with the Government respecting any new steps they desired to be taken. They had accordingly submitted to the Government a full and detailed Report of their views. When the Government had time to consider it, they would lose no time in taking the steps they should think necessary to enable them to prepare for the consideration of Parliament next Session a scheme for that purpose. It was impossible for him to give any hasty pledge on the subject.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, he only wanted to know that the Report of the Select Committee had not gone to sleep.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he had to complain of the management of the National Gallery. The pictures were not properly brought before the public, or they would be just as much appreciated as other things were.

Lord ELCHO said, the defence made by the hon. and learned Member for Exeter was identical with that set up before the Committee which sat fourteen years ago. The Committee of that day were not convinced; but recommended that more care should be taken in cleaning the pictures, and that recommendation was attended to. As to pedigrees, pictures stood in a similar position to individuals. It was well known that there were people who would draw up pedigrees showing anybody's descent from William the Conqueror or Alfred the Great, according as a Norman or a Saxon ancestor was required. One of the first auctioneers in London had informed him that the Rembrandt he had referred to would, if put up to sale, fetch scarcely anything at all.

Vote *agreed to.*

(10.) £1,650, British Historical Portrait Gallery.

(11.) £11,215, to complete the sum for Magnetic and Meteorological Observations, &c.

(12.) £2,600, to complete the sum for Board of Manufactures, Scotland.

(13.) £53,799, British Department, Paris Exhibition.

Mr. OSBORNE said, he hoped that we should never see another Exhibition—at all events, not one conducted on such a principle as this, where the French Government had made us pay for everything.

Vote *agreed to.*

(14.) £2,300, Learned Societies, Great Britain.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he found that one item in the Vote was £500 for the Royal Academy of Music in England. There was a similar institution in Ireland, and he hoped the Secretary of the Treasury would give an assurance similar to one he was understood to have given to a deputation that the claim of that institution would be favourably considered by the Government.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, he hoped that no such assurance would be given. He could not see what claim either of the institutions in question had upon the public purse. He believed the money included in this grant was entirely thrown away. The matter was discussed some twelve or fourteen years ago, and then there was not an advocate in its favour. The grant to the Academy of Music was perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. HUNT said, the case of Ireland was under consideration, but he had made no promise. Before next year the whole subject would be considered by the Government.

Mr. WHALLEY said, there was no part of the kingdom where music was more cultivated than Wales; yet Wales did not participate in the grant. If the hon. Gentleman therefore wished for a reason to refuse a grant to Ireland, he might justify himself under the case of Wales.

Vote *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £25,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1868, for the Entertainment of Foreign Potentates."

Mr. OSBORNE said, he wished to ask whether any precedent existed for such a Vote. Were the Allied Sovereigns, or more recently the Emperor of Russia, for instance, entertained at the public expense? If so, that precedent would be sufficient.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: There is no precedent for the entertainment of a Sultan.

Mr. OSBORNE said, he spoke of

Sovereigns. He was then to assume that there was no precedent.

Mr. AYRTON said, it was necessary that an explanation should be given before the grant was voted. The Committee was aware an arrangement had been made by which the Sovereign's expenditure was to be withdrawn from the notice of the House or the public. No doubt that was a wise arrangement. It was extremely precise in all its details, and he doubted whether, with that arrangement in view, it would be possible in point of law to put the Motion from the Chair, and for this reason the Act of Parliament for the settlement of the Civil List provided that if any excess should take place in any one year over £385,000, the sum provided by that Act beyond £15,000, which would bring the *maximum* up to £400,000, a full account of every item of that excessive expenditure should be laid upon the table of the House before the additional sum was granted. The demand made upon the House, however, was for an excessive expenditure of £25,000 within one year, and no explanation accompanied the request showing why it was rendered necessary. It was expressly provided by the same Act of Parliament that the year should begin on the 1st of January, and end on the 31st of December, and the excessive expenditure for any given year could therefore not be made out until the 31st of December The grant to the Sovereign was dispensed by the various Officers of the Household, and it was provided that if the expenditure in one department was excessive, and in another a surplus was found, the one should be balanced by the other, if possible. But it was impossible for the Officers of Her Majesty's Household to say whether they would have a surplus or the reverse on the coming 31st of December in their respective departments. If any of those departments had been put to great expense, say in June, in respect of the Sultan's visit, it might be that skilful management would result in such economy during the remainder of the year, that the accounts of the department would balance completely by the 31st of December. Therefore, until the end of the year had come it would be impossible to say whether any excessive expenditure had arisen, either in one department, or in the establishment as a whole. Consequently, it would not be according to the Act of Parliament for the Civil List that the Committee should be asked to grant to the Sovereign any supplement to the Civil List for the current year at present. All these remarks were made on the assumption that the grant was asked for on account of the expenditure of the Sovereign. If it were not so—and they had been left entirely in the dark on that point—his remarks would not apply. It was quite possible that the grant was required for the Secretary of State for India. If, however, his remarks did apply, he wished to point out that in cases where special grants were made to the Civil List, a formal message was usually sent to the House by the Sovereign, stating the circumstances which had rendered it necessary to make the request. If this Act of Parliament for the settlement of the Civil List was broken through on one side, it would go forth that it was not considered binding, and then it might be broken through on the other, and the temptation would be held out to some Member of the House having occasional fits of economy to move reductions in the Civil List. For the sake of the dignity of the House and the honour of the Sovereign, he trusted nothing would be done hurriedly in this matter, and that the necessary explanation would be accorded to the Committee before the Vote was proceeded with.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I hope the Committee will hesitate before they accept the views of the hon. and learned Gentleman. There is no doubt this expenditure to a certain extent must have been administered by the different departments of the Household, because there is no other mode in which it could be administered. Therefore, really, that is not a consideration which affects the question. As far as the Sultan is concerned, part of the funds must, as I have said, be administered in this manner. With regard to the other potentate who visited this country, the funds would be administered by the head of the Foreign Department, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The hon. and learned Gentleman laid great stress upon the necessity for a skilful and economical management of the Civil List. I would remind the House that during the long reign of Her Majesty—and I hope it may be lengthened for at least an equal term—the Civil List has been administered with so much efficiency, prudence, and good management that Her Majesty has never, on any occasion, been forced to appeal to the support and assistance of her subjects in consequence of any want of skill or economy in the administration of that settlement which was agreed upon in a spirit of mutual confidence and satisfaction. Nor can I refrain from adverting to one consideration which ought not to be forgotten by us. Although there has never for a moment been any wish to appeal for any extraordinary aid of the Civil List as settled by this House, there can be no doubt—though I should not have referred to it had not the subject been mentioned—that the large increase in the cost of establishments, owing to the great rise in prices, has rendered the economical management of these resources still more necessary than in previous years, or at the period when the scale upon which the Royal expenditure is based was estimated and settled. But what I wish the Committee to understand is that the occasion on which Her Majesty's Government recommend this appeal to the Committee is not an ordinary one. Distinguished personages have heretofore been the guests of the Queen ; but Her Majesty has never on these occasions applied to Parliament in consequence of increased expenditure. But the late occasion was one of a very rare and extraordinary character, and the expenditure was of a particular kind. It was not—as has usually happened in the case of other Sovereigns—the reception of a Sovereign accustomed to our ways, and whose life is regulated in accordance with the general arrangements adapted to the habits of the Sovereign of this country, and for whom, therefore, without any extraordinary expenditure, the requisite preparations could be made. It was absolutely necessary that considerable expenditure should be incurred in order that the reception of the Sultan and the Viceroy, but especially the Sultan, should be such as would be satisfactory not merely to that Sovereign, but to the country. The expenditure, no doubt, was unusual, and it was so considered. We felt that the country would be greatly chagrined, and the House of Commons, too, if that reception were not one calculated to sustain the dignity of the country. I wish, therefore, the Committee to feel that this was an extraordinary occasion. It was in a certain sense a national reception; and I think I may say that the country has no reason to be displeased with the reception given to the Sultan.

Lord ELCHO said, that some time ago he put a Notice on the Paper intending to ask a question of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon this subject. Incidentally, however, his hon. and learned Friend had brought the subject before the House. He was afraid that, from the remarks of the hon. and learned Gentleman, an impression might go abroad that, having entertained these distinguished foreigners, we were now rather averse to paying the bill. It would be unlike Englishmen to take the credit for, but decline the cost of, a national entertainment. He did not think this was the intention of the hon. and learned Gentleman ; but that his intention was rather to point out that although it was quite right to give the entertainment, it ought not to be defrayed by any Vote of this House. This gave the Chancellor of the Exchequer an opportunity of pointing out—which he did very clearly and justly — that Her Majesty, during the many years she had reigned over this country, had never come to Parliament for an extra grant, but had confined her expenses strictly within the Civil List, which was granted for this purpose. So far from objecting to this Vote of £25,000, he should be glad to see this sum annually voted for this purpose. When we saw the intercommunication now going on between different nations, and the way in which distinguished foreigners, including even the Sultan, travelled about, we must feel it to be desirable that these national courtesies should be offered, and that we should have the means and opportunities of entertaining foreigners of distinction when they visited this country. The position of Her Majesty was very different from that of the Emperor of the French, whose Civil List was three or four times as great as that of Her Majesty, and who had a Palace specially set apart for the reception and entertainment of distinguished visitors. Owing to the circumstance of a similar Palace not having been provided by the nation for this purpose, many distinguished foreigners who had visited us had been obliged to go to hotels. He would take the case of a distinguished Mahomedan—a man looked up to by the Mahomedans of the whole world—and we had more Mahomedan subjects than almost any other nation. When Abd-el-Kader came to England he lodged at Claridge's Hotel. He did not know whether the hon. and learned Member saw a letter in *The Times* signed " An Arab," complaining of the treatment which Abd-el-Kader received. The writer of the letter stated that Abd-el-Kader was so disgusted at being sent to a "khan," as he called it, that he went away sooner than he otherwise would have done. He made inquiry into the circumstances, and found this to be a genuine letter from an Arab, and that it expressed the feeling of Abd-el-Kader at his treatment. This had been corroborated by a letter which he had received from a Member of the House who had travelled in the East, and visited Abd-el-Kader at Damascus. When the civil war took place in Syria between the Maronites and the Druses, all the Consulates except the English were destroyed. In that Consulate 5,000 Christians took refuge, and were saved by Abd-el-Kader, who sent a guard of 1,200 Algerians for their protection. Many of those 5,000 were English, French, and other Europeans. What was the result? The Emperor of the French, the Queen of Spain, and other potentates, in gratitude for the protection thus afforded to their subjects, conferred marks of honour. The Emperor of the French sent the Grand Cordon of the Legion of Honour; the Queen of Spain the chief order of Spain. "But from England," said Abd-el-Kader, "I received nothing." He felt this very much, and expressed himself strongly. Everything, however, was put right, for Lord Russell sent Abd-el-Kader an English rifle, made by an English maker, but which would certainly never gain a prize at Wimbledon. That was the only compensation he received for the services he had rendered to the Christians in Syria. He really thought that when distinguished foreigners came to this country, who had rendered services to this country, they ought not to be rewarded by being sent to an hotel; and when they were to have some token of recognition through the Foreign Minister, they ought not to be rewarded by the present of an English rifle. We boasted, and justly, of being a hospitable nation. Foreigners who came here were hopitably entertained by individuals; and when distinguished potentates visited this country, there ought to be some means of properly entertaining them. Considering the limited amount of the Civil List, it was not for Her Majesty to undertake the duty. So far, therefore, from grudging this charge and cavilling at it, he should like to see a sum annually voted for this kind of international courtesy. The present Vote was to defray the expense of entertaining the Sultan in Buckingham Palace, and of entertaining the Viceroy of Egypt at Dudley House. Lord Dudley having the honour of the Viceroy's acquaintance, and having, when in Egypt, been received by him with the utmost courtesy, was extremely glad of the opportunity of offering him the hospitality of his house; and when making that offer he was quite prepared to bear the entire expense of entertaining him. The Foreign Secretary, however, naturally thought that would be too much; and made an offer to Lord Dudley that every expense of entertaining the Viceroy should be borne by the Foreign Office. Every Member of the House would feel with him that it was unworthy of a great nation to be in the position of having no Palace where guests could be suitably entertained, and that a private gentleman should be put to the inconvenience of giving up his house, however willing he might be to do so, and even to bear the expense. At Paris there was a Palace, the Elysée Bourbon, set apart for foreign visitors of distinction. They were lodged there at the expense of the State. He was informed by a gentleman who had travelled a good deal that distinguished foreigners had a strong feeling against being sent to an hotel. It would certainly tend to our national credit—nay, more, to our advantage, to have some Palace—a new building, if need be, or an additional wing if need be—in which distinguished foreigners might be entertained in the name of the nation, so as to avoid the necessity of locating them at Claridge's Hotel. They could not expect Her Majesty to be put to the inconvenience and expense of entertaining all these foreign visitors in her own Palace, and he was sure the nation would not grudge an annual Vote for this purpose.

Mr. THOMSON HANKEY said, he thought the noble Lord was mistaken in supposing that the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton) had objected to the expense of entertaining the Sultan or the Viceroy. He understood that the objection which the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets took to this Vote was on a point of form, and not of substance—that the House ought not to be even asked apparently to contribute to the augmentation of the Civil List—a form of proceeding objectionable on constitutional grounds, and contrary both to the spirit and to the wording of the Civil List Act. He entirely concurred with the noble Lord who had just spoken in thinking that an extraordinary expenditure of this kind ought to be borne by the nation. He had in fact called attention on a previous occasion to the impropriety of allowing any part of it to fall upon a private person. The only question was in what form ought the money to be voted? It seemed to him that it would be better if the Vote were taken in connection with the expenditure of some one of the great Departments of the State. Indeed it had been incurred under the control and authority, either of the noble Lord opposite (Lord John Manners), or of some other of the heads of the principal departments of State. Her Majesty might be said to have vacated her Palace of Buckingham, and handed it over to the nation for the occasion, and the expenses of preparing it for the reception and entertainment of the Sultan ought certainly to come out of the public purse. He deprecated altogether the idea that the House grudged the outlay. So far from it, he was sure that if it had been double or treble what it was, the nation would have gladly borne it.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I really do not think there is any difficulty. The question arose just as we were on the point of adjourning, and I had risen to make some explanations with reference to the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton). There is no doubt that if this question is mixed up with the Civil List there are points of difficulty which may arise. But there is nothing in the Vote we ask which connects it in any way with the Civil List. I have not introduced the question of the Civil List. It was introduced by the hon. and learned Member in remarks with that information which always distinguishes his observations in this House. I do not want to enter into any argument as to the provisions of the Civil List. I do not altogether agree with some of the hon. and learned Member's inferences. No doubt if the case were such as was assumed in this discussion, if Her Majesty had, on her invitation, been honoured by the presence of Princes and Emperors, they really would have been, as they have been before, her private guests, however exalted their rank. They would have been under the same roof with Her Majesty, they would have shared her hospitality, and have been her companions, and, under such circumstances, no appeal has ever been made to the House. I may repeat that for the twenty-eight years of Her Majesty's happy reign there never has been an appeal to this House to add to the expenditure of the Civil List. That list was estimated upon liberal views of what would be the fair and ordinary expenditure for the Sovereign of this great country, but with no reference to the extraordinary circumstances connected with the recent visit. The changing manners and advancing civilization of the age will no doubt frequently give an opportunity for the repetition of such events. This was in every respect a national visit, and it should be a national reception, and a national expense. The House of Commons is an assembly of men of the world, and we can speak of these things without misunderstanding. When Princes and Emperors have been guests of Her Majesty such circumstances have never been discussed in this House. The House of Commons individually may have been gratified that some of the most distinguished personages of the world were the guests of their Sovereign, and that they were received in a manner consonant with the position of so exalted a personage as their Queen, but no observations have been made upon circumstances which, though splendid, were essentially of a social character. But is that the case with respect to the two important and interesting visits we have received from these Eastern potentates? Nobody took so great an interest in those visits as the House of Commons. Those visits were not the result of ordinary invitation. The moment it was known that there had been the expression of a desire on the part of the Sultan and the Pacha of Egypt to visit England, no one waited to hear whether the ordinary form of invitation had been sent. The House of Commons night after night made inquiries whether the rumours were true, expressed a hope that they were true, and showed a nervous anxiety that the reception of these great personages should be in a manner which would express decorously the regard of the country for them. Hon. Gentlemen rose night after night to know what precautions were taken that they should be well housed and well received, and to express the hope that the manner in which they were greeted should be becoming to this great country. When they were informed, as they were informed in one instance, by my noble Friend the Secretary of State (Lord Stanley), that preparations had been made on an extensive scale, but in a place of public entertainment, the House of Commons were disappointed. At the same time they sanctioned the arrangement because they felt its necessity in the great deficiency of places of public reception which unfortunately distinguishes this country. The House of Commons entirely identified itself with these visits. They were national visits, and there was an undertaking on the part of the Government, by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that the reception of these illustrious persons should be worthy of the country—and the House of Commons would properly and justly have called us to account if there had been any meanness or inadequacy in the preparations. Is there, therefore, any analogy in visits from such personages under such circumstances and a casual arrival of a Prince or Emperor of Europe upon a social visit to Her Majesty? The House must feel that there is no analogy between the two cases. When Princes and Emperors of Europe have paid a visit to Her Majesty, Her Majesty has received them in a manner becoming her position. On the present occasion, from unhappy and deplorable causes, these visitors were not received by Her Majesty as would some years ago perhaps have been the case. But the House of Commons expressed a desire that the Sultan, at least, should be the tenant of a Royal Palace. Her Majesty placed her own Palace at his disposal. But the House and the country felt that, in so doing, Her Majesty was only assisting in the general effort of the country to receive the Sultan in a becoming manner. Under these circumstances there is nothing in this Vote connected in any way with the expenditure of the Civil List. The argument which has been raised upon the assumption that this expenditure, to a certain degree, might have been dispensed by Officers of the Household, has really nothing in it. So far as the Pacha of Egypt was concerned, nothing of the kind occurred. The expenditure was managed in a manner as efficient as could be arranged, but the only person immediately responsible for it was the Secretary of State. I hope, therefore, that the House of Commons will take a large view of the question; that we shall not get into a pedantical analysis of the Civil List; that we shall not hear observations about this being made a precedent affecting the expenditure which may be incurred on the reception of Royal visitors under ordinary circumstances. I trust that we shall mark out this as a remarkable case; that we shall fully recognize that this was a national reception, and that these Princes were national guests. I hope that we shall feel gratitude to Her Majesty for having deigned to place her own roof at the disposal of the nation that the reception might be adequate. I trust the House will have confidence in the Government of the day in the exercise of the discretion confided in them; that they will recognize that, in this instance, there has been no wild extravagance, that everything that has been done was done with judgment and consideration, and that the result has been both gratifying and satisfactory.

Mr. LAMONT said, that though he had a Motion upon the subject for that night, he disclaimed any intention of grumbling. If the sum had been £50,000 instead of £25,000 he would not have complained. What he wanted to know was how the money had been spent, and therefore he desired to move for a detailed account of the expenditure.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, that the money ought to be paid freely. Whether they should get the particulars or not was a matter of taste. If a man came to dine with one, and the host immediately began to talk about the price of the things on the table, the guest would not feel as comfortable as he ought to be. While the House could not be too careful in checking the national expenditure there were occasions on which it was well to be generous, and this was one of them. A great country like England ought to be given to hospitality. Somebody must entertain visitors; the House of Commons had undertaken it, and they ought not now to grumble at paying the bill. On the occasion of the late visits the City of London had come out very handsomely and the nation ought to act in the same way.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he wished to inquire, whether the expense of the India Office entertainment was included in the £25,000?

Mr. AYRTON said, it was an old saying that "we live and learn." Certainly the House of Commons had learnt something to night from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He had thought that, living under a Constitutional Monarchy the Sovereign always invited foreign Sovereigns to this country and entertained them, and he confessed the observations he had made were founded on the supposition that the old constitutional practice existed in the present case. But it seemed that there was now a new *régime*. To-night the British republic seemed to be the thing; for had they not been given to understand that the nation had invited those two Eastern Potentates, and that Her Majesty assisted in entertaining them. That was language rather new to the House of Commons. It was the first time they had heard of Her Majesty's Government inviting foreign Princes, and Her Majesty assisting to entertain them, and lending her house for that purpose, just as a nobleman had been good enough to do. They were told, therefore, that the House of Commons, representing the nation, having entertained those foreign Sovereigns, was now called upon to pay for the entertainment. His hon. Friend the Member for Finsbury, thinking that the nation was like the City of London, was of opinion that the House of Commons ought to pay the bill as they had done in the City. But gentlemen in the City were always in this pleasant position—they never paid a bill for one dinner without having another dinner to settle the account. In the City of London when they gave an entertainment it was never known whether they gave it to their guests or to themselves. There was a difference between the two cases. The House had not participated — very much to the chagrin, as it appeared, of some hon. Gentlemen — in the entertainment for which it was called upon to pay. He had always thought that the money was voted to the Sovereign, and that the Sovereign undertook the task of representing the nation, and that whatever was done was done in the name of the nation. This might appear a trivial matter, but, whether trivial or not, it engaged the attention of Parliament when Her Majesty ascended the Throne. The language of the Act then passed was precise. It stated that when the total charge for the year of the several branches of the Civil List should amount to more than £400,000, an account stating the particulars of such excess, and the causes thereof, should be submitted to Parliament. It must not be supposed that they were now discussing a question affecting the Sovereign. It was one affecting certain great Officers in Her Majesty's service. It was said that this was the first time in the present reign that such a demand had been made on the House. This arose from the circumstance that Her Majesty had hitherto been well served. It was therefore an unhappy contrast between the present and the previous servants of Her Majesty. It brought back recollections of those unfortunate days when messages not unfrequently came down to explain that there was a deficit in the Civil List, and to ask the House to assist in making it good. There were two questions that Parliament had a right to ask with regard to this Vote. The real question the House had to ask had reference to the manner in which the Officers of Her Majesty had performed their duties—whether this Vote was a real necessity, and whether the House was called upon to grant it? If it was a necessity, the law prescribed the manner in which it was to be brought under the consideration of the House. There was a right and a wrong way of doing things, and he did not think the explanation given by the right hon. Gentleman was satisfactory. He had not told them to whom the money was to be paid, or who was responsible for the expenditure of the money. These particulars ought to be given before the supply was voted.

Sir ROUNDELL PALMER: I think that of the two matters in question, substance and form, the House will consider substance of more importance than form. We agree that it was to the interest and honour of the country that fitting entertainment should be given to those foreign Potentates who, in a remarkable manner, visited the country. We also agree that the extraordinary charge involved is not a fit one to be thrown upon Her Majesty's Civil List, but ought to be voted by Parliament. We are all satisfied with the manner in which the Government discharged the duty on the part of the nation of entertaining them. In regard to the reception of the Pasha of Egypt, if I have not been misinformed, the fact is, that a private nobleman (Earl Dudley) placed his house at the disposal, not of the Pasha, but of Her Majesty. I speak on what I can hardly err in regarding as the best authority, when I say that that eminent nobleman, to whom the country is grateful, relieved Her Majesty from the difficulty in which Her Majesty was placed by having simultaneously to entertain two such illustrious guests. As Her Majesty had only one Palace suitable for the entertainment of the Sultan, who was necessarily the occupier of it, Lord Dudley placed his house at the disposal of Her Majesty, who took charge of it and entertained the Pasha. I believe the country in general is well satisfied with the manner in which the Government discharged its duty and maintained the honour of the country. Under the circumstances, there can be no doubt that this is an extraordinary charge, which ought to be provided for by an extraordinary Vote out of the public revenue, and that it is not one to be met by an ordinary departmental Vote, or thrown upon the Civil List. I feel the importance of observing proper constitutional forms; but I fail to see that there has been, in this case, any deviation from them. It is not customary to ask for Votes for the Secretary of State for this or that department. So much money is asked for the public service under certain heads. This is an extraordinary requirement, and, therefore, properly comes under an extraordinary head. I do not know whether any better form could be devised; even if it could, we shall probably be disposed to condone anything exceptional in this case. The hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets good-humouredly, and by way of joke, seemed to place an interpretation, which I should not like to be seriously taken, upon what fell from the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to this being an entertainment by the nation and not by the Sovereign. The Vote is for a sum to be "granted to Her Majesty," who, as representative and head of the entire nation, is charged with the duties of public hospitality. I did not understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer to mean anything inconsistent with that. He simply adverted to the question raised, whether this was a charge that ought to be put upon the Civil List, or ought to be paid out of the national funds by a special Vote of Parliament as a national and public expenditure. It was in that point of view I understood him to speak of national as distinct from ordinary Royal hospitality, and not as meaning that national hospitality was not the hospitality of the Queen dispensed on behalf of the nation. In other words, there are two kinds of Royal hospitality; one national, to be met in an extraordinary manner out of the public funds; the other private—if that term can be applied to the hospitality of such illustrious personages—and to be met out of the funds of the Sovereign. That was the distinction I understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer to draw. I should be sorry if the House for a moment misunderstood the language used, or should be disposed to infer that we were inaugurating republican, as distinguished from monarchical, principles in these matters.

Vote *agreed to.*

£15,000, Paris Exhibition, Department of Science and Art.

Mr. POWELL said, he wished to ask if this was the entire sum that would be called for on account of the Paris Exhibition?

Mr. HUNT said, that it was not an addition to the £116,000 voted for the Paris Exhibition expenses. A Committee of the House having recommended that £25,000 should be allowed for purchases, the Government had determined to recommend the expenditure of £15,000 if it could be saved out of the £116,000 with a view to encourage economy in the administration of that fund. The object of the present Vote, therefore, was to authorize a different appropriation of part of a sum already voted.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he wished for an explanation of the manner in which this Vote was to be allocated. A number of singular purchases had been proposed on a former evening of "democratic jewellery" and other odd matters. The evidence of one of the witnesses examined before the Committee was that an inferior class of French pictures and some cheap French jewellery were to be purchased. He thought the Committee ought to have some information on these points.

Mr. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, that if no purchases were to be made except with money saved from the Paris Exhibition Vote, he doubted whether any purchases would be made at all. The House might think itself lucky if it were not called upon to add to the £116,000.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he put full confidence in the statement of the Secretary to the Treasury that £15,000 would, in all probability, be saved out of the £116,000. With regard to the cheap French pictures, he might say, as a Member of the Commission appointed in connection with the Paris Exhibition, that Mr. Cole recommended the Commission to purchase some pictures of that class, which, he said, would have a very good artistic effect; but the Commission declined to adopt that course. With regard to the recommendation made by Mr. Cole for the purchase of "democratic jewellery," the Commission were of opinion that some good would result from the purchase of the whole or part of the fine collection exhibited in the Paris Exhibition by Mr. Castellani, which had been collected from the peasantry of Italy. Democratic jewellery was the jewellery worn in most countries but our own by the poorer classes of the people. Hon. Members who were familiar with France, Italy, and all Eastern countries, would be aware that the women of all classes, rich and poor, were in the habit of wearing jewellery, which, although not of great intrinsic value, was of an artistic form, and designed with great taste. There was no reason why the example should not be followed in this country. It was thought desirable by the Commission that they should purchase a collection of those ornaments for the Kensington Museum.

Mr. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, that after what he had just heard, he hoped that the Commission would not be able to save £15,000.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he wished to ask, if these purchases were made, what would be done with them? If objects of science and art were to be put into cellars or garrets they would be of no use or benefit to the public.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he trusted that a list of whatever was purchased would be laid before the House during the next Session of Parliament.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he wished to correct a wrong impression on the mind of the hon. Member for Poole (Mr. Henry Seymour). The Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Hunt) had not stated that £15,000 would be saved out of the Vote of £116,000 for the Paris Exhibition, but that only so much as was saved from that Vote and no more, would be spent in these purchases, instead of the surplus being surrendered to the Exchequer. Power to do this was asked by proposing the present Vote for the consideration of the House. It was proposed to intrust the duty of choosing these articles to the Chairman of the late Committee (Mr. Layard) and other gentlemen, and no objects would be purchased that were not worthy of being placed in the Exhibition at South Kensington.

Mr. SCOURFIELD said, he did not exactly see why it should be a point of honour with the Commission to spend the whole of the £116,000. If the surplus which might be saved were surrendered to the Treasury, it would form a very good example, and would, in his opinion, be quite as good as buying "democratic jewellery."

Vote *agreed to.*

Question [August 5] again proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £259,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1868, for Public Education in Ireland, under the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland."

Sir JOHN GRAY said, Sir: The Vote proposed to be taken is part of a larger sum of £344,000, at which the cost of primary education is estimated by the Board intrusted with the control of education in Ireland. On the part of the Irish people I will frankly admit that the sum annually expended on education, and cheerfully voted by this House, is large and generous; but the sense of gratitude for that generosity would be very much enhanced if the costly system of instruction so provided were framed more in accordance with the wishes and feelings of those for whom it was intended. Unfortunately, however, they are not consulted on a matter so vital to the harmony and well-being of the country, and the result is that the generous English public give these large grants from time to time under the impression that they are conferring great favours on the Irish people, whereas the mode of allocation, no matter how much educational advantages are gained by it, produces deep discontent in a very large class, and fails to give satisfaction to any. Under the National Education Board a system has been forced on the Irish people with which they have no sympathy—it is distasteful to the sincere members of the Church Establishment—it is disliked by the Wesleyans — it has been distorted to render it palatable to the Presbyterians; and the great bulk of the population, the Catholic people, use it as best they can, patiently hoping that this House would one day or other investigate the facts, and, ascertaining that they voted the public money for a system that is called "united," but which is the parent of division, remodel the whole plan, and give to Ireland—Catholic, Protestant, and Dissenter—that religious and denominational system which has been so long and so successfully applied in England. Surely if the religious and denominational system be good for Protestants in England, it cannot be bad for Protestants in Ireland. If the separate system be good for Catholics in England, and it has been found to be good for them, it must be good also for Catholics in Ireland. The Protestant and the Catholic in Ireland alike wish for it; but a school of *doctrinaire* statesmen have inaugurated an idea which has grown into a base superstition to which themselves bow down, and they now expect every person in Ireland to join them in the worship of their idol, the so-called "united" system, which, in fact, has no substantial existence, and is an unreal sham. I will not recur to the history of the education struggles in Ireland, for certain distinguished Members of the House seem to abhor historical reminiscences. I may, however, without being either antiquarian or historical, recall to the recollection of hon. Members that nearly thirty-six years have elapsed since the attempt to force this mixed or "united" system of education was made. It will be remembered that Lord Stanley, in his celebrated letter, in which he announced his desire to have this system adopted, proposed it, not as an original system, but an improvement on an old and vicious system under which the money of the State was openly used for proselytizing purposes, and which itself was an amelioration of a still more and more offensive system. Every person frankly admits that the system as propounded by that letter was a vast improvement on the Kildare Place Society, and it was accordingly received with general approval. What, however, was that system? Lord Derby intended that system to be a combined—a really "united" system, and provided, as the first condition, that the concurrence of the Catholic and Protestant clergy of the district should constitute, where practicable, the basis for the formation of each school. This was the leading idea of the plan, and it was expected that all schools under the new system would be opened by the concurrent action of the two pastors. Failing this, it was provided that one of the pastors and some laymen of another congregation might concur in the application; and failing that, that laymen belonging to each congregation might jointly apply, so as to impart to the school the character of united control and direction. As an additional guarantee it was suggested that a Catholic and Protestant teacher might be appointed to each school of sufficient magnitude to warrant the expense; but there was one other, and still more vital, element of protection and satisfaction. It was provided that religious instruction to the children of each creed should be given in each school at fixed times, and that the Catholic pastor of the parish should determine the religious instruction to be given to the Catholic youth, and the Protestant pastor of the parish should determine the religious instruction for the Protestant youth; with, however, a stringent proviso that, in order to guard against even the suspicion of tampering with the faith of any child, Catholics should not be allowed to be present during Protestant religious instruction, and Protestants should not be present while Catholic religious instruction had been given. Thus Protestant and Catholic pastoral authority, as well as Catholic and Protestant parental authority, were recognized, and their action invited as an essential and vital portion of the idea on which "united" education was based. But what is the result? It was stated by Mr. Cross, the late Secretary to the Board, before the Lords Committee of 1854, that only forty-eight schools out of 4,000 had joint patrons, either lay or clerical. It is still more noteworthy that the concurrent action of Catholic and Protestant, one of the most essential features of a "united" system, was stated in that inquiry to have been abandoned by the Board in 1840, in order to conciliate the Presbyterian body, who demanded, as a condition of accepting grants, that they be not required to obtain the co-operation of either Catholic clergymen or Catholic laymen. Yet these men are now the great clamourers for "united" education. Before going into the question of how far the existing system was entitled to be called a "united" system, so far as the pupils are concerned, I will call the attention of the House to the model school Estimate, and take a course not usually taken by Irish Members with reference to a Vote for Irish purposes—propose its rejection on the ground that it is useless, not wanted by the Irish people, and is a scandalous waste of the public funds. The Vote moved in bulk by the noble Lord (Lord Naas) consists essentially of two classes of items—one for the general purposes of the primary schools, the other for the central model, the district model, and the minor model schools, with their adjunct training departments. I will at present confine my objections to the Vote for the two latter, which are in no way essential to the general system. The central model and training establishment in Dublin may, in principle, be as objectionable as the others, but a defence for it is palpably to be found in the fact that it exists at head quarters, and is perhaps requisite while the system lasts. But the externs — the district and minor model schools—are of a totally distinct class, and the Estimate for these I will ask the House to refuse, if I succeed, as I expect I shall, in showing that they are extravagantly costly — amounting to no less than £23,505 yearly—and of no avail, save as a source of irritation and discord. I will ask the House to examine this Vote somewhat in detail, in order that they may understand how it is proposed to expend these £23,000. The thirty-third Report of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland has been just issued, and it brings down the statistics of the system to the 31st of December, 1866. From that Report it will be seen that the cost of the Ballymena school was £742 12*s.* 9*d.*, while the average attendance was only 143 pupils, including male, female, and infant school departments. Belfast cost for its model school £3,571, and the average attendance, including infants, was 1,052. Clonmel cost £743, as the charge for 143 pupils; for 497 pupils in Cork, £1,572; in Limerick the cost was £1,174 12*s.*, and the result of this large expenditure was 292 pupils, still including one-third infants; for Kilkenny, we were called on to pay for 133 pupils, including infants, the extravagant sum of £827 19*s.* 1*d.* Instead of giving other illustrations, it would be more convenient to give the House the gross attendance in all these schools. Sligo, however, having been referred to by the noble Lord, it will be well to have the cost of this "united" school, at which, in a Catholic town, there is but one Catholic on the roll — that cost is £795 3*s.* 4*d.* yearly; and yet this is the "united" model school—the model exemplar of "united" or mixed education in Ireland. The real results obtained from this large Vote of £23,000 will be better appreciated by taking the whole attendance at these district and minor model schools. The Commissioners give that as averaging 5,833, and one-third of these are "infants." And to what class do the parents of these children belong? No doubt many of them are poor, and many of them belong to the artizan class; but in some of the towns in Ireland many of the children who attend these schools are the children of parents who can as well afford to pay for their education as hon. Members of this House. It is a fact that handsome covered cars and carriages are to be seen outside the model school, where they are habitually sent on wet days, accompanied by liveried servants, in order to take home some of the pupils. I intend, therefore, to conclude with a Motion that the £23,505 for these two classes of model schools be disallowed, on the grounds that the ratepaying public ought not to be called on to pay, for the education of a few children, including the children of the rich men, such an exorbitant sum, and on the ground that they are objected to by the clergy of all denominations. There is no difficulty in opposing this Vote, for these model schools are trebly condemned already, and the only matter of surprise is that the Government should venture to ask the large sum of £23,505 for uses so emphatically repudiated by all parties as these model schools are—condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities of the people's Church in Ireland, condemned by the late Government, and condemned by the Commissioners of Education themselves. I then only ask the House to give effect to that condemnation by not wasting £23,505 of the public money in sustaining a doomed system, the extravagance of which amounts to a financial scandal. The noble Lord indicated that he would have accepted the Estimate of the Commissioners for separate educational training schools were he not impressed with the belief that it would be the adoption, in fact, of the denominational system. But in England we have denominational training schools, and denominational colleges for training, and why not have them in Ireland also? We have Catholic inspectors of Catholic schools, and Catholic teachers of training schools. We have Protestant inspectors for Protestant schools, and Protestant training schools for Protestant teachers in England —why not in Ireland also? The same is true of Jews and Quakers in England, and the same rule ought to be applied to Ireland. Having said so much in justification of the Amendment asking the House to refuse the Vote for the two classes of model schools, it will be necessary to examine the facts as to the system as a whole, with a view to ascertain were it, in fact, that success which it was reported, or the utter failure as a "united" system, which I insist it is. The noble Lord the Chief Secretary has stated, as an illustration of the perfect success of what he calls the system of education in Ireland, that there are no less than 4,000 schools under the direct patronage of the Catholic clergy in Ireland. I cannot understand what the meaning or purpose of using these words was if they were not intended to imply that "the system"—that is, the "united" system — had proved a great success—[Lord NAAS interposed a remark]—I am glad to see that I have not misinterpreted the noble Lord's views, and that he was rightly understood by me when I assume that he wished to convey to the House that the system was eminently successful. [Lord NAAS: I do not say so; quite the reverse was what I meant.] Well, if I was pleased at not having misunderstood the language of the noble Lord—though I am at a loss to conceive what the object of the noble Lord was in making that statement if it were not to indicate to the House that there was in existence in Ireland an extensive system of "united" education—I am far more pleased that the noble Lord repudiated it, because his doing so was a repudiation of the statement promulgated by the Resident Commissioner, and, I hope, an assurance that the Government was at length relieved from the superstition about "united" education, and would at once establish the sounder system of denominational education, so desired by all classes in Ireland. I admit that when the noble Lord talked about the extensive adoption of the "system" by Catholic clergymen, I did think he meant to endorse the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Resident Commissioner (Mr. M'Donnell), and adopted by the Education Board as their reply to the letter of the Catholic Bishops to Sir George Grey. In that letter the Bishops asserted that the schools had become extended in proportion as they became "separate," and asked that the large proportion of schools which were, in fact, denominational be not called "united," and subjected to "united" rules, but be dealt with in accordance with truth and fact. That letter was sent to the Commissioners for their reply, and the success of the "united" system was never so elaborately asserted as it is in that reply; and I will ask leave to read it to the House, just as it was read by the noble Lord, and which will account for the interpretation I put on his statement, which I am glad he now repudiates. In that letter Mr. M'Donnell says—

> "So long as it was generally, though erroneously, believed that "united" education under the National system was a failure, and that it was a plausible but a visionary scheme, it was not surprising that many sensible men were not unwilling that it should be abandoned. The experiment had, however, now proved eminently successful."

The Commissioner then went into a series of figures for the purpose of demonstrating the success of the system; and when the noble Lord read that passage, and added confirmatory figures of his own, it was not surprising that his objection was misunderstood. To return to the assertions of the Resident Commissioner, I will demonstrate that, however successful in establishing schools and imparting good secular education, it is a sham and a pretence to call it a "united" system. I will show, from the statistical tables given in the last Report of the Commissioners, that there is practically no such thing in Ireland as "united" education, and that the money given on the assumption that there is, is given under a gross delusion, propagated by such statements as I read from the letter of the Commissioners. From the Report of the Commissioners for the year ending December, 1866, it appears that there were in operation in Ireland 6,453 schools, and 910,073 pupils on the rolls. Now, in the table showing the number of unmixed schools, the Commissioners report that there were no less than 2,638 totally unmixed in all things—no union of patrons, no union of teachers, no mixing even of pupils. There were amongst these 2,638 schools, 2,454 into which no Protestant pupil enters from year's end to year's end, and 184 into which no Catholic pupil ever enters; and yet this House is told by the reply of the Commissioners that the "united" system is "eminently successful." Let the House now examine the table; they will find that there are no fewer than 373,756 Catholic children, and 18,702 Protestants, or, in all, 392,458 pupils in these schools, all of whom were, according to the signed official Report of the Commissioners, receiving exclusive Catholic or exclusive Protestant education; a number greater than half the whole Church Establishment population of Ireland; and yet the "united" system is, in the teeth of these, their own figures, declared to be "eminently successful." These 392,000 must be admitted to be on the separate system, for in this very Report of 1867 the Commissioners tell us that where there is no attendance of the minority there is no mixed education; and there are 392,000, without any mixture, even on the rolls. Of the so-called "united" schools, the Commissioners say there are 3,720. Of these, however, there are 2,483 under the exclusive control of Catholic patrons and Catholic teachers, and 1,106 under the exclusive directions of Protestants. Thus, of the so-called "united" schools, no less than 3,587 are either exclusively Catholic or exclusively Protestant, as to patronage, teachers, and teaching. The pupils in these schools represent in the aggregate 436,367; which, added to the 392,458, make 828,825, or more than eight-ninths of all the pupils on the roll. But to comprehend fully the position of these schools and the real nature of them as "united" or mixed schools, the House must analyze the details so as to ascertain what amount of union or of mixture there is. This examination will, I feel, justify me in saying that the 436,367 are, having regard to the system laid down in Lord Stanley's letter, almost as well entitled to be classed with those receiving separate education, though the pupils are somewhat mixed, as if there was no mixture of pupils at all in these so-called "united" schools. There are in schools directed by Catholic patrons, taught by Catholic masters, and in which, with an infinitesimal exception, there is no provision made for any religious instruction for Protestants, 321,641 Catholics, with whom 24,381 unprotected Protestants are mingled, and there are mingled with 114,726 Protestants in Protestant schools—in which, as a rule, no religious instruction is provided for them—29,722 Catholics. The true meaning and full force of what I urge will be, however, still more apparent if we examine the schools as a whole by the standard laid down in Lord Stanley's letter—namely, 1st, united patronage, which means united, or, to use Lord Derby's term, concurrent management of Catholic and Protestant; 2nd, joint teaching; and 3rd, provision for religious instruction for both classes. The hon. and gallant Member for Longford (Major O'Reilly) obtained from the House a Return in 1864, giving most valuable details as to the whole working of this system. From the Return it appears that there were out of the then existing schools (6,153) but 42 under joint patronage. There were only 103, including public establishments, as workhouses and asylums, in which there were joint teachers of both creeds, and more and more damnatory than both, there were but 547, in which provision was made to give religious instruction to both Catholics and Protestants. Is this, I ask, a "united" system? There is no union as to management and control, save in 42 schools—there is no joint teaching, save in 103 — there is no provision for the toleration even of both creeds, by allowing instruction to be given to each, save in 547 out of 6,153 schools, and yet the Commissioners come to this House and ask for public money, with the bold assertion of this paid Commissioner, that the "united" system has been "eminently successful." But what does this mixing of pupils amount to, for it can no longer, I hope, be contended that the mixing after the fashion I have explained means "united" education in any sense of the term? The same Return, that of my Friend the Member for Longford, shows that there were 436 of the so-called "united" schools with 1 of the minority, the meaning of which is that 1 of the minority is on the roll—not attending school, but is on the roll—there are 436 schools in which the minority is represented by 1; there are 416 in which the minority is represented by 2; 312 schools in which it amounts to 3; 216 schools in which it amounts to 4; and in 188 it amounts to 5, thus showing no less than 1,569 of the united schools in which the minority of the rolls were from 1 to 5, which would give an attendance of about between one and two pupils as the daily average. The absurdity, the fatuity of calling this "united" education, or even mixed education, was ably exposed by the Protestant Lord Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Trench) in one of his recent Charges. That divine says very frankly that the people of England are under a great delusion about this so-called mixed or "united" education. He says—

> "But, indeed, mixed education exists already much more in name than in reality, however little this may be recognized in England."

Now, this truth is not yet realized in England, and I will, therefore, read another illustrative passage from this Charge—

> "Step by step the Board have been compelled to modify the system, to give ampler and still ampler scope to the religious convictions of the patrons of schools, or of the great majority of those who attend them; till their schools are more and more becoming denominational schools in fact, though at the same time hampered and embarrassed by inumerable restrictions. . .
> In the county of Antrim there were 285 such schools; but if those were subtracted in which one communion has it so entirely its own way that only 5, or fewer than 5, in many cases only 1, of the other communion attended those schools of mixed education will at once be reduced to 149, nearly one-half. The same process will reduce the 144 of the county of Cavan to 71, more than one-half. But the results are far more remarkable when we leave the northern province. Of course, we must not forget how far more numerous are the Roman Catholics than the members of our communion in the three other provinces—how far more numerous, therefore, we may expect to find them in the schools. Still this fact is quite insufficient to explain the remarkable phenomena which present themselves to us. In the county of Louth there are 24 schools of mixed education. These, under the same process which I have just described, will dwindle to 4. Or take the county of Tipperary. Has the school at Tipperary itself, with 1 Protestant and 256 Roman Catholics; or in the county of Waterford—that at Tallow—with respectively 1 in 200; or at Tramore, with 1 in 458; or that at St. John's Square, city of Limerick, with 1 in 353—any proper right to swell those Returns?"

I will only read a few of the illustrations to be found in the Appendix. In New Glanmire School the numbers are, 1 Protestant on the roll, 94 Catholics; in Clonpriest, 1 Protestant, 97 Catholics; Lysheen, 1 Protestant, 158 Catholics; Cloyne, 1 Protestant, 200 Catholics; Ballygraddy, 1 Protestant, 114 Catholics; Cullen, 1 Protestant, 170 Catholics; Doneraile, 1 Protestant, 414 Catholics. There are 25 schools in which the Protestant element is 1 on the roll; and the total of 72 schools give 210 Protestants on the roll, or an average attendance of 70, divided amongst 72 schools—not equal to 1 in each school each day, while the Catholics on the roll amount to 9,825, or an average daily attendance of 2,375 for the 72 schools. This is the evidence of Dr. Trench on the system, and I venture ask is this a "united" system "eminently successful?" Take an illustration of the working of this system in my own county—Kilkenny. In 1 union in that county, Castlecomer, there were, according to the evidence of Mr. Cross, the Secretary to the Board, 8 schools in that parochial district. In No. 1 there are 279 Catholics and no Protestants; in No. 2 there are 384 Catholics, no Protestants; in No. 3, 36 Catholics, no Protestants; in No. 4, 41; in No. 5, 54; in No. 6, 45, and no Protestants; while in 7 there were 33 Protestants and no Catholics, and in 8 there were 49 Protestants and no Catholics; and yet this is the mockery of the "united" system in 1 Kilkenny parish. Even in the capital of Ulster, where it is said to exist in perfection according to the Commissioners, the inspector of the Board in his official Report for 1865 says the very reverse. Here is the evidence of the man who is in daily contact with the working points of the "united" system. Mr. Dowling, one of the Northern inspectors, reporting on Belfast, says—

> "The absence of mixed education in Belfast, which is generally supposed to be the centre of the principle, is a remarkable fact, and caused me no little surprise when I came to observe it. The fact is that the great mass of the schools possess no mixed attendance, or possess it in so small a degree that they may, considering the mixture of the population, be regarded as exclusively composed of one denomination."

Let me now sum up the results as shown by this official statement. There are but 24,381 Protestant children mixed with the 321,641 Catholics, and but 29,722 Catholics mixed in schools with the 114,726 Protestants in Protestant schools. The whole mixture then amounts to 54,103 out of 910,073 pupils. But, in fact, the only real "united" education is that of the 103 schools which have joint teachers, and there the numbers are remarkable, for instead of the contrast of 321,000 and more to 24,000, the number of Catholics and Protestants in these 103 schools are respectively 13,699 and 13,305. In point of fact, there are but these two latter numbers really under "united" instruction —27,004; and this is the amount of the success of the system. I would now ask permission to refer to the unassisted schools in Ireland. I will first name the Church Education Society, a society deserving the greatest respect as a body. Too much credit cannot be given to the disinterested zeal of its supporters, for the fact that while there are but 1,510 benefices in Ireland, the Church Society maintains 1,498 schools solely by private subscriptions, and without one penny of the Education grant. That Society has no less than 68,856 pupils on its rolls, and of these 47,397 are members of the Church Establishment, while all the members of the Church Establishment who are on the rolls of the National

Board is but 63,338. The Church, then, does nearly as much for its own children as does the State—it does more, for the attendance at its schools is about 50 per cent, while the attendance at the National schools is about 33 per cent, which would give a greater Church pupil attendance at the Church schools in the whole than at the National schools. Then there are the Christian Brothers, who refuse to take aid on the condition of excluding religious teaching. They give instruction to about 50,000 children, and their schools will compare with any in the world for efficiency. The most Rev. Dr. M'Hale, Archbishop of Tuam, has about 15,000 children of the poor at denominational schools in his diocese. The Nuns, who decline the rules of the Board have over 20,000 children in the poor schools, which would give say 85,000 Catholic pupils unaided, and 68,000 at the Church schools unaided, making 153,000 pupils unassisted, because of the existing superstition of statesmen about the "united" myth. These numbers, added to the numbers who are not receiving "united" education under the Board, would give—admitting even for the sake of argument that 29,722 Catholics who are on the rolls of Protestant schools, and the 24,381 Protestants who are on the rolls of the Catholic schools are entitled to rank as pupils receiving "united" education—nearly 1,000,000 children on the one side and 54,103 on the other. Is this myth then to be sustained against true Protestant principles and true Protestant feelings, against genuine Catholic principles and Catholic feelings, against the avowed interests of the 1,000,000 now recipients of separate education, for the imaginary convenience of the 54,000 who have been, for the purpose of the argument, allowed to stand on the muster roll of the mixed system? But I have, I think, shown on the authority of the returns of the Member for Longford, on the authority of the charge of the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Trench, on the figures of the Commissioners themselves, that in 103 schools, only enrolling 27,000 children, is there real "united" education; and this includes the model and public institution schools, and there is no evidence to sustain the assumption that these children and their parents would not, if they could get them, prefer the denominational schools. Why, then, not allow Irish Protestants to have, and give them pecuniary aid to have, Protestant instruction on the condition of their not taking Catholics into their schools? This is what they say they desire, and this they ought to get. Why not leave the Catholic 828,000 children free to receive religious instruction as their parents desire, as their ecclesiastics ask for, on similar conditions that no Protestant children be seduced into their schools? Why not place Ireland on the same footing, as to free education, as England? It may be asked why are the Catholics so sensitive on this point, and so desirous to have denominational education? The story is too long to tell. I will, however, quote from the memoirs of Archbishop Whately, recently published by his daughter, a painful confession which will do much to explain this feeling of the Catholics. The position of Archbishop Whately in connection with the Education Board is matter of history. He was the life and soul of the system; he compiled its books; was the acting Chairman, was the working man of the Board. The Archbishop, when in Oxford as Mr. Whately, was the tutor of Mr. Senior. He became in time Professor of Political Economy, in which he was succeeded by his former pupil. He was then translated to Dublin. Thus related they had close intimacies, few secrets, and the most open and unbounded confidence in each other. When Dr. Whately was head of the "united" system — the non-interfering system—his friend asked how he accounted for the many reported conversions to Protestantism then said to have taken place in Ireland, espectially in the West of Ireland? The following is the confession of the Archbishop as published by his own daughter:—

> "The great instrument of conversion, however, is the diffusion of Scriptural knowledge. For twenty years large extracts from the New Testament have been read in the majority of the National schools far more diligently than that book is read in ordinary Protestant places of education. But these extracts contain so much that is inconsistent with the whole spirit of Romanism that it is difficult to suppose that a person well acquainted with them can be a thorough-going Roman Catholic. The principle upon which that Church is constructed, the duty of uninquiring submission to its authority, renders any doubt fatal. A man who is commanded not to think for himself, if he finds that he cannot avoid doing so, is unavoidably led to question the reasonableness of the command. And when he finds that the Church which claims a right to think for him has preached doctrines, some of which are inconsistent, and others are opposed to what he has read in the Gospels, his trust in its infallibility—the foundation on which the whole system rests—is at an end. Such I believe to be the process by which

the minds of a large portion of the Roman Catholics have been prepared for the reception of Protestant doctrines. The education supplied by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Catholic Church. Two things only are necessary on the part of the Government. One is that it adheres resolutely not only in its measures, but in its appointments in the selection of bishops, as well as in making Parliamentary grants—to the system of mixed education. I believe, as I said the other day, that mixed education is gradully enlightening the minds of the people, and that if we give it up we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Propery. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion. I cannot openly support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight my battle with one hand, and that, my best, tied behind me.

I ask the House to mark the sentiments in the last passage. The great liberal Archbishop was working all the while as the underground agent of a proselytizing policy. His aims were to wean the Irish people from the old faith of their fathers, and he calls on the Government to persevere in the policy—to sustain the "united" system—to prostitute the mitre by conferring it only on advocates of that system —to sustain the public grants, and all to wean the youth of Ireland surreptitiously from the "abuses of Popery." Can you wonder, then, if, with this new revelation of an unexpected treachery in their hands, the Catholic people desire to be freed for ever from this system? Ought you not rather to feel surprised that, after such a gross betrayal, they could ever again give their trust, their affection, their confidence, to any man professing the same faith, lest, perhaps, he, too, should go and do likewise. The hon. Member then moved the reduction of the Vote by £23,515.

Whereupon Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £236,195, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1868, for Public Education in Ireland, under the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland."—(*Sir John Gray.*)

Mr. POWELL said, he could not help regretting the line of argument pursued by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He thought they had had enough of controversy between the two Churches, and enough of antagonism between the two creeds. What was important was to impart such a religious and secular education as might exercise a beneficial and enduring influence in after life. The great difficulty in comparing the system and effects of education in England with those in Ireland arose from the strange discrepancy in numbers between the two Returns. Of the 910,819 children in the Irish schools, the average attendance was only about 300,000, but if a child attended one day in Ireland he was included in the Returns, whereas in England the Return was made on the day when Her Majesty's Inspector visited the schools, and proceeded on quite a different principle, so that of the 1,200,000 returned for the English schools the average daily attendance was something more than 900,000. In both countries they would find that very much the same difficulties existed in the way of education. There were the same complaints of irregular attendance, of the inarticulate reading, and of the unsatisfactory character of the attainments. In England the great mass of the children left school at ten, eleven, or twelve years of age; but, in Ireland, those at school above twelve years of age were no less than 25 per cent of the entire number: those at eleven years, 32 per cent; and those at ten years, 42 per cent. These figures referred to the attendance in the 5857 National schools. There was another circumstance which struck him in comparing the English and Irish systems, and that was the absence in Ireland of local contributions. Another point to which he would call attention was the character of the education given to the teachers in Ireland; and he would ask whether those teachers were so trained as to fit them for the education of peasant children? What was the examination to which they were subjected? Why, they were asked such questions as these:—"Show that endowments for charitable purposes are not really burdens, first, on the tenants of trust estates, and, secondly, on the public." "Compare the results of successful and unsuccessful strikes, and point out which are the more injurious to the workmen engaged in them." "Specify some instances in which workmen may legitimately and usefully combine." Did such questions as those indicate that the teachers are submitted to a process fitting them for the education of peasant children? In Ireland the visits of Inspectors were of a friendly and consultative character, and he should be glad to see the system adopted in England. He feared that these discussions on the religious part of the question withdrew attention from the more important subject of combined secular and religious education; but he hoped that, before long, a system of education would be adopted in the interest of all classes of the people.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, that differing from the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, he thought secular education had had a preponderating share of attention, and that Irish education could never be satisfactorily settled until the supremacy of religion in it was fully recognized. If in any country more than another the religious feeling pervaded the population it was in Ireland. The favourite doctrine of the advocates of mixed schools was that if children of different creeds had secular instruction in common, feelings of frendship and fellowship were produced, which lasted during the whole of their lives. He looked upon this as a perfect delusion. Children had their quarrels and amusements together; but this left no influence on their after-life. To suppose that by being taught together and sent out into the playground together permanent friendships were formed was a childish notion. A National system of education, wherever it had full scope, had resulted in denominational education. At Dundalk Roman Catholics and Protestants were educated separately, the National schools being attended exclusively by Protestants, while the Roman Catholic girls went to convent schools, and the boys to schools managed by the clergy. He had compared notes with Members representing Protestant constituencies in the North of Ireland, and he had found the state of affairs there to be the same. The Mational system had worked itself into a separate system, Protestants going to one school and Roman Catholics to another. It was true that placards were put up implying a distinction between secular and religious education, but this was a mere form. The system pretended to be one thing and was really another. It would be much better to look the difficulties of the matter in the face, and to say that the system of denominational education which had answered so well in England should be extended to Ireland also. If there were reasons in England for denominational education, there were much stronger reasons in regard to Ireland. The proof that the mixed system was not applicable to Ireland was that it had worked itself out. One of the most enthusiastic supporters of the National system was the late Dr. Whately. But when he awoke from his dream he found that the system did not exist, or where it professed to exist it was a very different system from what he had imagined. Dr. Whately was so disappointed that he resigned his place at the Board and gave up the whole thing. In that Dr. Whately was wrong. What he should have done was to have re-considered the whole question, and then he would have found that the reason the system did not work was because it was founded upon a wrong principle. He hoped the Government would no longer uphold the delusion —for it was a delusion — of a mixed system, but would adopt a system in which religion would be the primary, and secular instruction, the secondary element. It remained for the Government to take a manly and decided course, and if they did they would leave the different denominations in Ireland to educate their children on the religious principle. If they did that they would find in the end that, instead of asperities being produced, peace and harmony would be promoted between the different religious persuasions. The Irish people looked to Her Majesty's Government to consult their wishes in this matter. If they did they would confer a benefit upon the people of that country, and at the same time earn their gratitude. He expected such a course of action from Her Majesty's Government because they were not the authors of the mixed system, and could not have the same reluctance as its authors to give it up. There would be, therefore, the less excuse for them if they shrank from this duty. The Irish people likewise expected that the question of the Roman Catholic University would be dealt with, and dealt with in such a way as to place the Roman Catholics of Ireland on a footing of perfect equality with the Protestants.

Mr. POLLARD-URQUHART said, that in one thing he agreed with the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Powell)—namely, in wishing that the means of education might be freely offered to the humblest peasant in Ireland. But that could not be done by attempting to force upon the people a system to which their clergy and themselves were opposed. It might be said that it was only recently that the Roman Catholic clergy had become so hostile to the National system. But great changes had taken place since 1847. In the first place an alteration had been made in one of the clauses which compelled the absence from religious instruction of children of a different denomination. As the clause stood now it only did not compel them to attend. That alteration had made a great difference both in the working of the system and the manner in which it was regarded. After the candid confession of the late Archbishop Whately it was not surprising that it was viewed as a system of proselytism, and if the revelations in the blue books were true it had, indeed, been worked in that way. He asked why did they attempt to force upon Ireland a system so different from that of England, especially as the denominational system was so well suited to the Irish people? Why force upon the Irish people a policy unsuited to them, and deny them that which was suited to them, and which they desired? At this particular period above all it was most important to conciliate the Irish people, and to consult even their prejudices. The Roman Catholic clergy had been the best friends of this country on a recent occasion. It was to them that the Government must look as the main supporters of law and order. Why not, therefore, win their attachment and gratitude by dealing with this question in a spirit of candour and conciliation in regard both to the clergy and people of Ireland?

The O'CONOR DON said, he thought it would be better not to press the Amendment. The existing system had been condemned by both religious parties in Ireland. He had himself on former occasions strenuously opposed this Vote for the model schools; but as the Government had proposed a Commission to inquire into the whole question, it would not be proper to oppose the Vote for the coming year. He could not say that the appointment of a Royal Commission respecting National education in Ireland was necessary, because most of the facts were known, and the question of principle should be decided by the Cabinet rather than by Commissioners. He suggested, however, to the noble Lord (Lord Naas), that the Commission should be appointed as soon as possible, so that it might conclude its labours before the beginning of next Session. The House might then, when the Session began, know the views of Her Majesty's Government. He should like to know what was to be the scope of the Commission. Were they to inquire into National education alone or into Irish education generally? Into the condition of training schools merely or into University education also? Considering the enormous amount of money spent on education in Ireland, he thought more might have been done, even in a secular point of view. Statistics showed that only 41 per cent of the population of Ireland could read or write. When it was remembered that from this must be deducted the education due to private efforts, he did not think that the result of the National system was satisfactory, considering that the system had been in operation now for nearly a generation. It would be well that one subject of inquiry for the Commission should be the low salaries—forming a very inadequete remuneration — of the teachers. Another point to which he would call the noble Lord's attention was the proposal that grants should be made for teaching classics and French to the children of labouring peasants in the National schools in Ireland. He must protest against grants out of the national funds for such a purpose. That would be a gigantic step towards entire State education. The National schools would be turned into little colleges which would destroy all the intermediate schools in the country. The teaching of Latin and Greek to the children of poor parents in the National schools would be much more injurious than serviceable. He hoped that before the Government placed the cost of this system on the Estimates, they would bring the system distinctly before the House, and obtain a clear expression of its opinion as to whether it was judicious and adapted to the circumstances of Ireland.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that he represented the feelings and opinions of the people of this country, who were called upon to contribute to this enormous sum, when he declared this to be the most extravagant and improvident Vote that could be possibly presented to the House. It was admitted by all parties that this system of National education in Ireland had deviated from its original purposes, and that the money had been devoted to purposes wholly different to the intentions of the founders of the scheme. The fact that only 41 per cent of the population of Ireland could read and write, and that emigration was chiefly sustained by those who had received this degree of instruction, seemed to indicate that the Roman Catholic priesthood retarded rather than promoted elementary education, so as to prevent the people reading the Bible and thinking for themselves. He therefore asked that a Commission, if appointed, should inquire into the doctrines taught by the priesthood. The object of the Roman Catholic priesthood was to keep the people in ignorance. They were supporting, in a country which was in a chronic state, a system of education of which they knew nothing. The Romish priesthood used this money to organize sedition and disaffection in Ireland, and he hoped the Royal Commissioners would inquire into the nature of the doctrines taught, and the influence exercised over the people of Ireland by the Roman Catholic priesthood. In the speech delivered by the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland a few nights ago, he did not tell the House what connection there was between the past education of the Irish people, upon which millions of money had been spent, and the present disaffection which existed in Ireland. That he should wish to hear the noble Lord speak of, and he begged to say that if the education of the people was placed in the hands of the Roman Catholic priests, the latter would go so far as to prevent the people receiving any amount of education—even so far as to keep them from learning to write. [" Oh !" *and laughter.*] He thought it was a pity that hon. Gentlemen would not listen to extracts from Roman Catholic authorities to show the sort of teaching the people got at their hands, which created disaffection in the country. He felt it his duty as an Englishman to inform the house on these points. One doctrine taught was to consider the priest a sort of divinity. [" Oh, oh ! "] Yes, a sort of divinity.

The CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member is not confining himself to the subject of the Vote.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he was not going to enter into that question, but merely to touch the fringe of it. He wished to know whether the House would sanction the teaching, for instance, the doctrine of the Confessional? He wanted to show something of the doctrines and teachings which were carried on, and which cost the country over £300,000. In one of the largest churches in Glasgow he had been asked to take the chair at a lecture on the Confessional. The clergyman of the church gave the lecture, and the result was that the doctrine of the Confessional turned out to be the most abominable and horrible that could be conceived. He could not give utterance to what he had heard about it. These were the doctrines and these the teachings that were given daily to the people of Ireland. The teaching of the Confessional was in daily practice, not only in the Romish churches, but in those establishments which imitated them.

The CHAIRMAN: The teaching of the Confessional is not involved in the Vote before the Committee.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he was at a loss to know what was involved in the question if the teaching of the Confessional was not. The money was expended on the teaching of the Church of Rome. What he had to propose to the noble Lord was, that if the Government would take the matter in hand, and inquire whether the doctrines of the Confessional—

Mr. READ said, he rose to Order. The hon. Member had been twice called to Order, and he had charged the Roman Catholic priesthood with organizing sedition. He, as a Protestant, complained of it.

The CHAIRMAN said, he had reminded the hon. Member for Peterborough that his remarks were not pertinent to the Vote under discussion. He believed that what he had said was in harmony with the feelings of the Committee, and he trusted that the hon. Member would not trespass beyond the subject of the debate.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he was at all times anxious to adhere to the rules of the Committee, and to defer to the opinion of the Chairman, but he still believed that he had been acting regularly each time he had been called to Order. If the Government would include in their proposed inquiry the doctrines and practices inculcated by the Romish priesthood on those whose education was intrusted by the Government to their charge the sale and circulation of the pamphlet issued by the Protestant Electoral Union would be at once suppressed. He had attempted to refer to these matters in the hope that the noble Lord would sanction an inquiry, on the part of the Commission about to be appointed, into the doctrines and education imparted to the people by the Roman Catholic priesthood, an inquiry which was all the more necessary, inasmuch as the money which we were expending in that direction was constantly increasing, without there being any corresponding diminution in the disaffection existing among the Irish population.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON said, he

desired to enter his protest against the discussion of so important a subject being taken at that hour, and at so late a period of the Session. It was impossible on such an occasion to follow hon. Members through the mass of misrepresentations and the absurd mis-statements which had been made that evening. He hoped, therefore, that neither the country nor the public would believe they were acquiesced in because they remained for the present uncontradicted. The hon. and learned Baronet who had addressed the House that evening (Sir George Bowyer) had made a mis-statement of this kind, which he was astonished to hear proceed from one of his extensive knowledge and position in the House. The hon. and learned Baronet had said that Archbishop Whately had given up the system because it had failed. Archbishop Whately withdrew his countenance from the schools because he found that, unknown to himself, a new system had been secretly and surreptitiously introduced, and because his complaints did not receive that attention to which they were entitled.

Lord NAAS said, he would not, after the extreme indulgence accorded to him the other evening, have again trespassed on the time of the Committee but for the fact that two or three specific questions had been addressed to him by hon. Gentlemen opposite. Nothing could have afforded a better justification of the conduct of the Government in determining to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole subject of the primary education in Ireland than the course which the discussion had taken that evening, for Member after Member had risen and called attention to what they regarded as faults and defects in the system. In dealing with so important a subject, no Government would be prepared to take upon themselves the responsibility of recommending any serious change, without at the same time laying before the House and the country in detail the opinions of those persons whose position and knowledge best qualified them to form a judgment upon the matter. He thought that a system like this, which had been in operation for so many years, and which had created so great an interest both in Ireland and in this country, ought not to be altered or even touched by the House or by the Government without full and adequate inquiry. He believed the course they had taken would prove to the country that the alleged defects of the system had been greatly exaggerated. It would show what a great work of usefulness the system had performed, while it would, at the same time, afford an opportunity to the real friends of education in Ireland to propose such alterations as would, without interfering with its usefulness, make the system harmonize more with the feelings and wishes of the majority of the Irish people. That was the sole object which the Government had contemplated in the proposals they had made to the House. He believed that if the Commission were fairly constituted, as the Government hoped to be able to constitute it, they would be able to lay the opinions of that Commission before the House at the commencement of next Session. It would then be the duty of the Government and of the House to consider this great question of national education in Ireland. Many hon. Members opposite had lost sight of the great work which this system had performed. For thirty years it had had to struggle with many difficulties. Notwithstanding these difficulties, they had by its means been able to offer to every child in Ireland a sound secular education—an offer which, in the case of an enormous majority, had been accepted. It had thus placed at the command of the children and of their parents the means of learning all that was necessary for persons in their class of life. That great object the National system in Ireland had attained. Therefore, in advocating changes, and suggestings alterations, they ought to be very careful, and to clearly see their way, to setting up something better, before pulling down what already existed. The Commission about to be appointed would be no hostile Commission for the purpose of overthrowing the existing system; but the purpose would be to make that system more efficient for the great object in view. The inquiry of the Commission would be confined to one subject—namely, the condition of primary education in Ireland as respected all classes and creeds, and the schools of all denominations. It was proposed not to limit the investigation to National schools, but also to inquire what success had attended unassisted schools. The House would then be in possession of all the information on the subject. He hoped that all persons feeling an interest in this question, and able to throw any light upon it, would deem it their duty to offer themselves as witnesses before the Commission.

MR. WHALLEY said, he wished to ask whether evidence would be taken as to the nature of the education in Roman Catholic schools?

LORD NAAS said, that evidence would be taken on the subject of primary education, no matter by whom that education might be given.

SIR JOHN GRAY said, he thanked the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland for the promise to appoint an impartial Commission. After the statement of the noble Lord he would withdraw his Motion, though he did not consider that the case he had made out against the so-called mixed system of education had been answered.

MR. WHALLEY said, he wished the noble Lord to explain what he meant by primary education?

LORD NAAS: It is the instruction of the poor in all matters necessary for their education.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(4.) £730, Commissioners of Education in Ireland *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) (No. 2) BILL.—[BILL 285.]

(Mr. Dodson, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. O'BEIRNE said, that in the remarks he was about to offer he desired to disclaim any intention of embarrassing either the right hon. Baronet or his Government, or to throw censure either on the present or the late Administration. No one in that House entertained a higher esteem for the distinguished General at the head of the department — General Sir John Burgoyne. He desired to treat a great national question in a broad and national spirit, and as the policy which was to be adopted for the defence of our naval arsenals and dockyards was decided some seven years since, after two nights of hotly contested debate, he had no wish to speak against that policy. But, Parliament having decided to erect fixed or shore fortifications, having voted an enormous sum of money for that purpose, and having entrusted to the proper authorities the disposition of that Vote, did so with the full conviction that the amount to be expended would be applied in the best possible manner; that the structures to be raised as a result of that expenditure should be second to none; and that at least, for an immense outlay, England should be protected by a system of defences equal certainly to those of any other nation, and pronounced to be the best, so far as modern science could form any opinion. It was to that simple question that he desired to invite the consideration of the House. If he was correct in his views, and if he had well appreciated the state of facts, a large proportion of the amount expended, if not the entire, had been uselessly so expended. The fortifications in course of erection were worthless as a means of defence. The systems adopted were not only not the best known, but they had proved to be worthless, if any reliance was to be placed upon experiments; and unless they held their hands and reconsidered what they were doing they would have invested the entire sum voted for the purpose of defence in structures which would tumble about their ears at the first attack from heavy guns. It appeared by the Bill that in March last, the end of the financial year, that of the entire sum voted, upwards of £6,000,000, more than 75 per cent, or £4,000,000, had been applied, leaving something like £2,500,000 to be still provided. Of this latter sum the Secretary of War now asked £800,000 for the year to end in March next. He would endeavour to describe, in popular language, the nature of the forts which were being erected, and the errors which, he believed, existed in the plans upon which those forts are to be built. He would confine himself to two of three classes of structures which had been decided upon. The first might be called the iron batteries, the second the stone batteries. There were to be three iron batteries — one at the Plymouth breakwater; two at Portsmouth, on the "Horse Sand" and "No Man's Land." There were to be some sixteen or seventeen of the stone batteries, but a description of one would be sufficient for his purpose. The iron batteries were to be erected upon a basement of granite, 14 feet thick, in which basement were to be the shell-rooms, living-rooms, &c. On this basement, which was to be 16 feet high above high-water mark, is to be placed the iron fortification, and on the top of the iron fortification were to be two moveable turrets; both the iron battery and the turrets were to mount heavy guns. Thus the face of this battery exposed to shot consists first of granite, 14 feet thick and 16 feet high, then a wall of iron, which wall of iron is to be 15 inches thick. The question, therefore, arose, what would be the effect of a well directed fire from heavy guns upon a face of granite 14 feet thick, and what effect would the same fire produce upon the iron battery which would be standing upon and supported by that granite? The battery was to be built upon what in the scientific world was called the "laminated" principle, and he hoped the House would be so good as to bear that name in their memory, as much of his argument would turn upon it. They were of granite base, with laminated iron superstructure. What evidence had they that granite would resist shot? The only experiments that ever had been tried to his knowledge had most distinctly and conclusively proved that stone could not resist heavy guns. On the contrary, in 1859, the common 68-pounder knocked solid granite of 15 and 18 feet thick to atoms after a few shots, even when covered on the outside with iron plating; and, although the shots did not penetrate the plates, the shock was so great that the stone went to pieces, and when the plates were removed a few rounds carried away the whole structure. There was nothing more clearly proved, and he would add more generally admitted, than that stone was perfectly worthless as a means of defence; and yet, with this knowledge in their minds, the authorities had determined to build stone basements for those iron forts, and to place the forts and guns and turrets upon them. Once attacked as he had endeavoured to describe he maintained that the whole of those structures must tumble to the ground. Let them see now what the iron could do in point of defences. It would have much greater power to resist than the stone, but, being dependent on the stone for its support, its own power could avail but little. But he also objected to the plan upon which the iron walls had been made. They were, as he had stated, upon the laminated principle. Now, this very principle had been condemned in unqualified terms by the two distinguished officers, General Lefroy and his colleague Captain Noble, to whose scientific care the entire of the experiments made at Shoeburyness since 1859 had been committed, and who in their Report, dated last year, distinctly stated that the laminated principle was much weaker than solid iron. They say solid iron of two-third the thickness was better than iron on the laminated plan, or, in other words, 4 inches solid was stronger than 6 inches laminated. Why, then, should the opinion of those officers be disregarded and a principle condemned by them be followed? He thought he had shown that the three main fortifications at Portsmouth and Plymouth were not built upon plans that would bear the test of the experiments. The principles adopted for the base and the superstructure were both wrong, and, as he contended, they would be found useless as a means of defence. He would now say a word as to the second class of forts, which were all built of granite, without any iron forts, but armed with iron shields let into the granite to cover the ports through which the guns were to be worked. But whatever was the strength of those shields, he was satisfied that the fortifications into which they were to be fitted being of granite, and granite having been proved to be useless as a material for the purpose of defensive works, those shields could not be held to improve or render impregnable a building so constructed; and that, after the experiments in November, 1865, which were adopted simply to test the stone forts and shield principle, and which proved beyond doubt that the principle was entirely useless, the Defence Committee unanimously declared against this plan, and stated it to be their opinion that a fort of granite fitted with shields would be untenable after thirty shots, and should be abandoned. He had now stated, as concisely as he could, the grounds upon which he rested his opinion that the great undertakings into which they had embarked should not be further prosecuted until they were better informed as to what they were doing. If he were correct in the conclusion he drew from the blue books, they were egregiously wrong in their principle of construction, and if that be so, was it not better and wiser to pause before plunging deeper into error? He had now discharged what he believed to be his duty. He had endeavoured to show that a grievous error had been committed. There was not one member of the Fortification Department to whom it was not perfectly well known that iron forts were beyond all question the best. With all the undoubted advantages there could be but one motive for adopting any other material than iron, and that was the desire to economize. He was no advocate for a lavish and ill-considered expenditure; on the other hand, he strongly deprecated an unwise and ill-directed economy, and he felt thoroughly convinced that if the right hon. Baronet persisted in building our new defences upon the plans now adopted, he would have proved to the country the sad effects of an economy, which he (Mr. O'Beirne) had shown to be unwise and ill-directed. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient to proceed further with the construction of the Fortifications for the defence of the Dockyards and Naval Arsenals of the United Kingdom until a Select Committee shall have reported upon the plans upon which such works are being erected," —(*Mr. O'Beirne,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Lord ELCHO said, he was about to move an Amendment to the Motion of his hon. Friend.

Mr. SPEAKER said, that it was not competent for anyone to move an Amendment to the Amendment of the hon. Member, unless the latter Amendment should have been first adopted by the House.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, that he should have no objection to withdraw his Amendment in order to allow of the noble Lord's Motion being substituted for it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Lord ELCHO said, it was not his intention to trouble the House with any lengthened remarks at so late an hour. He had reason, however, to believe that the system of fortification by means of iron shields had been determined upon without sufficient experiments being made, and therefore he begged leave to move an Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient to proceed further with the construction of the Fortifications for the defence of the Dockyards and Naval Arsenals of the United Kingdom until the strength and sufficiency of the proposed Fortifications and Iron Shields has been tested by actual experiment, by submitting them to the fire of the most powerful known guns,"—(*Lord Elcho,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. SAMUDA said, he was of opinion that iron plates of a total thickness of 15 inches would be sufficient to resist the attacks of modern ordnance. The principle in respect of the application of iron sheathing, was superior to that adopted in the case of the Russian fortifications.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he thought the mixture of iron and stone sufficiently strong to resist fire from ships, and that was the purpose for which they were designed. They were not designed to resist the fire of land batteries. He was acting on the best advice he could obtain, and was bound to regard the consideration of expense. He saw no reason for changing the present plan and adopting one which would incur an additional expenditure of more than £1,000,000, besides the loss which might arise from suspending the contract. He, however, had no objection to any experiments being tried which might relate to the construction of future works. Without any disrespect to the hon. Member for Cashel (Mr. O'Beirne), he was compelled to say that he was not justified in acting in accordance with his unsupported opinion in defiance of the Report of the Committee authorized to advise him.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. HUNT said, that a communication was going on between th Treasury and the War Office on the subject of the accounts of fortifications. Probably the Accountant General of the War Office would be called on to render an account under certain heads. As soon as the matter was settled, it would be embodied in a Minute which would be prepared, he hoped, in time to lay upon the table before the prorogation of Parliament.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow,* at Twelve of the clock.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Order for Committee read.

Account No. 46 of the Finance Accounts [presented 28th June] *referred* to the Committee.

Ways and Means *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. *Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, there be issued and applied to the Service of the year ending the 31st day of March 1868, the sum of £1,475,177 18*s*., being the Surplus of Ways and Means granted for the Service of preceding years.

2. *Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the sum of £19,106,591 2*s*., be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow*, at Twelve of the clock.

House adjourned at a quarter after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, August 10, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee* —*Resolutions* [August 9] *reported.*

Ways and Means — *Resolutions* [August 9] *reported.*

Public Bills—*Ordered*—Consolidated Fund Appropriation*; Courts of Referees.*

First Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Courts of Referees * [311].

Second Reading—Agricultural Gangs* [310].

Committee—Naval Knights of Windsor [300].

Report—Naval Knights of Windsor [300].

Third Reading—Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses) (No. 2) [285]; Naval Knights of Windsor [300], and *passed.*

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

SUPPLY—REPORT.

Resolutions [August 9] *reported.*

PARLIAMENT SQUARE—STATUE OF MR. CANNING.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE rose to call attention to the proposed removal of Canning's statue from its present position, and to the general arrangements of Parliament Square. He did not wish to protract the Saturday's Sitting for more than a few minutes on a point which certainly deserved the attention of the House, inasmuch as it concerned the arrangement of the ground before and around the building in which they were assembled. If an understanding were not now arrived at, they might come back next Session, and find the harm already done. He wished in particular to call attention to the rumour that the statue of the late Mr. Canning was to be again removed. He spoke on this subject with much reserve, as it was one of peculiar delicacy on account of the family feelings which were involved in it. The question which they had to consider was, as the lawyers said, *de bene esse*, and he would only deal with its artistic phase as one element in the final settlement. He was glad to find from what had the other night fallen from his noble Friend the First Commissioner of Works that his bias was in favour of keeping the statue on the site which it at present occupied. What the noble Lord had said was in perfect accordance with an able and convincing letter from Mr. Barry, the architect of the Houses of Parliament, which appeared the other day in *The Times*. The argument dwelt on in that letter, as well as by the First Commissioner of Works, had special reference to the peculiar appropriateness of having something like a background to the statue. He thought the statue placed in a most admirable position. In its former place it was backed by a grove, and thus the rear of it, which was not, artistically, very remarkable, and which had been so graphically described by his noble Friend, was hidden from view. That grove had been since swept away, so that were the statue to be brought back to its former site it would no longer enjoy that advantage, besides which there was great danger that it would crush down the railway arch on which it would have to stand. The same disadvantage would attend its removal to the centre of what was now called Parliament Square, which the noble Lord darkly hinted might probably be its final resting-place, besides the destruction of the admirable works which were now being carried out there. If the House would recall the condition of the neighbourhood at the time of the original erection of the statue, it would realize that at that time it would have been impossible to have thrown it back 100 feet. To the rear there was a large mass of squalid houses, and the Westminster improvements were in a very inchoate condition. Since then, however, those wretched buildings had been removed, and that magnificent thoroughfare, Victoria Street, opened as an approach to the Abbey from the north-west. Victoria Street itself debouched upon what was perhaps the most picturesquely architectural square to be found in any city in Europe. There stood around it the Abbey, Mr. Scott's new houses, the Westminster Palace Hotel, Mr. Barry's chambers, the hospital, and Mr. Scott's noble column to the memory of the Westminster men who fell in the Crimea, which was a very beautiful picture in itself. Each portion of this picture pieced in with the Houses of Parliament, and in the aggregate constituted a really beautiful picture. The taking down of the block of buildings between Parliament Street and King Street was a mere matter of time and estimate; but when it was done it would add still more to the grandeur and magnificence of the scene. It would, too, bring the statue into bolder relief, as seen by those proceeding down Victoria Street and Great George Street. There was, also, on the same ground with it, a fountain of an ornate and costly character, the munificent gift of the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Surrey, whom they were so glad to see among them again the other day. In placing it where it was Mr. Barry had taken advantage of his opportunity of offering a specimen of an art, of which London, unfortunately, contained too few specimens, that of architectural gardening. The architect ought always to be the designer of the subsidiary adornments, which enhance while they accompany his constructions.. The foreigner understood this principle as the Englishman did not, and hence the notable beauty of foreign cities. In the present instance, Mr. Barry was carrying out a very felicitous and dignified conception in what was hereafter to be known as Parliament Square, with the two symmetrical plots, the fountains and the central alley, flanked by its avenue of statues and comfortable seats. The fountains and the flower-beds had, he believed, not been accepted by the First Commissioner, but he hoped they would be. The only objection he had heard to the fountains, that they would be small, must have come from the American whose idea on seeing Vesuvius was, that in Niagara, his country had a water power sufficient to put it out, while all that the flower beds wanted was a beadle to keep off the little boys, and a gardener to look after them. To remove the statue back to its former site would destroy the fine perspective effect between the Crimean Column Square and Parliament Square. It would be a positive cruelty to art to interfere with that square and central alley, which, as he had said, was a first specimen of town gardening of which London hitherto possessed so little. Whether the fountains should be added was a matter of detail. Let Canning's statue be kept where it was. There would still be area enough for the statues of Peel and Palmerston, each of whom deserved, and ought to obtain, his own conspicuous place He hoped the noble Lord (Lord John Manners) would give them some public assurance that the integrity of the garden at Parliament Square would be preserved, and that Canning's statue would not be removed from its present position.

COLONEL WILSON PATTEN said, he wished to make a single observation in consequence of the allusion which had been made to the feelings of the family in connection with the removal of Mr. Canning's statue. Those feelings, no doubt, should be held almost sacred; but it so happened that he had the honour of being associated with the late Lord Canning, Lord Aberdeen, and Sir James Graham in considering a site for the statue of Sir Robert Peel, and a proposal was discussed which, if carried out, would render it necessary to remove Mr. Canning's statue. Lord Canning thought there was a disinclination to remove it, out of respect to the feelings of the family; and, when the Committee was over, Lord Canning stated to his right hon. Friend the Member for Oxford (Mr. Cardwell) and himself that he wished it to be clearly understood that he had no objection whatever to the removal of the statue; and he hoped the Committee would act as they thought proper in regard to both statues without considering any matter of private feeling. It did not occur to him to make any observation on this subject when reference was first made to the feelings of Mr. Canning's family; but his noble Friend the First Commissioner (Lord John Manners) thought it desirable the circumstance he had related should be known; and his right hon. Friend the Member for Oxford entirely bore out his recollection.

LORD ELCHO said, he hoped the statement of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster would be satisfactory to his noble Friend opposite, and those who, from personal feelings, were disinclined to sanction the removal of the statue from its original site. He thought the statue had gained greatly by removal. Its effect was infinitely better when placed at the end of the vista, than when close upon the

Houses of Parliament and the street where it formerly stood. The only thing objectionable to his eye was that the statue had been placed square to the road, but not to the vista. The open space might be advantageously adorned with flowers and statues, as suggested by the hon. Member (Mr. Beresford Hope). Looking at Trafalgar Square, he doubted whether the proposed fountains would be an advantage; but, of course, everything would depend upon the design. He did not think there would be room for more than three statues in Parliament Square; but on the model in the Library there were five or six.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, he thought it would be an improvement to remove St. Margaret's Church, which spoiled the view of the Abbey. He believed that the difficulty which stood in the way of such a measure was that of finding another site for that church. It appeared to him that an eligible site could easily be procured upon the vacant ground in the neighbourhood.

Mr. LOCKE said, he had understood that if St. Margaret's Church were to be taken down, its site was not to be built upon, but to be made use of for the purpose of improving the roadway. In his opinion, the effect of the statue of Canning had been greatly improved by its being removed to its new site, because, in coming down Parliament Street, a front, instead of a side, view of it was obtained. In its former position, he had never thought it to be a fine statue; but he had been greatly surprised to see how well it looked in its present situation. He hoped that the piece of ground opposite to the statue would be well laid out, as it was a very fine site, and the opportunity should not be thrown away of effecting a great improvement in this part of the metropolis.

Mr. HENLEY said, it was hardly fair at a Twelve o'clock Sitting on Saturday—which was intended only for the despatch of necessary business—to attempt to obtain a Parliamentary, or rather a quasi-Parliamentary, opinion upon a matter of this kind.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE said, that the subject was upon the Paper for discussion.

Mr. HENLEY said, he was aware of that fact, but thought it was absurd to suppose that hon. Members would come down to that House on Saturday to discuss such a matter. He was not surprised at the statement of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Colonel Wilson Patten), because it was in keeping with the whole life of the late Lord Canning, who never allowed any personal considerations of his own to be an impediment to what he considered a public improvement. It was difficult for any person to form an opinion with reference to the projected plan for laying out the ground opposite the statue until the proposed improvements had been completed. It appeared to him that the ground had been cut up into two small portions for the purpose of forming an alley in order to let the statue be seen. Most people could not see the statue at all in coming to the House, and it was generally dark—or rather it ought to be dark—when they were leaving it, and, consequently, they would never see the statue at all. Some people believed that the statue had been put out of the way, and that there was an end of it. He confessed, not being what was called a man of taste, that where 100 persons coming down from Parliament Street to the House could see it formerly, not one could see it now.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, that, in justice to the hon. Member for Stoke, he must explain that this question had been put on the Paper for discussion yesterday, and had been postponed until to-day, at the especial request of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to facilitate the despatch of public business. He hoped that this subject would not, at the present period of the Session, lead to a difference of opinion between the two Houses of Parliament, as, from what he had heard the other day, in "another place," he was afraid that the opinion generally entertained there was just the reverse of that which appeared to be entertained in this House. There were two questions involved in this matter—one of taste and another of sentiment. He trusted he might be excused if he gave no positive or definite opinion as to what should be the future permanent position of the statue. He had already expressed his own opinion that, as far as taste went, the present position was decidedly superior to the old one. An objection had been made that the statue, being made of bronze, required sunlight to show it off to the best advantage, and that it was completely shaded where it now stood. All he could say in reply to that statement was, that that morning, when he came down to the House, he saw the statue standing in a full blaze of sunshine. He hoped that, as the improvements went on in Parliament Square and the neighbourhood, they would assume a more favourable appearance. Whether St. Margaret's Church would be removed or not he was not in a condition to say; but, undoubtedly, if the block of buildings between Parliament Street and King Street were removed, as he confidently trusted they would be, there would be a magnificent view of Westminster Abbey from Whitehall, and then it was highly probable the question of the removal of the church might be entertained; and as the Embankment Commissioners in 1863 had recommended that a portion of the site to be obtained by the Act, which had just become law, to the west of the Victoria Tower should be built upon, he thought that would be a convenient position for it; but that was a matter which could not assume any definite proportions for some years to come. He would undertake that nothing should be done to prejudice the question of the ultimate destination of the statue until next Session, remembering, at the same time, that the predominant feeling of the House of Commons was in favour of retaining it on its present site.

Mr. GREGORY said, he entirely agreed with the noble Lord that, as a matter of taste, nothing could be better than the effect of the statue on its present site; still he was glad to hear that the arrangements that had been made with respect to it were only to be regarded as provisional, so that at some future time the matter might be fully considered and the feelings of those who had survived that great man consulted on the subject. He wished to ask the Secretary for the Treasury, whether the Government were prepared to accede to an application which had been made for the sum of £320, to enable such steps to be taken as would render it possible to properly exhibit the pictures in the Royal Irish Academy to the public? With respect to the auxiliary museum to be established by the authorities of the Kensington Museum at Bethnal Green, he observed that if those authorities were allowed to transfer the overflowings and sweepings of Kensington to other parts of the country, there would be no check upon their extravagance, while there would be such a clamour at the Treasury for grants for local museums in different towns that it would be impossible to resist it. Every county town in England and Ireland would put in a claim for a grant, and certainly he should absolutely insist upon one for Galway.

Colonel SYKES referred to the fact that, though the Fortification Bill had stood as the first Order on the Paper of business for yesterday evening, Supply was proceeded with instead in the meeting of the House for the Evening Sitting. He had come down to support the Motion of the hon. Member for Cashel (Mr. O'Beirne) in reference to the Fortification Bill, but, owing to the change in the Business Paper, that measure did not come on for consideration until after twelve o'clock. By that arrangement he was prevented making some observations upon the important subject of fortifications, but he would revive the subject next Session. He was opposed to the enormous outlay of £10,000,000 upon fortifications, except as regarded those which were necessary for the defence of our arsenals. With respect to auxiliary museums, he observed that such institutions existed in almost every town in France, being supported partly by the State and partly by the local authorities. The effect of these institutions in improving the public taste accounted for the superiority of the French over the English in matters of art.

Mr. HUNT said, he was surprised that so experienced a Member as the hon. and gallant Gentleman who last spoke was not aware of the Standing Order that, as long as the Committee of Supply was open, Supply should stand as the first Order on Friday. There was a special Morning Sitting yesterday for Supply, and, as all the Votes were not passed in the Morning Sitting, Supply still continued open, and was consequently fixed as the first Order for the Evening Sitting. No irregularity had therefore been committed. In reply to the question regarding the Irish Academy, he stated that an application had been made on behalf of that institution for a small sum of money, and the Treasury consented to give a grant amounting, he believed, to £200.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, in reference to the point raised by the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Sykes), that when the Sitting of the House was divided into two, he conceived that the Notices given for one of the Sittings did not apply to the other, and he concurred in the observation of the hon. Member for Galway that if the Kensington Museum were to be allowed to send collections to some towns, demands would soon come from other places for collections to be sent to them. The course taken by the Government had the effect of stifling discussion on the question of fortifications, which ought to have been taken first at the Evening Sitting. He also observed that he could not acept an inexperienced official like the Secretary to the Treasury, who only by a lucky fluke in the wheel of fortune had found himself thrust into an important political position, as an authority upon the regulations of the House. He should therefore like to have some explanation from the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the explanation which has been given entirely satisfactory; it is a matter of such extreme simplicity that anybody who looked at the Paper could not make a mistake. Supply was fixed for the Morning Sitting. It was uncertain whether Supply would be closed at the Morning Sitting; therefore it was impossible to put down Supply in two places for the same day; and Supply was only fixed for the Morning Sitting. I hold in my hand the Paper printed for the evening, and the hon. Member, if he looks at it, will find that Supply is at the head of it.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH: Then that must have been printed in the interval between the two sittings.

Mr. SPEAKER: How is it possible that you can print anything for the Evening Sitting until the Morning Sitting is concluded? If Supply had been concluded at the Morning Sitting, some other arrangement would have been made for the Evening Sitting. Supply was not concluded, and if the hon. Member will do me the favour to look at the Paper he will find that Supply stands, as I have stated, at the head of the list for the evening.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH: I beg respectfully to submit, as I have always understood, that as private Members could not give a Notice between the Morning and Evening Sitting, it was not competent for the Government to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was no notice of any individual Member; it was an Order of the House, Supply not being concluded, that it should stand at the head of the list for the Evening Sitting.

FORTIFICATIONS (PROVISION FOR EXPENSES) (No. 2) BILL—[Bill 285.]

(*Mr. Dodson, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Colonel SYKES said, he must enter his annual protest against the extravagant expenditure of the taxes of the country under this Bill. If the hon. Member for Cashel (Mr. O'Beirne) did not repeat his Motion next Session, for a Committee to re-consider this question, he should do so.

Lord ELCHO observed that what he had proposed was not to oppose the fortifications, but that an actual experiment should be made to test their strength and sufficiency, and till that was done they should not be proceeded with. He had withdrawn his Amendment to that effect, on the Secretary of State for War undertaking that the experiment should be made.

Sir JOHN HAY observed, that in the interval the works would not be stopped; but it might, he thought, be assumed that if the experiment was against the efficiency of the fortifications they would not be proceeded with.

Lord ELCHO said, he wished it put on record to this effect—that a complete section be made, full size, of Devonport Breakwater, giving one embrasure, granite base, concrete roof, with two supporting pillars, girders, brickwork, granite, &c., as per drawing, signed by Colonel Jervois, January 19, 1867, and issued to contractors—that this section should be submitted to the following tests:—Six shots of Palliser's projectiles from the 9-inch rifled gun; six shots of Palliser's projectiles from the 600-pounder rifled gun; both guns to be placed at 600 yards. He thought no other test would be satisfactory, and he hoped the Secretary of State for War would see that it was carried out.

NAVAL KNIGHTS OF WINDSOR BILL

(*Lords*)—[Bill 300.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN pointed

to the injustice of compelling all the knights to attend the service of the Church of England, the knights being appointed from old officers who may be of any religious persuasion, and moved the following clause:—

> "After the passing of this Act it shall not be obligatory on any Naval Knight of Windsor not being a member of the Established Church of England and Ireland, to attend Divine service in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, daily or at all."

Colonel NORTH expressed his great gratification at finding that Her Majesty had extended to Roman Catholic gentlemen in the army and navy the privileges attached to the Knights of Windsor. It appeared by the statutes which emanated from the Crown relating to those appointments that the knights were exposed to the inconvenience of being obliged to attend the Church service daily, or suffer certain fines in consequence. Whilst supporting the principle contained in the clause moved by the hon. Baronet, he nevertheless thought that it would be much better to leave this concession to be made by Her Majesty herself than to seek to effect the remedy by the introduction of the clause in the Bill. There were, however, many other grievances of which those officers had to complain. Considering that their average was seventy-five years, and that some of those officers had reached eighty-four or eighty-five years, it was hard to expect them, whatever religion they might profess, to attend the services of the Church daily, such services lasting about two hours. There were, however, certain special days on which he supposed there would be no objection on the part of those officers to attend the Church. [Sir Colman O'Loghlen: Hear, hear!] He thought from the interest which Her Majesty had always taken in the comforts and convenience of those gentlemen, that she would feel disposed, if their case were properly submitted to her by the Government, to give her sanction to the exemption sought for for them. But another hardship to which those officers were subjected was the heavy fees they were compelled to pay upon their appointment as Knights of Windsor, and for other matters incidental to their office. An officer was obliged to pay a fine of £5 5*s.* 4*d.* upon his appointment on the lower foundation. There were thirteen knights on the Royal foundation receiving £100 a year, but those on the lower grade received only £35 17*s.* 7*d.* Now, he (Colonel North) thought it too bad that officers receiving such small allowances should be obliged to pay £5 5*s.* in the first instance, and the same sum on removal from the Lower to the Royal Ward. He did not, however, think that the House of Commons was the proper place to obtain a remedy for those grievances, but hoped that the Government would submit the case of those officers to Her Majesty, who, he had no doubt, would be graciously pleased to relieve them from the obligations imposed on them in respect to the attendance at the Church service and this unnecessary taxation. He must repeat the expression of his delight at the fact of these appointments being opened to Roman Catholics, for who had ever known a Roman Catholic soldier to halt at the deadly breach or to shrink from any of the dangers of the battle-field.

Mr. LABOUCHERE thought that, independently of Dissenters and Roman Catholics, who, as Knights of Windsor, were required to attend Divine service in St. George's Chapel, some of the knights, who were Church of England men, had not the slightest wish to go to church every day, and there could not be any necessity for calling on them to do so.

General DUNNE suggested, that the matter should be submitted to Her Majesty by the Government, and he had no doubt that the grievances complained of would be immediately remedied by our gracious Sovereign. It was formerly the practice to exact fines for non-attendance at chapel, but a stricter rule was now enforced, and attendance was absolutely required. There were many aged gentlemen who, even from their limited means, would rather pay the fines than be obliged to attend church daily.

Sir JOHN HAY: Mr. Dodson, I earnestly hope that my hon. and learned Friend will not insist upon inserting the Amendment of which he has just given notice. I deprecate its insertion because the clause which he proposes is much more important than the Bill to which he desires to add it. The Bill is merely for the purpose of enabling the Admiralty to fill a few vacancies now existing in the Naval Knights of Windsor. The present regulations oblige us to select only from lieutenants who are bachelors and who are of blameless lives. Now, the fact is that though there are plenty of lieutenants of blameless life, there are very few who are of sufficient standing, and who are also bachelors. The object of this measure is to enable us also to include those lieutenants who have received the rank of retired commander in the list of those from whom we may select; and, also, that widowers may receive the same consolation as bachelors. I concur with what has fallen from my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Oxfordshire in thinking that if any change is necessary, the relief should be sought in a modification of the Statutes of the Order, and not in the Act of Parliament. The duties which these gentlemen are called on to fulfil could never be objected to by them on occasions of State ceremonial to whatever communion they might belong. The duties are common both to them and the Military Knights of Windsor, and thinking, as I do, that it is a fair subject for consideration, whether any relief may be given to these officers, I trust my hon. Friend will not press the adoption of this clause.

Sir COLMAN O'LOGHLEN withdrew the clause, stating that unless the obnoxious regulation, against which it was directed, was abolished, he would again call the attention of the House to the subject next Session.

Clause *withdrawn.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND APPROPRIATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Dodson, Bill to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means to the Service of the year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Hunt.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time.

COURTS OF REFEREES BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Dodson, Bill to enable the Courts of Referees to administer Oaths and award Costs in certain cases, in the same manner as Committees on Private Bills, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Dodson, Colonel Wilson Patten, and Mr. Woodd.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 311.]

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock, till Monday.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, August 12, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2)* (330).

Second Reading—Army Reserve (320); Militia Reserve (314); Expiring Laws Continuance* (321); Public Works (Ireland)* (315).

Committee—Factory Acts Extension* (296); Courts of Law Fees, &c.* (286); Railways (Ireland)* (316); Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* (289); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. (307).

Report—Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act (1865) Amendment* (247); Factory Acts Extension* (296); Courts of Law Fees, &c.* (286); Admiralty Court (Ireland)* (326); Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal* (312); Sewage* (328); Railways (Ireland)* (316); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. (307 & 332).

Third Reading—Canongate Annuity Tax (Edinburgh)* (264); Poor Law Board, &c.* (303); Banns of Matrimony (311); Guarantee of Government Officers* (327); Public Health (Scotland)* (306).

Royal Assent—Patriotic Fund [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 98]; Customs Duties (Isle of Man) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 86]; Inclosure (No. 2) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 71]; Public Records (Ireland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 70]; Vice President of the Board of Trade [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 72]; Christ Church (Oxford) Ordinances [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 76]; Offices and Oaths [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 75]; Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 73]; Trades Union Commission Act (1867) Extension [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 74]; Wexford Grand Jury [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 77]; Tyne Pilotage Act (1865) Amendment [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 78]; Prorogation of Parliament [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 81]; Railways (Scotland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 80]; Dundee Provisional Orders Confirmation [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 79]; Vaccination [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 84]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 83]; Morro Velho Marriages [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 93]; Galashiels Jurisdiction [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 85]; Weights and Measures (Dublin) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 94]; Dublin Metropolitan Police [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 95]; Court of Chancery (Officers) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 87]; Trusts (Scotland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 97]; Recovery of Certain Debts (Scotland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 96]; Militia Pay [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 92]; Indemnity [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 88]; Bank Post Bills (Ireland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 89]; Customs Revenue [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 82]; Inland Revenue [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 90]; Dominica Loan [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 91]; Sir John Port's Charity [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 99].

NEW FOREST.

PETITIONS PRESENTED.

Viscount EVERSLEY *presented* seven Petitions from the owners and occupiers of land in the New Forest for inquiry into the Operation of the Deer Removal Act, and praying that, pending inquiry, further enclosure may be arrested, and said, that an Act was passed in the reign of William III., empowering the Crown to enclose 6,000 acres of the Forest for the purpose of planting, it being provided that whenever it might appear to the Lords of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the trees on the land thus enclosed had attained such a growth as not to be liable to be injured by the admission of cattle to graze upon it it might be what is termed "thrown out," and other portions of the Forest enclosed in lieu of it. In 1851, however, another Act was passed, called the Deer Removal Act, which empowered the Crown to take in 10,000 acres more for planting purposes—making, with, the 6,000 he had just mentioned, 16,000 acres. Now, from a Return which had been laid before the House he found that the number of acres enclosed was 8,000, and the number proposed to be enclosed upwards of 7,000, making in all nearly 16,000 acres; but if to these 16,000 acres the whole of the enclosures "thrown out" were added it would be found that in reality 20,000 acres had been enclosed by the Crown to the injury of the commoners, who had rights of pasturage for their cattle. It was assumed by everybody, when the Bill was under discussion, that the rights of the commoners would be held sacred, and that they would not be infringed in the way in which they had been by the enclosures being left in such a state that it was impossible for them to enjoy their common rights. All he asked was that the matter should be inquired into during the winter, and that the planting should not be extended over 16,000 acres. It might be well, he might add, that a Committee should, next Session, be granted to investigate the subject.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM replied that as far as he had been able to ascertain the enclosures had been "thrown out" as soon as the timber in them was sufficiently grown to be safe from the injury which might be done to them by cattle, and the real question was whether the land so "thrown out" was made available for pasturage by persons having common rights in the Forest. It was, he admitted, perfectly right that the commoners should be satisfied that the powers of the Crown under the Deer Removal Act should be fairly exercised, and not in any way stretched to their prejudice. That was a question which might be fairly looked into; and the course proposed to be taken by the First Commissioner of Works was that during the winter a Report should be called for as to the exact state of the Forest and the portions of it which had been "thrown out" since the Deer Removal Act was passed. That Report would be laid before Parliament, and then it would be open to the noble Viscount to take any further steps in the matter which he might deem fit.

THE EARL OF MALMESBURY said, that in the course of years, if the causes to which the noble Viscount had referred continued in operation, the rights of the commoners in the New Forest would be all but extinguished. What his noble Friend proposed to do, however, would go far to remove the feeling which existed on the part of the commoners in this matter. It was very desirable that some arrangement should be made both for the inrests of the Crown and of the commoners.

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH said, the enclosure of the New Forest was carried out in a reckless manner, and the commoners had no opportunity of representing their case or of remonstrating against these proceedings. The first notice of them they had was by seeing the fences erected. What he would urge on his noble Friend was that, at all events, for this year, and until the Report had been made, the Commissioners should hold their hands, and not continue enclosing in the manner they had been doing. The commoners' rights were becoming of less and less value every year, not through any fault of their own, but from the action of the authorities of the Crown. He was not, however, surprised at what had occurred. It was only what he had anticipated when the Deer Removal Act was brought in.

Petition to lie on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM—REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE BILL—(No. 318.)—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS TO LORDS' AMENDMENTS CONSIDERED.

Commons' Amendments to Lords' Amendments, and Commons' Reasons for disagreeing from some of the Amendments made by the Lords, *considered*, (according to Order).

THE EARL OF DERBY: My Lords, in rising to call your Lordships' attention to the state in which the Bill for the Amendment of the Representation of the People has come to us from the other House of Parliament, I take it for granted that it would be the general feeling of your Lordships that, except in some case of extreme necessity—except on the introduction of some clause so objectionable as to justify the extreme resistance of your Lordships—it would not be desirable that you should run any risk of the rejection, at the present time and under present circumstances, of the Bill, which has occupied the attention of the House of Commons and the serious and anxious attention of the country for five months, and the rejection of which would necessarily lead to great, and I may say not unreasonable, agitation throughout the country during the recess, and would not only render unavailing all the labour and all the pains which the House of Commons have bestowed on the subject, but would for the next Session of Parliament almost monopolize, as it has done during the present Session, the attention of this House, to the exclusion of many measures which it would be most desirable to pass. I shall, therefore, pass over without notice all the minor Amendments and alterations which the House of Commons propose to make. And among these minor alterations, I trust I shall not be considered as depreciating the University to which I have the honour to belong, or the post which I have the honour of holding in that University, if I include the Amendment which your Lordships introduced, and which proposed to give to resident members of Colleges and Halls of Oxford and Cambridge, the right of voting under the lodger franchise. That clause has been rejected by the House of Commons; but I do not conceive that this is a point upon which your Lordships would desire to be at issue with the other House; I shall therefore confine the observations I have to offer to your Lordships to three points only. These are the main Amendments which have been introduced by your Lordships, to one of which the House of Commons has assented; and from the others of which it has disagreed. In the first instance, I will refer to that moved by my noble and learned Friend (Lord Cairns) who is not now in the House, and whom I rather envy at this moment, as he is inhaling the breezes of Scotland, instead of attending here. The object of this Amendment was to provide that voters in "three-cornered constituencies" should have two votes only. That Amendment was adopted by the almost unanimous vote of your Lordships' House, and in deference to your Lordships' judgment, the House of Commons and Her Majesty's Government thought it their duty to accede to that Amendment, and that clause stands part of the Bill. It might, therefore, appear unnecessary to say a word on the subject; but I am anxious that as far as regards my personal opinion I should not be liable to any misunderstanding on this question. I am not favourable to the principle of three-cornered constituencies. They are a novelty unheard of in this country until the passing of the Reform Act of 1832, and they are novelties which I do not think, on the whole, have acted very advantageously. But if it were desirable in any case to give effect to the representation of minorities—of which I say nothing, and which I think is, in principle, to say the least of it, a very doubtful question—but if, in the opinion of your Lordships' House, it is desirable to give effect in certain cases to the representation of minorities, then I agree that in no case could you apply that principle better than in the case of the three-cornered constituencies, or in that of the City of London, which is represented by four Members. And it does so happen that the experiment—for such it is—may be tried very fairly and very impartially in the present state of the case, where the seats are divided—where there are eight counties which return three Members, and where there are—by the measure adopted by the House of Commons, although not originally introduced by the Government, and to which they gave a not very willing assent—four large towns which will return three Members each. With regard to the counties it does so happen that there are only three out of the eight if the Bill passes — [Earl STANHOPE: Only seven.] I mean eight if the present Bill passes—and out of these eight counties there are only three in which even under the present system, without any introduction of the representation of minorities, the same object is not attained which would be attained by the introduction of this Amendment. There are Berkshire, Bucks, and Oxfordshire that return three Members of one and the same political opinions. With regard to all the others there are two on one side and one on the other; which would probably be the result in every case.

I do not object, therefore, to trying the experiment on this limited scale; but I should entertain the very strongest objection to the extension of this principle of three-cornered constituencies for the purpose of introducing that other principle of the representation of minorities. I think it would lead to very great inconvenience. It may be very well tried on a limited scale; but I should have the very strongest objection to its general extension to the constituencies of the country. It is unnecessary to pursue this subject — that Amendment of your Lordships has been accepted by the House of Commons, and it is likely very shortly to become the law of the land. There are two other Amendments with which, to my great regret, the House of Commons have disagreed. One Amendment was that introduced by the noble Marquess on the cross-Benches (the Marquess of Salisbury), who proposed that there should be a right of voting by polling-papers. The other is Clause 5, by which the qualification for the leasehold and copyhold franchise was reduced from £10 to £5. Now, my Lords, it has been said that our Amendment was for the purpose of raising the franchise from £5 to £10. But that was not quite a legitimate way of putting the question, because our Amendment was to resist the reduction from £10 to £5 — the franchise having been deliberately fixed by the Reform Act of 1832 at £10. In rejecting this Amendment, the House of Commons have thought fit to state their Reasons, and, in looking over those Reasons, I confess I was very forcibly struck by the advice given to a gentleman about to act as a Judge, "Give your judgment by all means; but do not give your reasons." More inconclusive Reasons, I think, for a great and important change in the franchise were never given than those sent up from the other House. I may be permitted, I hope, to examine the grounds upon which the clause is recommended—for the *onus probandi* in this case does not rest with us—who propose to retain the qualification which has existed for thirty-five years—but the *onus probandi* is on those who seek to reduce the franchise. Let me look at the Reasons assigned by the House of Commons for dissenting from your Lordships. They begin by saying, first—

> "Because all the franchises conferred by the Reform Act 2 *Will.* IV., c. 45, with the exception of those given to copyholders and leaseholders have been reduced."

It is literally true, as stated; but the fact is that there has been no reduction of any qualification except the occupation franchise. The freehold franchise has not been reduced, it is quite true; but the freehold qualification was not conferred by the Act of 1832; and therefore it is not putting it fairly to say that every other franchise conferred by the Act of 1832 has been reduced except those of the leaseholders and copyholders. I must observe this—that in the Act of 1832 Parliament deliberately placed restrictions even upon the freehold franchise; because the noble Earl (Earl Russell) very well recollects that although the Houses of Parliament did not see fit to interfere with the 40*s.* freeholds in fee, yet they did introduce a modification deliberately that any freehold occupation qualification, except under certain circumstances, should not be enjoyed under £10. This placed freeholders for life and copyholders and leaseholders for a term of sixty years originally granted on precisely the same footing. But they made another alteration; because they seemed to consider at that time that you were to take the length of possession in a sort of inverse ratio to the amount of the qualification, and consequently they provided that a leaseholder for twenty years originally should require a value of £50, and not £10. And that is the law up to the present time, and, singular to say, it will continue to be the law when this Bill is passed; for although the House of Commons proposes to reduce the £10 down to £5 for leaseholders for lives and leases for terms of sixty years, they have made no reduction in the amount originally granted for leases for twenty years, and under the Amendment of the House of Commons that still remains at £50, at which it was originally fixed. I presume that the franchise introduced in the present Bill will be regulated and controlled by the provisions of the Act of 1832. That Act, as the noble Earl very well knows, provided that under the head of leaseholders should not be included the holders of sub-leases, unless the property was in actual occupation of the persons holding the sub-leases. I presume that, as the Reform Act did not in any case repeal that prohibition in reference to sub-leases of property not being in actual occupation, that prohibition still continues. Then it is said—

> "Because persons possessed of freehold property of the clear annual value of 40*s.* are entitled to the franchise—

therefore copyholders and leaseholders to the amount of £5 should be entitled. And certainly a more astounding discovery was never made than that given in the third Reason of the House of Commons—namely, that—

> "Copyhold property and property let on leases of long duration are, from the security of title and the facility of the means of transfer, in some respects preferable to freehold property, and present a like character of solid and substantial interest."

I myself have had something to do with long leases. A part of my property is let on leases for seventy-five years, a part for ninety-nine years, and a part for 999 years. Yet, I never ascertained that a person would give me as much for a lease of seventy-five, or even for ninety-nine, or even for 999 years, as he would for a freehold. Although it may appear extraordinary, it is a fact that there is an appreciable difference between the price of a freehold and a lease of ever so long a period—even for 999 years. It does not amount to more than a quarter per cent; but there is this difference, and a lease of 999 years is not an equivalent to a freehold. But in the face of this the House of Commons desire you to believe that a lease that has not more than a few years to run, or is dependent on the life of a man of eighty, is in point of security of title and facility of the means of transfer and in point of value and stability, equal to a freehold in fee simple. I do not know what reason the House of Commons has for making such a statement; but I can only say that my experience and that of your Lordships and the common sense of the country are quite contrary to the declaration of the House of Commons, and therefore strike out at once the Reason they assign for £5 leaseholders and copyholders voting. Although they rest their arguments on the possession of the franchise by the 40*s.* freeholder, it must be remembered that that qualification existed prior to 1832, and that Parliament, while then leaving it unaltered, deliberately required as a correlative and corresponding interest the value of £10 for a leasehold, however long the term. To say, therefore, that because the 40*s.* freeholder has a right to vote, therefore the copyhold and leasehold qualification should be reduced to £5 is tantamount to saying that in 1832 Parliament took a line which is not to be justified. The Commons go on to say—

> "Because persons possessed of copyhold and leasehold property of the clear annual value of £5 are persons well qualified to have a voice in the election of Members of Parliament."

Now really, my Lords, that is begging the whole question. The question is whether they are so qualified or not, and it becomes those who say they are qualified to show the character and condition of the persons who will obtain the vote under a £5 leasehold qualification. I do not say they are not qualified, but the *onus probandi* obviously rests on those who insist on admitting them to the franchise. Now, who are these £5 leaseholders? In the represented boroughs they will consist of the class who are leaseholders of unimproved plots of land, without any dwelling-house or building upon them raising them to the value of £10 a year. Those who have leaseholds above £5 value and under £10 will have the right to vote; whereas those who, under precisely similar conditions, have leases of the value of £10 and upwards will be debarred the right of voting because the property qualifies them or some other persons who occupy it to a vote for the borough. There will consequently be this anomaly—the man who has a wretched property in a borough, unimproved and unbuilt upon, will have a vote for the county, while the man who has built upon his property and improved it to the value of £10 will have no vote for the county. The last Reason which the Commons give on this point is this—

> "Because, inasmuch as the provisions of the Bill tend on the one hand to increase largely the voters by the occupation franchise in counties, and on the other hand to diminish the voters by proprietary interest, it is expedient that by all fit methods the number of such last-mentioned voters should be increased."

Your Lordships will observe the great interest which the House of Commons take in the increase of proprietary interests as distinct from the occupation franchise; and I may be permitted to say that while, in this House, we have heard from the Liberal side nothing but declarations that we are lowering the franchise to a ruinous and dangerous extent, the moment we introduce anything which is to be a restriction on that franchise—which noble Lords opposite think too extensive—our Amendment is rejected by the other House, which insists on the lower franchise in opposition to the moderate alteration proposed by the Government. Now, the Commons state that "the provisions of the Bill tend on the one hand to increase largely the voters,"—I suppose the number of voters is meant "by the occupation franchise;" but I do not see in what way they tend to "diminish the voters by proprietary interest." I apprehend the only possible way in which that can arise is from the reduction in the amount of the borough franchise, and, consequently, from the conferring upon a certain number of occupiers below the value of £10 the right to vote for the boroughs instead of the vote for the counties which they at present possess, inasmuch as their occupation does not confer upon them a right to vote for the borough. That is the only way in which I can imagine any diminution in the number of voters proprietary or otherwise. Now, my Lords, do you really suppose that these £5 leaseholders, with, perhaps, only one or two years to run, or dependent upon the single life of a very aged man, really represent a stable proprietary interest? Do you really put them forward as representing the interests of property in contradistinction to the franchises arising under occupation or in any other way? If the House of Commons is so anxious to increase the rights of property as against the occupation franchise, I want to know why they struck out those franchises which were dependent upon property—namely, the possession of so much money for a certain period in a savings bank, and the payment of a certain amount of direct taxation, both of which were the direct representation of property, and forced upon the Government the lodger franchise, which is a direct occupation franchise, irrespective of property? So much for the Reason of the House of Commons; but I think it should be no light cause which should induce your Lordships to disagree with the Commons upon a point which, though of not inconsiderable, is at the same time not of paramount, importance. As far as I am able to ascertain, although in Staffordshire. Cheshire, and probably in part of my own county—Lancashire, there may be a considerable number introduced by a £5 leasehold qualification, in most of the other counties the number will be very insignificant, and will not exercise any material influence in an election. I cannot say that I have much respect for the Reasons which the Commons have assigned, but I think there is one Reason which the Commons have not assigned, yet which will probably have more weight with your Lordships than those which they have assigned, and that is, that, in the first instance, this clause was introduced into the House of Commons and carried without any division, and that, in the next place, your Lordships' Amendment was rejected by a majority of no less than 47 in, for the time of year, an extraordinarily large House. I cannot flatter myself that if your Lordships should insist on your Amendment, and should again send down the clause to the House of Commons, there would be the slightest prospect of the House of Commons altering their view of the matter, and then the only thing left would be the form of a Conference between the two Houses, from which I do not think any advantage would arise; for it is—from all the instances I have seen—one of the most useless and unmeaning things I know of. I have been told, but I confess I can hardly believe it, that the objection entertained by the House of Commons to a Conference is that the Lords who take part in it sit with cocked hats, while the Members of the House of Commons stand bareheaded. I could as readily believe that one of your Lordships holding the title of Baron would refuse to dine at a friend's house because a Duke or a Marquess would have the right of walking out of the room before him. I am unwilling to believe that so childish a motive could have actuated the House of Commons. I believe their object was to inform your Lordships as early as possible of the objections they entertain, and of the strong feeling which, as manifested by the division, exists against your Amendment. The only other point of any importance is that to which I have before referred — the measure proposed by my noble Friend (the Marquess of Salisbury), and with respect to which I must say that upon that subject I entirely concur with him. I think the introduction of voting papers, as was admitted by the noble Earl the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (the Earl of Kimberley), would facilitate the exercise of the right of voting by a very large number of persons who are now excluded from it, and that in counties especially it would greatly diminish the expenses of elections. But the apprehension is that they would tend to increase bribery and corruption; and the House of Commons appear to have thought that the machinery introduced—and certainly only introduced at the latest moment, on the Motion of my noble Friend—would be insufficient to obviate the evils and dangers of the system. I must, however, call your Lordships' attention to the fact that though this clause should be excluded from the Bill—and it does not introduce anything in itself objectionable—on the contrary I believe the clause would have been a very valuable adjunct to the Bill; but it is not indispensable, and is only accessory to it—its omission does not prejudice the operation of the remaining portions of the measure, and the proposal is one which may again and again be brought under the consideration of Parliament. Indeed, so sure am I of the justice and wisdom of it that I am satisfied time will work its way, and that ultimately we shall see that very advantageous proposal carried into effect. I do not think, therefore, it would be wise on the part of my noble Friend to ask your Lordships to insist on the Amendment. My noble Friend will, of course, reserve to himself the right of raising the question at any future period, and I am sanguine enough to hope that further reflection and consideration will satisfy the House of Commons and the country that with proper precautions—the necessity of which I do not deny—this principle may be introduced with the greatest possible advantage to the country and to the great increase of the number of persons practically admitted to the franchise, as well as to the prevention—certainly not to the increase—of modes of corruption practised at the present moment; and unquestionably to the prevention of practices which deter people from voting by violence and intimidation. When my noble Friend proposed the Amendment I stated my entire approval of it, and I added that I thought it was desirable that the House Commons should have an opportunity of re-considering their former decision. Now, on the first occasion the majority against the proposal in the House of Commons was 38, and on the second, although the Government, with a view of disarming opposition, were willing to apply the plan to counties only, the majority so far from being diminished, was raised to 52, and that in a House, including pairs — those Members, by-the-by, voted without having heard the arguments—of more than 600 Members. It would be quite impossible, therefore, to expect the House of Commons to reverse its decision. These, my Lords, are the views I humbly submit to your Lordships. Satisfied with the important concession in one respect made to your Lordships' feelings and opinions, I think you should not run the risk of endangering so important a measure as the present, which has absorbed so much of the time of Parliament, and has so deeply interested the whole country. I cannot say that the Bill is such altogether as I should have wished to see it, yet I accept it as tending to settle a great and paramountly important question. For these reasons I beg to move that your Lordships do not insist on the Amendments to which the Commons have disagreed. It may be proper to add that since I came into the House I have been informed that one or two technical Amendments will be required to be made in certain clauses to which Schedules have been attached. The House of Commons have objected to the Schedules, but have not made any material alterations in the corresponding clauses. I apprehend that no difficulty will be found in introducing the requisite Amendments.

Moved, "To agree to the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords."—(*The Earl of Derby.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, that the proposal for the introduction of voting papers was a most important one, and had been carried by an immense majority in their Lordships' House; and he was very little satisfied with the manner in which it had been received by the House of Commons. He found that the only Reason for disagreeing with their Lordships was given in these words:—

> "Because it is not desirable to depart from the law and usage of this realm, hitherto established, which require that all voters for counties and boroughs shall appear personally at a fixed time and place in order to record their votes."

But if that were the only Reason which could be alleged he would like to know how their Lordships could have been expected to entertain the Bill itself, the whole of which was a complete alteration of every regulation and law of voting which existed at present. He was not satisfied, he confessed, with the way in which the question had been brought forward in the House of Commons. What was done, he supposed, was intended as a compromise, but it was a compromise which appeared to him to have sacrificed a very large point for a very small one. The present state of the law with respect to voting prevented a large number of persons from exercising the franchise. At the very last election very nearly half the electors were unable to come to the poll. Now, that was a very serious matter; but it had been entirely overlooked by the House of Commons. This was one of the subjects which deserved the very serious consideration of their Lordships, and, as had been well said by the noble Earl (the Earl of Derby), might be brought before them again as a separate measure in a future Session. The regulations under which the voting papers were proposed to be used might have been altered and no doubt improved, but he must say that in the debates in their Lordships' House no one had ventured to oppose the principle that persons should have the security of the proposed mode of recording their votes. The case was very different in the other House of Parliament, and he could have wished that the Reasons for disagreeing with their Lordships had been given more in detail. Notwithstanding the decision arrived at by the other House, he was not at all inclined to alter the strong opinion he entertained on the subject, and he could not help thinking that the House of Commons in this instance had preferred that the franchise should be exercised under a system of rotten eggs, brickbats, and other such means, to one that would have secured the exercise of the right of voting in a satisfactory manner.

EARL STANHOPE: My Lords, the Motion which my noble Friend at the head of the Government has made this evening is one in which I am prepared to concur, though I must admit that it is with some feeling of disappointment and regret. Like my noble Friend himself, I attach great importance to the use of voting papers. I think that in the boroughs they would facilitate the means of recording votes and tend to check mob intimidation, and in the counties to prevent the inordinate expenses that are at present incurred. As to the boroughs, it can surely need no argument to show how often men of timid temperament or enfeebled health may be deterred from recording their votes by the riots which frequently take place. But there is another argument which I think has not been used in these debates, and which seems to me of great force in this direction —it is the tendency of voting papers to prevent the riot itself. For what is the use of a riot if it be not to prevent electors from coming to the poll to record their votes for what may be called the unpopular candidate? Well, then, if the rioters, or their instigators, are made to understand that the riot will not be effectual, and that the vote may be recorded in another form, you take away the inducement to the riot. Then, as to the diminution of the expense of county candidature, surely it is a great grievance that in many cases persons well entitled to represent a county by birth, by property, by intelligence, and by the affection of their neighbours, are prevented, to all practical purposes by the enormous sums which are required, from carrying on a county contest. Observe, too, that this is an evil which must be expected to increase in proportion as the number of voters themselves increase. Therefore, my Lords, on both these grounds I am decidedly in favour of the adoption of voting papers. I do not wish that the scheme should, just now, be carried any further than was proposed by my noble Friend on the cross-Benches (the Marquess of Salisbury); but if it had received the approval of the other House of Parliament, if it had become law, if it had been tried in practice, and if, as I believe it would, it had received on trial the approval of the country, then I should look forward to the time when by a subsequent enactment voting papers should be made not only permissive but obligatory—that voting in counties, at least, should be carried on by voting papers only. In this manner you would get rid of four-fifths of the expenses of county elections — of the expenses for travelling, of the expenses for agents at the booths, and of other sources of expense which I will not stop to enumerate. It is, no doubt, highly advantageous that the candidate should have the opportunity of publicly and personally declaring his views to his constituents—with that the institution of voting papers would not interfere; and though I wish to guard myself from being understood to wish that this extension of the scheme should be adopted at present, I certainly do hope that we may see the time when, public opinion being ripe for it, county elections may be carried on by means of voting papers. I must acknowledge that the reasons given by my noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) against insisting on this Amendment are conclusive. The increasing majority in the House of Commons against the proposal makes it hopeless to expect that our engaging in any further controversy with them would bring them round to our view. On this Amendment, therefore, I am prepared, as my noble Friend has advised, to give way. I confess I should not have been prepared to give way if the Commons had thought fit to disagree with what the Prime Minister has referred to as the almost unanimous decision of your Lordships, I mean the restriction of the right of voting to two Members in the cases of constituencies returning three. That is a most important principle, it was sanctioned by the highest authorities in this House, by the noble Earl whom I see opposite (Earl Russell), and whose opinion upon the question of Reform—and indeed upon any other question—must always be heard with the highest respect. It was sanctioned by many of the noble Earl's Colleagues in the late Government, and by many of the Peers on the opposite Benches. If the Commons had thought fit to disagree with your Lordships on this question, I should have felt that it was the duty of your Lordships to try, at least, a Conference before the question was settled. My noble Friend (the Earl of Derby) alluded to the repugnance which some Members of the House of Commons are supposed to feel to a Conference on the ground of some difference of rank or etiquette, the Members of our House wearing their hats, while the Commons are uncovered. I agree with my noble Friend that we cannot suppose such a motive to weigh with men of so much sound sense and judgment; but if such an objection should weigh in any quarter, I cannot conceive it possible that any of your Lordships would for a moment refuse your assent to a Motion enabling Members of both Houses to meet on perfectly equal terms. If your Lordships agree to the Motion of my noble Friend, and do not insist on your Amendments, the last obstacle is removed which would have prevented the passing of this Bill, and within a few days the Bill will become the law of the land. I acknowledge that ever since the introduction of this Bill I have felt considerable doubt and misgiving as to its probable results. At the commencement of this Session I thought that a measure of a more moderate scope, and with a limit in the amount of the borough franchise, would have been satisfactory to the country, and would have commanded a majority in this and in the other House of Parliament. In passing I may observe that it is surely idle to say you renounce "the hard and fast line" when you still retain one in counties. Now, however, that this measure is becoming law I do not desire to join in any gloomy forebodings with respect to it, and I wish, as far as I am able, to look forward to it hopefully and cheerfully. I think that we who may have had these gloomy feelings are bound to do as much as possible to falsify our own forebodings. It must be our endeavour to secure as far as possible the good working of this measure; and without paying any exaggerated compliment, or indeed any compliment at all, to that large labouring or artizan class which is henceforth to have so vast a share in the affairs of this country, we may express our earnest hope that they will show themselves worthy, in all respects, of the great trust that is about to be conferred upon them. Above all I hope that those who may have felt doubts and misgivings about the working of the measure will not, when it comes into operation, cease to take an active part in political affairs. I trust that we shall not take the course that is said to have been pursued in the United States, where, under the operation of a franchise not dissimilar to that now introduced, we find men of education, intelligence, and property—nay, whole classes, refrain from taking part in the administration of affairs, and even from recording their votes. I trust that no class in this country will be inclined to take that course. Without in any degree denying our prepossessions against the measure, it will be our duty to combine as far as we can to secure its prosperous working. On the other hand, if this expectation should not be fulfilled—if attacks should be made upon any part of the Constitution which we most highly value—if, for instances, the Established Church, or the rights of the Crown, or the succession to landed property by primogeniture should come to be assailed, I also trust that we shall be found ready to combine without distinction of parties for the purpose of securing the institutions which we have hitherto enjoyed, and under which this country has been so prosperous and so renowned.

THE EARL OF CLANCARTY: My Lords, not having attended the discussions upon the details of the Bill when in Committee, I feel some hesitation in rising to express dissent from the recommendation of the noble Earl at the head of the Government, that your Lordships should concede to the requirement of the House of Commons, that the clauses relative to voting papers should be expunged from the Bill. They form, in fact, the only check provided by the Bill against the inconveniences that must arise from the proposed very extensive and democratic increase of the constituency. The noble Earl, indeed, so warmly commended the use of voting papers, and so ably exposed the weakness of the objection to them, as well as the unsound reasoning of the House of Commons against your Lordships' Amendments regarding the qualification of leasehold and copyhold tenants, that I was, I confess, very much surprised at his recommendation that the House should, nevertheless, yield its own opinion upon both points. The country, I considered, was greatly indebted to the noble Earl and his Colleagues, and especially to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for the triumphant success with which, in the face of a large and very hostile party, the main principle of the Bill, the extension of the elective franchise to its legitimate limit, was established, with the consent of both Houses of Parliament; but this achievement, though subsequently accompanied with an important provision for the representation of large minorities, will, I apprehend, be of very little value to the country without such security as the use of voting papers would have afforded for the free and peaceable exercise of the elective franchise. So far from being a boon to the community, the extended franchise will, in the absence of protection for its free enjoyment, only aggravate the evils—the rioting, intimidation, the acts of violence and outrage—that so commonly disgrace our contested elections, and will operate practically to disfranchise not alone the old and infirm, but the many respectable voters who may decline incurring the personal risk of attending the poll to record votes henceforth of comparatively little value. Your Lordships are, and I hope will long be, looked up to as the guardians of the Constitution and liberties of the country; but you will scarcely deserve that title if, in assenting to a change so extensive and democratic as that proposed in the Bill, you do not provide, as far as possible, for the free and secure enjoyment, both of existing rights and of those you would confer. The privilege to the voter of transmitting his votes by paper to the returning officer is an experiment already partially tried, and found to work well. It was the only security offered in the Bill for the peaceable exercise of the franchise; and you are now called upon by the House of Commons to surrender it; and why? Because, they say, it would afford facilities for bribery and undue influences; but in what manner it does not appear, nor is it conceivable, unless upon the supposition that the magistrate, whose signature should be endorsed as a certificate of its genuineness upon the voting paper to be transmitted to the returning officer, should lend himself to be the agent of bribery. But have the Commons done anything to put down bribery and corruption, or to check the exercise of undue influences upon voters presenting themselves personally at the poll? How many boroughs have they had, under the existing system of voting, to disfranchise on account of the prevalence of corruption? In how many has it appeared, as in Sodom of old, that "ten righteous" men could not be found? And what provision have they made to carry out their own resolution of last Session, "that no Act to amend the Representation of the People could ever be satisfactory which did not amend the law relating to Bribery and Corruption?" The Bill contains no provision whatever for the purpose; but your Lordships may perhaps think that your declining to expunge the voting paper clauses would cause the loss of the Bill, and that the disagreement between the two Houses would necessitate a dissolution of Parliament. Such might undoubtedly be the case; but a new Parliament would then take up the subject of Reform, with the advantage of the principles, upon which it should be based, having been already established, and a Bill very similar to the present, but with improvements, including, probably, the necessary provisions for the use of voting papers, would readily be passed; or, if the use of voting papers should be still objected to, would then, of course, acquiesce in what must be accepted as the deliberate expression of public opinion upon the question; but my belief is that, whatever desire there exists in the country for an extended franchise, there is an equal desire for the free and peaceable exercise of it. I therefore regret that the Government should have advised your Lordships to yield your own judgment in the matter to that of the House of Commons.

The Earl of HARROWBY said, he did not rise to ask their Lordships to dissent from the conclusions of the noble Earl at the head of the Government. The question of the franchises of copyholders and of leaseholders was not of sufficient practical importance to warrant delay in the settlement of the question; and important as he thought the principle involved in the question of voting papers, he admitted that there were considerable practical difficulties which made it natural that the other House should form an opinion different from that of their Lordships. At the same time, he hoped the principle would be further considered, and with an earnest desire to admit, if possible, large numbers to exercise the franchise freely, who were now prevented, and would be, by the difficulties and obstructions of personal voting. He could not, however, but congratulate their Lordships upon the success of one Amendment involving a principle of the highest importance, and upon the fact that, in the House of Commons, a successful resistance had been offered to those who were determined that no opinions should be represented, but those of a tyrannical majority. The large towns were made what they were by the capital and enterprize of the wealthier classes, and it was rather hard that when those towns got additional representation, those who furnished that capital should be practically denied the expression of their views. The principle was one which he hoped would be further expanded. It was a great thing to extract, even from Radical quarters in the House of Commons, the admission of the right of minorities to be represented. He knew that the noble Earl the Prime Minister was not favourable to the principle, and yet, apparently, he had no objection to a minority governing, for that was his own case, and that surely was a greater novelty than any that was involved in the representation of minorities in three-cornered constituencies. Indeed, in the history of the country there was not to be found a previous instance of a Government holding its position without commanding a majority in the lower House. He believed the present position of things was unexampled. The result was we had government without power, and power without responsibility—a position more novel and dangerous than the principle of the representation of minorities. One result of the Government being in a minority in the House of Commons was that the House of Lords was reduced to a mere registration court, and could not review independently what was done by the other House. Its Leaders having already capitulated with superior numbers in the House of Commons, were precluded from subsequently calling in the Conservative influence of the House of Lords to alter the terms. In a thousand ways it was fraught with the highest danger, in a constitutional point of view, that a minority in the House of Commons should be responsible for the government of the country. It was a situation which, in the interests of the country, ought not to be permitted to continue.

Earl RUSSELL: I do not wish to detain your Lordships any length of time. The noble Earl at the head of the Government has proposed that we should acquiesce in the Amendments made by the House of Commons. It is fair to say that I not only concur in the conclusion to which the noble Earl has come, but that I also entirely concur in the course taken by the other House. I believe that they have dissented only from objectionable Amendments made by your Lordships, and they have accepted the useful Amendments which your Lordships have made. The noble Earl opposite criticized the Reasons given by the House of Commons; but I must say, without concurring in every one of them, that they are sufficient to warrant our acting upon them. The Commons disagree with the omission of Clause 5—

> "Because persons possessed of copyhold and leasehold property of the clear annual value of £5 are persons well qualified to have a voice in the election of Members of Parliament."

I entirely concur with that statement. The noble Earl says that nothing is adduced to prove it. I do not know that he has taken pains to prove the qualifications of others who become differently entitled to the franchise. The matter is rather one of opinion than one for mathematical and statistical proof. Again, the Commons disagree to the voting paper clauses—

> "Because the use of voting papers at elections for counties and boroughs, in the manner proposed by the Lords' Amendments, would facilitate undue influence and other corrupt practices at such elections."

I entirely concur with that Reason. I believe that with voting papers, introduced in the manner proposed, a person who had a large amount of land in a county would have been able to have gone round with a partizan justice of the peace, to have got voting papers signed at the houses of his tenants, and thus to have got votes sent through the post expressing opinions the reverse of those held by the voter. Therefore is it that I entirely concur with the House of Commons in rejecting the proposal for voting papers, and I think it is a great blessing we have escaped this Amendment of your Lordships. I trust that the House of Commons will act in a similar way with any proposition for voting papers in any future Bill. There seems to be a great deal of alarm as to riotous conduct at elections. I have been at a great many elections since the Reform Act, and have been rather delighted to attend them, for I do not remember any one case of riotous proceedings. I have seen a great crowd of persons, but never any riotous proceeding. I have also been told when I have made inquiries that the polling-booths have been almost empty, and that those in attendance have had a very dull time of it. With regard to this Bill generally it is too late to enter into any discussion of its provisions; and all that remains to be done now is to facilitate as much as possible the working of it. I only trust that the people who have been now intrusted with the franchise will do their duty honestly, and use their powers well, and that Members of both Houses will do all they can to make it work beneficially.

The Marquess of WESTMEATH said, that the noble Earl (Earl Russell) might not have seen any violence at English elections, but the noble Earl had considerable property in Ireland, and if he would take occasion to visit it at election times he would be soon undeceived as to elections passing over without violent and riotous proceedings. There was not only violence at the election, but men of straw were sent into Parliament, and their votes told for as much as those of the responsible Members for the Ridings of Yorkshire. He thought it impossible to listen to the noble Earl without getting up to testify to the abominable violence that occurred at some Irish elections. Did their Lordships imagine that men would enlist into Her Majesty's forces if they expected to be pelted with stones and mutilated? They still, however, enlist; and if they were pelted all the thanks they got from their commanding officer was that they had behaved admirably under difficult circumstances. If Parliament did its duty it would enact that the first stone thrown at Her Majesty's troops when doing their duty should be considered practically as a reading of the Riot Act. As to voting papers, he was on Saturday in the company of a gentleman who had a qualification in thirteen places, and he wanted to know, as he could not go to the poll at every one of these places, whether he ought to be disfranchised, as he would be to a certain extent, by the rejection of the voting paper clause?

On Question *agreed to.*

Then it was *moved* not to insist upon the Amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed as far as Page 29; on Question, *agreed to.*

Then it was *moved* to insist upon the Amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed in Page 29, Line 20, and Page 31, Line 21; on Question, *Resolved* in the *Affirmative;* and a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords insisting on the said Amendments: The Committee to meet *forthwith.*

BANNS OF MATRIMONY BILL—(No. 311.)

(The Lord Houghton.)

THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Lord HOUGHTON said, the Bill which he had the honour of introducing was not, as this was, a mere Indemnity Bill, but a Bill to fix a disputed point of law in the sense which it had been acted upon in the custom of the country for upwards of 100 years. But the Bill which he introduced had been totally altered; and this Bill, if passed, would be altogether contrary to the Act of Uniformity, inasmuch as it would permit any clergyman to publish banns of matrimony either after the Second Lesson or after the Nicene Creed at Morning Service. It would enable a large body of clergymen to defy and break the law according to any fancy they might adopt of what it was. The Bill which he introduced was in accordance with the whole common sense of the country; but, unfortunately, a right rev. Prelate (the Bishop of Oxford), who possessed the art of persuasion, had induced the Government to adopt his views and to alter the character of the Bill. For his own part, as he thought this alteration in the Bill would have the effect of interfering with the Act of Uniformity, and with the Act which was passed to prevent clandestine marriages, and of encouraging clergymen to defy the law when there was no necessity for it, he trusted the House would not agree to it.

On Question, Bill read 3^a, with the Amendments; an Amendment made; Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

TURNPIKE ACTS CONTINUANCE, &c., BILL—(No. 307.)—(*The Lord Clinton.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Bill *reported*, without Amendment.

Report *brought up*.

LORD REDESDALE moved that Clause 3, empowering trustees to grant compensation to clerks of trusts and surveyors, be struck out. A number of turnpike trusts had been allowed to expire during the last twenty years, and yet during that time there had been no instance in which any of the officers had been allowed compensation. The clerks of these trusts were generally solicitors, and had, he maintained, no more claim to compensation than they would have for the loss of their business by death, for instance, of a person who had always employed them. Moreover, since the passing of the Highways Act, surveyors of highways were very much in demand, so that any one among them who had a good reputation in his business would be sure to obtain an appointment. The only precedent for such a proposal as that contained in the clause was that which occurred about two years ago, when some of the turnpike trusts about London were abolished; but that was, in fact, a metropolitan job. He hoped, under those circumstances, that the House would not give its assent to the clause.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD thought that the clause was a reasonable one, and that it would be very hard upon both surveyors and clerks, who had frequently been occupied on these trusts for many years, if they were thrown upon the world without any compensation for the loss of their employment. The power only went to allow trustees to give three years' salary; and, as that was a moderate proposition, and as compensation had been allowed under the Metropolitan Act, he hoped the clause would not be rejected.

LORD DENMAN said, he had been entrusted with a Petition from a clerk and surveyor of roads in the county of Derby, and did not think, judging from the general conduct of the trustees of roads in that county, that if the clause were agreed to, anything like excessive compensation would be given by them.

THE EARL OF ROMNEY said, the operation of the Bill would be general. The solicitors and surveyors who were clerks and officers of these trusts generally resided in large towns, and their time was not wholly given up to the discharge of the duties of their position. He saw no good reason, therefore, why the clause should receive the assent of the House.

LORD CLINTON said, he would offer no further opposition to the omission of the clause.

Clause *struck out*. Further Amendments made; Bill to be read 3^{a} *To-morrow*, and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 332.)

ARMY RESERVE BILL. (No. 320.) (*The Earl of Longford.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, explained that its object was to consolidate five statutes now in force in reference to the enrolment of out-pensioners, and to extend the operation of the Act of 1859, so as to enable the Crown to enrol discharged soldiers, including the present pensioners, in a Reserve Force, to the extent of 50,000 men. These were to be enrolled in two classes; the first to consist of those men who, from their age, might be regarded as more effective, and who would be enrolled under the special condition that they were to be liable to general service at home and abroad in the event of war or invasion. The second class would be enrolled as ordinary pensioners, and would be liable to serve at home only. The Secretary of State would have power to make regulations for the government of the force, to provide for the period of its training, and the appointment of officers. He would also be invested with a discretionary power to attach those men for training to any regiment of Militia. The regulations were to be laid before Parliament.

Motion *agreed to*; Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

MILITIA RESERVE BILL. (No. 314.) (*The Earl of Longford.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that it was supplemental to that that had just been read the second time. It gave power to the Crown, through the Secretary of State, to enrol a proportion, not exceeding one-fourth, of the full quota of the Militia, who would be enlisted under the special condition of being transferred to the regular army on the emergency of war or invasion. At all other times their duties would be exactly similiar to those of the other Militia regiments, but they would receive a higher rate of bounty, and be liable to a somewhat longer period of training.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

POSTAL COMMUNICATION WITH THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES.—QUESTION.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, that before their Lordships separated he wished to put a Question on the subject of Postal Communication with the Australian Colonies to the noble Duke the Colonial Secretary, of which he had given him private notice.

THE EARL OF DERBY: I believe the noble Earl was a member of a Committee of your Lordships' House who specially reported against the continuance of the practice of questions being put and speeches made on subjects of which only a private and not public notice has been given.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: The noble Earl is perfectly right. I was a member of that Committee; and if he thinks it courteous on his part, at the close of the proceedings this evening, and at this late stage of the Session, to debar me from saying the few words I intended to say, I will not further detain your Lordships.

THE EARL OF DERBY: No, no!

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, that as his noble Friend withdrew, as he understood, the opposition he had made—

THE EARL OF DERBY: I made no opposition.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON proceeded to say that he would very shortly state the point to which he wished to direct attention. At present there were two lines of postal communication between this country and Australia, the one by Panama and the other by Suez. Towards the line by Panama the country made no contribution; but to the postal communication between Suez and the southern coast of Australia the Treasury paid an annual subsidy of about £70,000. An intercolonial conference had lately taken place at Melbourne on the subject, and it was then proposed that three lines of postal communication should henceforth be established between this country and Australia—namely, the two at present existing, the one by Panama and the other by Suez, and the third which should form a branch of the Great Peninsular and Oriental line, and pass from Ceylon to the northern coast of Australia. It had been proposed that the Imperial Government on the one hand, and the Colonial Governments on the other, should each bear a moiety of the expense, which apparently stood by one calculation at £140,000 each, and by another at a sum not exceeding £200,000. He did not wish to recommend the increased expense which such a subsidy would entail on the Government of this country; on the contrary, he saw many strong and reasonable objections to it. He should be satisfied if the noble Duke (the Duke of Buckingham) could assure him that the subject would receive the consideration which was due to its own importance, and also to the feelings generally of the Australian colonists. It should be borne in mind that, corresponding with the vast increase of the population, of the exports and imports of these colonies, and of the enormous development of their material resources, there had been, so to speak, a raising of the standard of intelligence and education. Thus everything which made frequent and rapid communication between this country and those colonies became to those colonies a matter of very great importance, in a social and political, not less than in a material, point of view. There could be little doubt that the single monthly postal communication which had hitherto satisfied the wants of the Australian colonies was inadequate to the requirements of their present condition. He therefore, before the close of the Session, recommended this question very earnestly to the consideration of the noble Duke the Colonial Secretary. He did not wish to exact any answer on the subject at that moment from the Government who had, perhaps, not yet had sufficient time for forming an opinion upon it. All he desired was that it might receive at their hands that attention which its importance demanded.

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM said, the Question which the noble Earl had put to him was one which opened up a matter of very great importance both to this Empire and to the Australian Colonies; and he certainly thought he might refer to it as illustrating the expediency of the rule laid down very recently by the Committee of their Lordships' House, to which allusion had already been made, that questions of magnitude and not of extreme urgency should be preceded by some public and general notice. The noble Earl had been kind enough to give him notice that day of his Question; but had he given a more general notice he should have been able to obtain, by a conference with the noble Duke the Postmaster General, much more information to place before the House, showing more fully than he now could do the position of the matter to which the noble Earl alluded. It was true, as the noble Earl had stated, that these Australian colonies, not deeming their present postal communication sufficient, had invited the Home Government to consider what arrangements were expedient for improving that communication, and those colonies had proposed a very large and comprehensive plan, involving a very great extent of ocean voyage, and a very large expenditure of money, of which they show no indisposition to bear a fair proportion. The questions they had raised were certainly such as deserved very serious consideration on the part of the Home Government before the proposals were rejected or materially modified; but they could hardly be considered with regard to those colonies alone. Those colonies had now attained a magnitude when postal communication with them became of great importance, not merely as connected with England, but in relation to almost every other part of the globe, and particularly to China, India, and America. All that had to be taken into view by the Government before arriving at a definite conclusion as to the proposal made by those colonies. There was another point which was likely to be of as great importance to the colonies as any particular route or any particular number of mails, and that was the cost of transmission and the rate to be charged for the conveyance of letters. All these were matters of great interest in connection with the question of over-sea postal communication to the colonies and to India; and they deserved very careful consideration, because while to many of the colonies the advantages hitherto afforded by the Post Office arrangements as to letters and papers had been very great, yet the colonies ought now to consider whether, in some cases, the reduction of the rates of postage might not be of more advantage than the multiplication of the number of routes. The question would have to be considered very shortly; and he had to point out to the noble Earl that there were other considerations mixed up with it besides the expense of communication with Australia alone, and which would require some little time from various departments of the Government before any decision could be arrived at. He could assure the noble Earl that the subject was one the magnitude of which was not likely to be underrated by the Government, and that the Government were quite aware of the importance which was attached, and rightly attached, to the proper adjustment and extension of the present system.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, August 12, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Consolidated Fund Appropriation.*
Committee—Contagious Diseases (Animals) (*re-comm.*) [228] [R.P.]; Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (*re-comm.*) [301].
Report—Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (*re-comm.*) [301].
Withdrawn—County General Assessment (Scotland)* (*re-comm.*) [270].

TURNPIKE TRUSTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in reference to his Statement that the accounts of the Income and Expenditure of Turnpike Trusts for 1866 had not reached the Home Office, If he will explain the reason why the Department of the Home Office, which attends to those matters, has omitted to act upon the power given by the Act of Parliament for enforcing the delivery of such accounts, so that they may be laid before this House; and also, if the omission referred to is not the reason why no accounts have been rendered up to a more recent period than the 31st day of December, 1864?

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON, in reply, said, the delay had not arisen so much from the non-delivery of the accounts as the necessity of afterwards revising them.

ARMY—CAPTAIN SCOTT'S CLAIMS FOR RIFLING ORDNANCE.—QUESTION.

MR. BLAKE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether any Report has been recently received at the War Office from the Ordnance Select Committee on Captain Scott's claims for reward for his system for rifling heavy ordnance; and, if so, whether there is any objection to lay a Copy of the same upon the table of the House?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: Sir, a Report has been lately received from the Ordnance Select Committee with respect to the claims of Captain Scott for reward for his system for rifling heavy ordnance. In that Report the Committee say, as they have said on previous occasions, that what is called the Woolwich system, upon which the guns are rifled, is in no degree founded on the invention of Captain Scott. The Committee, however, repeat the recommendation which they made before, that Captain Scott should be allowed to receive the same amount of reward which has been allotted to other competitors. Under these circumstances, I propose to reconsider the decision which I before came to respecting Captain Scott's claim, as I find that he is the only competitor who has not received a reward. In point of fact, I shall allow a reward to be granted to him. As to the latter part of the Question, I have to say that I must decline to lay the Report upon the table.

FAMINE IN THE WEST OF IRELAND. QUESTION.

MR. REARDEN said, he rose to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is his intention to adopt measures, as speedily as possible, to relieve the famine-stricken poor in the West of Ireland, and to afford employment to the population in that district of the country by the promotion of the Public Works promised by him before and after the Whitsuntide recess?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHATTERTON) said, in reply, that he had not received any information which would enable him to answer the Question, and he therefore hoped the hon. Member would postpone it until a future day, when the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland would be in his place.

ARMY—VOLUNTEER CAPITATION GRANT.—QUESTION.

MR. LAIRD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to recommend Parliament to grant an increased allowance to the Volunteer Force, as, failing such increased allowance being made, many of those Volunteer Corps, which are composed principally of artizans, must be disbanded?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: Sir, I cannot undertake at this time to state what recommendations Her Majesty's Government may think it their duty to submit to Parliament next year in regard to the increase of the capitation allowance to the Volunteers; but I will repeat what I have before said, that probably the Government will think it their duty to give serious consideration to that Memorial which was presented in the name of a considerable body of officers commanding Volunteers, and stating in the strongest terms that they feared that if the present system were continued it would be necessary that some of the corps should be disbanded. During the recess, with a view to next year's Estimates, that Memorial shall receive serious consideration.

LORD ELCHO: Perhaps my right hon. Friend will at the same time consider whether some changes cannot be made in the mode and time of payment.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON: I have no objection to inform my noble Friend that I have already decided on a change in regard to the mode of payment, so that hereafter delay should be impossible. The capitation grant will be paid in the shortest possible time after the number of efficients has been ascertained, and it will be paid to the commanding officer of the corps in conjunction with the finance committee.

IRELAND—ATTACK ON A WESLEYAN MISSIONARY.—QUESTION.

MR. VANCE said, he wished to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If information has reached the Irish Government of a murderous attack on the Rev. W. G. Campbell, a Wesleyan Missionary stationed at Athlone; if he has not been severely injured and his life endangered by having been stoned in the village of Granard; and, whether any steps have been taken to bring the perpetrators of this outrage to justice?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Chatterton) said, in the absence of the noble Lord the Chief Secretary for Ireland, he had to state that information had been received in due course of a violent attack having been made on the Rev. Mr. Campbell, who received several severe blows from stones, though he was happy to say that his life was not endangered. The constabulary repaired at once to the spot, but could not at the time afford adequate protection to Mr. Campbell. The names of the parties implicated in the affair were taken down, and they were summoned to appear at the Petty Sessions held at Granard on the 8th instant; but it unfortunately happened that on that day, in consequence of a severe domestic affliction, the local magistrate was not in attendance. The cases were accordingly postponed to the next Session, which would be held on the 22nd instant, and instructions had been given to two of the resident magistrates to attend, in order that no further delay should take place. The Sessional Crown Solicitor had also been instructed to attend and investigate the case.

IRELAND — CASE OF CHARLES FLYNN, PAUPER LUNATIC AT MOHILL.

QUESTION.

Mr. BLAKE said, he rose to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether he has seen that portion of the Correspondence between the Poor Law Commissioners and the Guardians of the Mohill Union, county Leitrim (contained in the Report on Lunatic Asylums for 1866, page 111), relative to the death of Charles Flynn at the Sligo Lunatic Asylum, "from injuries received at the Mohill Workhouse," according to the verdict of the Coroner's Jury, where it is stated by the master that Patrick Keenan, in charge of the infirm patients, "had a whip with which to keep the occupants of the ward quiet;" and to inquire whether, as the fact appeared to have been passed over without notice by the Commissioners, he has any objection to suggest to them the desirability of pointing out to the Guardians of the Poor of the Mohill Union the inhumanity and illegality of their suffering the infirm patients in their charge to be kept quiet by means of a whip?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Chatterton) said, in the absence of the noble Lord the Chief Secretary, he would beg to state that the attention of the Irish Government had been directed to that portion of the Correspondence which was mentioned in the Question. The facts of the case appeared to be these:—A pauper named Charles Flynn was transferred to the Mohill Workhouse where he was received as an ordinary inmate. Afterwards, however, it was found that he was subject to violent epileptic attacks. He was at once sent to the Infirmary until arrangements could be completed for sending him to the district Lunatic Asylum in Sligo. During his confinement in the Infirmary he inflicted injuries on himself which resulted in his death. Dr. Brodie, Inspector of the Poor Law Board, was despatched to the place to investigate the matter, and an inquest was held, when the jury returned an open verdict. The injuries the man received were not such as would have been inflicted by a whip, and were evidently the result of violence the man had himself been guilty of. The result was that he fractured his ribs and thereby caused his death. It was true that the master of the workhouse had a kind of whip in his possession; but it consisted merely of a number of soft cords. Of course, however, it was objectionable that such an instrument should be used, or that it should even be kept for the purpose of inspiring fear; indeed, it was reported that it had never been used, and would now be dispensed with, so that it was unnecessary to address the Commissioners or Board of Guardians on the subject.

RAILWAY COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

Mr. M. T. BASS said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to take into consideration, during the recess the Reports of the Royal Railway Commission, with a view to any action upon the subject?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, in reply, that the serious attention of the Board of Trade had already been given to the Report of the Royal Commission on Railways. It was too early at present to say whether any legislation would be attempted during next Session. He might be allowed to suggest, however, that the debates and actual legislation, as well as the attempts at legislation during the present Session, showed that this would not be a very hopeful task, and that perhaps time might in the end be gained by pausing until the public mind was more made up with respect to the principles on which such legislation should be founded.

MERCANTILE MARINE.—QUESTION.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Board of Trade, If it is his intention to bring in a Bill early next Session to consolidate and amend the Acts which govern our Mercantile Marine?

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE, in reply, said, these laws would certainly have careful consideration during the recess. Amendments were required as well as consolidation; and it might be a question whether the consolidation ought not to be postponed until the Amendments were concluded, or whether it would be more advisable to combine amendment and consolidation in the same measure.

COAST OF ABYSSINIA.—QUESTION.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, In whose possession Her Majesty's Government acknowledge the Coast of Abyssinia on the shores of the Red Sea to be, from Souakim to Zeila?

Lord STANLEY: Sir, I understand that some time ago the Turkish Government placed the government of Massowah and the adjoining district under the Viceroy of Egypt upon certain conditions. I believe the right to the coast was in former times a matter of dispute; but it appears to me to have been exercised *de facto* by local authorities, who have owed and rendered allegiance to the Sultan.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he wished to know whether any portion of it was in the possession of the French Government?

Lord STANLEY: I may remind the hon. Member that that is a Question of which he had better have given me notice. As at present advised, I am not aware that any claims have been put forward by the French Government to hold any portion of the coast.

EGYPT—ENGLISH WORKMEN IN EGYPT.
QUESTION.

Sir JOHN GRAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he has received any Communications with respect to the alleged ill-treatment received by British Engineers employed on Railways in Egypt; and, if any steps have been taken to adjust the matters in dispute?

Lord STANLEY, in reply, said, he had received various communications with reference to the alleged treatment of certain British subjects who were engine-drivers, not engineers, employed on railways in Egypt. It seemed these men had struck work, after notice given, in consequence of certain grievances of which they complained not having been redressed. Representations were made on their behalf by the Acting Consul General, and the Egyptian authorities had appointed a Commission to inquire into the subject. That Commission had not yet reported, and he (Lord Stanley) was awaiting the Report and Evidence. Pending the receipt of the Report of those making the inquiry, money had been advanced for the assistance of the men.

SANITARY REPORT.—QUESTION.

Mr. POWELL said, he wished to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Whether he is prepared to explain the reason of the delay in the publication of the Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council, and to ask when the said Report will be laid upon the table of the House?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, in reply, that the Report referred to by the hon. Gentleman was put into the hands of the printer at the beginning of April; it consisted of upwards of 600 pages, and contained a number of geological and other maps, the preparation of which had caused the delay. He expected, however, that the Report would be in the Library on Saturday next, and would be delivered to hon. Members on the following Monday or Tuesday.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.
QUESTION.

Mr. FAWCETT said, the period of the Session had now arrived when many minor measures would have to be abandoned. But there was on the Paper a measure second to none in importance—the Bill for regulating the Hours of Labour, which, he supposed, would have to be abandoned, as there was little chance of its coming on that night.

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member could not enter on a discussion of the Bill.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he was going to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER said, that would not alter the case. The Bill was on the Paper for to-morrow.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he would then put it to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, it being impossible to proceed with the Bill that night, and a promise having been given that it should be proceeded with this Session, so that it might pass contemporaneously with the extension of the Factory Act, he would allow it to be taken to-morrow before the Parks Regulation Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER said, the hon. Member was out of Order.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he thought he was taking the course which would prove most convenient to the House.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I am very sorry, but I have made those arrangements for the conduct of business which I thought would be best, and at present I cannot say that I am prepared to change them. Notice has been given that the Meetings in Royal Parks Bill would come on to-morrow, so that it would surely be inconvenient to some hon. Members if the arrangement were altered.

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL.

QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he rose to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether it will be convenient for him to explain the reason witnesses of one side only have been examined before the Committee on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Chatterton) said, it would have been more convenient if the Question had been addressed to the Chairman of the Committee; but he understood that the Committee thought the onus lay upon those who desired the change to show cause for it, and consequently they only were examined. It was not necessary to examine witnesses as to any matter of fact in reference to the maintenance of the existing law, and to examine them upon theological questions would merely have taken up time to no purpose.

Mr. WHALLEY: But seeing the result, and the Report which has been adopted on that *ex parte* Evidence, I wish to ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman, whether he still retains that view?

Mr. Speaker

APPROPRIATION BILL.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he wished to call attention to the fact that a Bill which stood on the Paper that night for the second reading was read a first time on Saturday without any notice that it was about to be introduced. It was desirable that a Bill of so much importance should not be galloped through the House, but should proceed regularly through all the stages.

Mr. SPEAKER said, it had always been customary to introduce the Appropriation Bill as soon as the House had agreed to the last Vote in Supply.

IMPRISONMENT FOR CHURCH RATES.

QUESTION.

Mr. HADFIELD said, he begged to ask a Question, of which he had not given Notice, relative to the imprisonment of two persons for Church rates for sums amounting to a few shillings only, but which had put the County in which the imprisonment took place to an expense of £147?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that he could not answer the Question of the hon. Gentleman, who had omitted to give the usual Notice of his intention to put it. If the hon. Gentleman would give Notice of it inquiries should be made.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. AYRTON, in proposing a series of Resolutions of which he had given notice on the subject of Indian Administration, said it might appear somewhat inopportune to invite an expression of opinion by the House at so late a period of the Session, but it must be recollected that the present was the first occasion this Session on which the House had been asked in a formal manner to direct its attention to matters connected with the Government of India. One or two debates had taken place upon matters of detail, but there had been no opportunity for considering and dealing practically, as a whole, with the question of the organization and administration of the Government of India. Having had some little opportunity of seeing how the

Government of India was carried on, he had been very much struck by what he considered the great defects of the system of the Governor General in Council. At present he believed that system to be wholly inefficient for its purpose. We seemed not to have made that progress which was to be expected in adapting the system established long ago to the great changes which had taken place in the condition of our Indian Empire. Originally, there had been a very loose Administration, marked by very great abuses, inasmuch as there was an unlimited number of Members of Council, and every Councillor thought it necessary to seek every opportunity for his own aggrandizement. A remedy for this state of things was supposed to be found in vesting the whole power in the Governor General and a few select Councillors; the number chosen at first being four, a limit subsequently reduced to three Civil Members. A power was, moreover, conferred on the Governor General, after he had gone through the somewhat cumbrous process of exchanging opinions in writing with his Council, of acting upon his own authority in cases where the interest, or safety, or tranquillity of the British possessions in India was directly concerned. But in all the ordinary affairs of Government he had no power of acting alone, and was bound to consult every Member of his Council. At a time when British sway in India was very limited, it was easy to act with a small number of Councillors; but now that our Empire had enormously extended, the difficulties of administration were proportionately increased. In 1834 the attention of the House was called to the condition of affairs. After a long peace it was hoped that the Governor General would be able to facilitate the passing of good and useful laws for the people, a direction in which very little had been done for many years before; and, accordingly, an additional Councillor, who was to be a member of the legal profession, and hence likely to be versed in questions of jurisprudence, was appointed. In 1861 it was found that the financial affairs of India were more complicated than any one locally connected with that country was capable of managing, and it was thought that another Councillor might be usefully added, to be selected from gentlemen in this country well versed in questions of finance. Hence the Governor General found himself compelled by law to consult six gentlemen, and to be guided by their opinions upon all matters connected with the general affairs of the Government, though he might emancipate himself from this necessity and depart from the opinion of the majority by acting upon his own responsibility in all cases where the matter at issue was one affecting the security or tranquillity of the Empire. If any one would reflect upon the limits which that Empire had now attained—1,900 miles from north to south by 1,500 from east to west—the number of States, the variety of languages, the differences of religion, and the multiplicity of sects, comprehended in those territories, it must be admitted that it was almost impossible for the Governor General in Council, as at present constituted, to conduct the supreme direction of the affairs of India. It was said that in practice a system had grown up of intrusting particular classes of duties to particular members of the Council without the necessity of their being participated in by their colleagues. Whatever practical advantages such a system might be attended with, if it existed, it virtually ignored the contents of the statute book, and thereby showed how much the exigencies of public affairs in India had outstripped the regulations made at home. Was that a desirable state of things? Ought we to drive the Governor General into dealing with departments of the Government with the assistance only of a single Councillor, not in a manner authorized, but prohibited by the law? If he was asked in what respect the Government of India was deficient, he had no difficulty in answering that the greatest deficiency consisted in the absence of any Member of the Council charged with watching over the agricultural industry and commerce of the country. Other departments were sufficiently represented; but the superintendence of questions relating to industry and commerce appeared to him to require that there should be appointed to the office of Councillor a person of very different education and very different attainments from those of the class from whom the Civil Service in India was recruited. However intelligent and well-informed these gentlemen were, they had not that knowledge which would enable them to grapple with the questions which had arisen and were constantly arising in India with relation to industry and commerce. Therefore, while anxious that the Governor General should be enabled to transact business with the assistance of one Councillor, he was also anxious that he should have a Councillor to advise and assist him in reference to the matters to which he had just referred. At the risk of being obliged to go into a few details, he would call attention to one or two of the more prominent branches of the subject. When he was in Calcutta, during the time of Lord Dalhousie, he suggested that the telegraphic system would be better conducted by a company than if taken up by the Government. But Lord Dalhousie was of a different opinion, and the telegraph became a Government undertaking. In 1862 he was anxious to know how far the Government had succeeded in the business, and he asked for an account. He thought if there was one general test better than another of the efficiency with which a great enterprize was conducted that test was to be found in the fact that those who conducted the undertaking had an accurate account of what was going on —of what was the capital, and what the revenue, what the profit, or what the loss. But it was not until the 19th of May, 1863, or fifteen months after he had asked for it, the Government in London obtained an account from India of the administration of the telegraphs of that country. The account he had called for was then laid on the table. In 1865 he moved for another account. Again there was a long delay, and it was not till February, 1866, he could get an account for the additional years following those included in the previous Return. And what was the result? The Indian Government had 11,700 miles of telegraph and 158 stations, on which they had spent £1,460,000, and on which, on the operations from year to year, they had lost £421,000. Well, that could not be said to be a very successful affair; but he did not wonder that it was not successful when its managers had no accounts made up, and when it took them fifteen months to be in a position to tell what was doing. He held in his hand the accounts of the administration of the telegraphs in Victoria by the Government of that colony. They had 2,500 miles of telegraph over a thinly-populated country; but, instead of having made a loss of £421,000, they were working at a profit equal to 3¾ per cent on the whole of the capital. But mark the difference of administration. The account which he held in his hand was the one for 1866. It was dated the last day of January, 1867, and it embraced the most minute details, even to every accident or interruption. If the Indian Government attempted to draw up a Report to include all the interruptions they never would be able to finish it. The last account of the telegraphs in India, which was called "Statistics of the Telegraphs of India," just laid before the House, only came up to the end of 1864, and were those which he had extracted from the Government. Did not that show inefficiency in dealing with great industrial questions? The railway system was another instance in point. The Government no doubt had pressed the construction of these lines, but the administration of them was involved in the utmost perplexity; indeed, the wonder was that they could be worked at all, considering how they were burdened with superfluous supervision. There was the Board of Directors in London, superintended by the Government here. There was another authority superintending the railway in India, another authority superintending that one, and the whole nominally superintended by the Government in India; so that there were five superintendencies, while in reality there was no member whose duty it was to represent this department of business in the Council. One of the lines which went from Calcutta was named — he did not know whether ironically or otherwise—after the Governor General. On the working of that line there was a deficit of £1,700 a year after payment of expenses. There were two projects now talked of, one for a railway between Scinde and Peshawur, at a cost of £5,000,000, and another, the Hindustain line, at a cost of £6,000,000. They were so assisted by the Governor General that perhaps they, too, would be called after him, and he ventured to predict that they too would be distinguished by an annual deficit. The first scheme was in connection with the Punjaub line, which, on a cost of £2,500,000, yielded a revenue of £25,000 a year; and the Scinde Railway, constructed at a cost of £2,250,000, and yielding a revenue of £10,000 a year—the other project was in connection with the Bombay and Baroda Railway, which earned £114,000 net in the year on a capital expenditure exceeding £6,000,000—these were the plans talked of. When he was in India persons interested in the development of railways projected a line in Western India in connection with a line that yielded to the Treasury £683,000 upon an outlay of £15,000,000. Those who were interested in that enterprize had considered what would be the best course to take with respect to a further development of its system, and they came to the conclusion that the best line would be one to open up that vast country known —politically rather than geographically— as Central India. He felt a great interest in the undertaking, and, with the concurrence of Lord Elgin, he negotiated with a Native Prince, the Maharajah of Holkar, an agreement by which that Prince was to grant a subvention, which would render a 5 per cent guarantee from the British Government unnecessary. But that having been done, one of our old Indian political Governor Generals arrived in India. He set to work, and the Maharajah was obliged to abandon his engagement. He could refer to other lines which were not likely to be productive, in consequence of their being interesting to gentlemen connected with certain services. He thought that it was absolutely necessary that this great branch of industry should be supervised with an intelligence which was not at present displayed in the management of Indian affairs. This was the more necessary, inasmuch as the time was approaching when the Government would be called upon to revise the contracts which it had made, and it was necessary to have a department in India capable of grappling with the question on comprehensive principles—with a system involving a capital of £83,000,000 sterling. But he would pass to another subject, and one which had for some time been occupying public attention—the question of irrigation. The Papers which had been produced on this subject contained the most abundant evidence that there was no mind in Calcutta applying itself steadily to the solution of this question. A despatch was sent home from India a few years ago, proposing that a loan should be raised, and that £29,000,000 should be spent on works of irrigation. Sir Charles Wood did perfectly right in treating that proposition with an answer which conveyed every feeling of amazement, indignation, and disgust at the extravagant manner in which the Government of India were dealing with that question. He declined to receive the despatch, and when another came he treated it as indignantly as he had done the first. He believed that one of the proposals was that £6,750,000 should be expended in the irrigation of the North Western Provinces, that the work should take ten to fifteen years in the completion, and that an establishment should be set up in connection with the affair, to cost £170,000 a year. Now, the House knew that when two periods were mentioned in this way they were always safe in taking the longest of the two. He thought, therefore that he might fairly assume that the work would not be completed in less than fifteen years, and £170,000 a year during that period would give no less than £2,250,000, as the sum which would be required to superintend an additional expenditure amounting together to £6,750,000. Indeed, that was the way in which the interests of the people of India were generally consulted — about one-third of the money expended upon any Government work was put into the pockets of the Europeans who were engaged in the superintendence. But the extravagance of such a proposal could best be understood by comparing it with what had been done in another direction. On the Madras Railway, which had occupied fourteen years in construction, £6,750,000 had been expended, and the amount devoted to superintendence and other similar expenses was £650,000, or £1,600,000 less than would in all probability have been incurred had the work been under the direction of the Government instead of a joint-stock company. This was a continuation of the old Indian system. Whenever any scheme was proposed, it was said, "Let us have a great establishment"—and one establishment was added to another, showing how little the public money was spent for the advantage of the public. An event which occurred some little while since afforded a striking instance of the way in which things were managed. In the beginning of last year an irrigation company had completed their works for irrigating 90,000 acres, sufficient for producing food for about 250,000 people. But the people would not take advantage of the opportunity, because they thought that although they might improve the land they would be visited with an infliction of the Government for centuries in the shape of an addition to the annual land tax. The Government then issued a proclamation to induce the people to take up the scheme, but it was conceived in such extraordinary language that they became still more frightened, and would have nothing to do with the scheme. He felt convinced that with regard to the question of irrigation, unless the supervision was marked by an intelligence and sagacity which had not yet been seen, it would be useless to hope that we should realize those benefits which we had a right to expect from the intelligence, energy, and scientific skill of our engineers, both in India and in this country. So strongly had he been struck with the present state of things that he had advised an English engineer who had brought before him an admirable and well-considered plan of irrigation not to have anything to do with the Government of India, because his efforts would lead to no good result, while they might end in his own ruin, and that advice he still regarded as sound. He had personally had some correspondence with the Government of India, and he had been thankful when he had obtained an answer in twelve months, and the House could easily understand that a correspondence which was carried on at the rate of a letter and answer every twelve months would inevitably be attended with destruction to the prospects of any professional or commercial man. There was another important matter which had come under his own observation, and that was the development of the great carboniferous district in the centre of India. Many years ago he had been struck with the magnitude of this question, and the advantages which would be conferred upon the country by having a supply of coal in the centre of India, as occasion might arise when it would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a supply from the coast. The Government of India, with a view to developing the coal, made a grant of 900 square miles to one man, inserting a clause, as a condition of the grant, that he should make 1,500 tons of iron — it being about as reasonable to insist on making a ton of iron there as for the Great Mogul to direct some one to grow pine apples in the fields of this country. But no condition about raising coal was mentioned in the grant. While in India he endeavoured to impress the importance of this subject by means of a letter to the Government, through a district officer, and being at Calcutta two or three months afterwards, he naturally desired to learn what had become of his communication. But no one had heard of it. Some people thought it was up the country, whilst others thought it was down the country. At last a gentleman got a copy of it from the officer to whom it was first sent, and it was brought under the consideration of the Government. To that letter, after the expiration of about twelve months, he got an answer, and ultimately found that it was useless to keep up any correspondence with the Government of India. The fact was, that if anything was proposed in India, the proposal was met by the principles of political economy—principles which the officials in India were always studying, but could never master or understand. The Government had guaranteed an interest of 5 or 4½ per cent on most costly machinery—that machinery being a railway—which could only be set in motion by fuel, the best of which was coal. But when they went to the Government to see if a supply of coal could not be obtained, they were told that it was contrary to the principles of political economy for a railway to have anything to do with coal. This was what was called the philosophical administration of affairs in Calcutta. Now if there was a real English statesman in Calcutta, such a course of proceeding would not be tolerated. He had now given his view of this question; but as the official mind always liked to have the official view, he might quote the opinion of Colonel Strachey, who was a great authority on this matter. He stated that on all questions relating to public works and industry there was no guiding or superintending mind in the Government of India—nobody gave them a well-directed attention—they must take their chance amid the multiplicity of Indian affairs. The whole thing, in short, was a perfect chaos. The Government had appointed that gentleman to a responsible post in superintending irrigation works; but still, the superintending officers had no authority for grappling with the questions before them, or power of controlling the action of the local Government. What was the general result of the system of Government carried on in India? On comparing the productive industry of India with that of our Eastern colonies, it would be found that with a population approaching 200,000,000 the imports were only £64,000,000, and the exports only £69,000,000; whilst in our Australian colonies (adding Tasmania and New Zealand), with a population of 1,600,000, the imports were £34,000,000, and the exports £30,000,000. They were called upon imperatively to review the organization of the Supreme Government—to send to the aid of the Governor General a competent Administrator to superintend every question connected with agriculture, industry, and commerce, and thus to make our rule not only as just, but as useful as possible for the people of that country. This was the first proposition he had to make to the House. It was absolutely necessary to secure better government for the people of Bengal. It had been transferred to a Lieutenant Governor. It was thought by some that a person who had risen in the Indian service after a long career ought to be appointed Lieutenant Governor of Bengal; but Parliament had not been of that opinion. When it deliberately considered this question on the renewal of the Charter in 1834, it thought there should be a separate Government for Bengal, placed on the same footing as that for Bombay. But there had been some difficulty in so dealing with the subject under the old system. Then it was thought the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal might have a Legislative Council to work with, but not for administering affairs. The result of that imperfect change was this — that in practice they could not appoint a really efficient man to the office of Governor of Bengal; the system had been continued of appointing those who were unfit for the office they were called on to hold. He maintained that it was absolutely necessary for the efficient government of Bengal that an Englishman should be sent out from this country, quite independent of all local interests, prejudices, and trammels. Until they completed their organization in Bengal, and placed it on the same footing as the Government of Bombay, they could not accomplish this object. In 1861 he had pressed this view on Sir Charles Wood, who promised to consider it; but the thing was put off, and the question now was, whether this important matter should be left on its present footing. It was absolutely necessary that the Secretary of State for India should direct his attention to the question. The other evening, when the famine in Orissa was under discussion, the right hon. Gentleman intimated his desire that our energies should be directed to some means of preventing such calamities for the future. The first step to prevent the recurrence of such a calamity was to reform the Government of Bengal. It deserved notice that even the Commissioners who were appointed to examine into the question, desiring to extenuate that great calamity, in effect came to the conclusion that the best remedy that could be found for the future was to improve the administration of the Bengal Government. It was due very much to the present condition of the Government of Bengal, that the people of Orissa had been so much neglected. No one really inquired into the facts of the case which would at once have been investigated, if there had been any master mind capable of dealing with them. While the lives of millions of people were in jeopardy no one took the trouble to ascertain what ought to have been ascertained by direct searching inquiry. It was said, on speculative grounds, there were large stores of grain in the country, and it never occurred to the Lieutenant Governor and the Commissioners of Revenue to take the smallest trouble to ascertain the fact. They were content to speculate in their offices on the subject, and they only discovered the truth by the fact that the people were dying in thousands for want of grain. All this arose from the feeble complexity of the present state of things in Bengal. It was therefore necessary to place Bengal on the same footing as Bombay or Madras. He would pass from the subject of the constitution of the Government of Bengal to the next Amendment he should desire to see in the administration of our Indian affairs, which had reference to the constitution of the Council at home. This was a very delicate question for the Secretary of State to deal with, for, as the noble Lord opposite had told him last year, it did not do for the Secretary of State to call his Council round him and ask them what proposition they had to make for their own extinction. Under these circumstances, it became the peculiar duty of independent Members to bring the subject forward, in order that the Secretary of State might be in a position to state that he had been forced to take action in the matter by the House of Commons, and not by any desire on his own part to subvert the comfortable position the members of the Council now occupied. The constitution of the Council at home formed the subject of a very lively discussion in the House at the time of the passing of the India Bill, nine years ago, at which time very conflicting opinions were expressed with regard to it. Some persons thought that there ought to be an Executive Council, the members of which should act somewhat in the capacity of Under Secretaries of State, while others thought it should consist of persons holding most elevated positions. Lord Russell said they should be Privy Councillors, having large salaries, and holding office for life. He, however, and those who had a direct and immediate interest in Indian matters, thought that neither of these extremes was the right course to pursue, but that the affairs of India should be directed by a Minister of the Crown, aided by a consultative Council, the Councillors not being overshadowed by the Secretary and the Secretary not being able to convert them into Ministerial officers of his own. This was the view which was adopted by Lord Derby, and which was embodied in the Bill as it originally stood. During the discussion that took place, Lord Palmerston suggested that the Councillors should be appointed for a period of ten years, and not for life. The then Government, finding themselves in a very delicate position, having to face a large majority on the Opposition side of the House, and having important vested interests to grapple with, proposed that the Councillors should be appointed during good behaviour. In consequence, however, of the great difference of opinion that existed, the Government at length, in deference to the general opinion of that House, proposed the compromise, which was embodied in the Bill by which the Council was established. It was desirable that he should read the language of that compromise, because upon it turned very important questions. It was provided by the Bill that Councillors should hold their offices during good behaviour, and unless removed in conformity with an Address from both Houses of Parliament; but it was further provided that if at any time thereafter it should appear to Parliament expedient to reduce the number of Councillors, or otherwise deal with the constitution of the Council, no member of the Council who had not served in his office for more than ten years should be entitled to claim any compensation for the loss of his office, or by reason of any alteration that might be made in the constitution of the Council; so that the whole question of the composition of the Council might be re-opened, if Parliament considered it desirable, within a period of ten years from that date. Now, next year was the last of that term allotted to Parliament for a re-consideration of the question. It was felt at the time the Bill passed that the question could not be satisfactorily settled then, and now that Lord Derby's Government was again in office, and was likely to remain so until the expiration of the ten years, the time was most opportune for a re-consideration of the question in a calm and temperate manner; in the interval afforded by the approaching recess the Government would have the opportunity of discussing it, and he held it to be their duty to bring it before the House for consideration next Session. No one could doubt that it was not a proper state of things to set up a Council in this country, the members of which were to remain within it, even though they might be tottering to the India Office when they ought to be thinking on their relations with the other side of the grave. That was not a mode of administering effectively and energetically the government of a great Empire. It was entirely contrary to the whole policy of our administration, especially as regarded our Colonial and Indian Empire. That policy was not one of convulsive and violent change, but one of the gradual circulation of new ideas and of new men. Throughout the discussions that had taken place upon this subject he had always expressed an opinion that the Council assisting the Secretary of State should be continually reinforced by new men, new information, and new energy. Men who had left India thirty or forty years ago could not know anything about the persons now engaged in conducting affairs there, or the present state of things in India. There should be men constantly entering the Council who knew personally the leading civilians and officers in India and the qualities they possessed, and who could give the Secretary of State confidential advice in the exercise of the most difficult, delicate, and responsible duty which he had to perform, that of selecting military men and civilians for the performance of the very highest duties which public servants in India were intrusted with. If the Council consisted of none but old gentlemen who left India ages ago, how was the Secretary to get that advice? Then there were many men who had recently returned from India who might make most useful members of Council, but they would have to be passed over until some of those wonderful constitutions, often seen amongst retired Indians, passed to their last account. There should be a gradual change, so as not to produce any sudden revulsion of views and opinions, and that change should take place under such conditions as would not lead to jobbing or intrigue. The change should be prescribed by law, and should take effect by the operation of law, the members not being put out of the Council as for any wrongdoing or want of capacity, but each retiring by rotation. The practical part of the plan he proposed was, that members of the Council should only hold office for seven or, perhaps, six years, a term quite sufficient to finish the career of gentlemen who had held public offices in India for many years. There was only one other Resolution which he had to offer the House, and that was to get rid of the solemn and extraordinary farce of the House of Commons sitting annually in Committee to declare that certain things had taken place two years previously. The House was not called upon to express any opinion as to whether those things had rightly or wisely taken place, but they had simply to say, as a matter of fact, that the Government of India had received so much money, and had spent so much two years ago. In order not to stultify their proceedings and convert this House into a debating society about matters of history, they should come to some practical conclusion, either of praise or censure, regarding the present or regulating the future. The best course to be adopted was for Parliament to have the Estimates for the ensuing year before them, and that they should pass a Resolution whether or not they were satisfactory. In doing that they would be called upon to consider whether the administration of affairs in India was satisfactory, and whether that which was the complement of that administration—the financial system in England—was deserving of their confidence. They would thus have an opportunity of passing a real Resolution upon the subject, and would have an opportunity of discussing every important subject connected with the administration of affairs in India. The House must have perceived that during the last two or three years there had been a growing disposition, and he might add, a growing requirement to mix up the English finances with those of India. He would mention one great illustration of this—the question of the transport of troops from England to India. There was a kind of partnership undertaken, and large ships were built. It became a joint transaction, and he did not complain of that, because it was evident that with the rapidity of communication, it was necessary, for the sake of economy, expedition, and efficiency, that there should be a large amount of united exertion, involving important questions of finance between the Governments of England and India. At the same time it was highly undesirable that only one portion of such joint transactions should come under the notice of that House. Again, there was the question of the Post Office which occurred the other day, and certainly it was most desirable that there should be a complete partnership between the two Governments in regard to the general Postal service of India and the East. When, however, this question was recently discussed, the House was placed in a position of great embarrassment, because there was on the one hand, the Exchequer here, which was under the most stringent rules, and, on the other, the Exchequer of the Secretary of State for India, which was under no rules whatever as regarded Parliament. The consequence was that they were waiting to see how they could get out of the complications in which they had been involved. In his opinion, the best way to deal with matters of this kind would be to lay the Estimates for the Indian service on the table, not to be dealt with to the full extent, like the English Estimates, but merely with the view of obtaining a vote of the House approving the expenditure proposed by the Secretary of State for India, for the same period of time as the English Estimates related to. The House would then be able to take a comprehensive view of the Indian finances, and would no doubt arrive at a satisfactory result. If there should be any discontent about any particular details, they would have the whole thing before them, and that discontent could be expressed in an intelligible form. He viewed, with some concern the fact that the Secretary for India had under his control the expenditure of so vast a sum of money, and he thought that expenditure should be under the same general supervision as was that of Her Majesty's Government in this country. He trusted that this suggestion would receive the sanction of the House, and that the Secretary of State would give the House an assurance that he would apply his mind to a practical examination of the condition of the Government of India. For his own part he was strongly impressed with the conviction that the condition of the Government of India with respect to those matters which he had referred to was in the highest degree unsatisfactory, and he believed that we were not doing justice to the people of that country. Year by year we were imposing enormous burdens upon them in the shape of taxes; but while we were exhibiting great intelligence and capacity in that respect we were not exhibiting a like intelligence and capacity in developing the industry of the people, and in doing that which would tend more than anything else to reconcile them to a Government which was alien to their feelings and their religion. He hoped the next Session would not be allowed to pass away without the matter being brought under the notice of Parliament. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by moving the Resolutions of which he had given notice.

Amendment proposed,

> To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the Governor General of India should be empowered, with the sanction of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to conduct the business of each Department of Government in concert with one or more members of his Council instead of the whole Council :—That, in order to insure better attention to the affairs of Trade and Agriculture, an additional member of the Governor General's Council in India should be appointed to superintend those affairs :—That the Government of Bengal should be placed upon the same footing as the Government of Bombay :—That one nominated and one elected member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India should cease to hold office at the end of each year :—That the members of the Council should retire in rotation according to their length of service, whether as members of the Council or as East India Directors :—and, That the existing practice of recording by Resolutions of this House certain financial facts relating to India should be discontinued ; and that instead thereof, the Estimates for all Expenditure in Europe of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council should be approved by a vote of this House before the same is incurred,"—(*Mr. Ayrton*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. KINNAIRD, on rising to second the Amendment, said he would not follow his hon. Friend through the whole of the matter which he had laid before the House, though he thought they ought not to shrink from the consideration of all the propositions submitted to them. At all events, the subject would be discussed in the newspapers during the recess, and thus the people of India would perceive that their interests were not overlooked in the House of Commons. There was, however, one point to which his hon. Friend had alluded on which he was anxious to say a few words—namely, the important question of irrigation. It was impossible to reflect on the terrible calamity which had recently occurred in Orissa and other parts of the Bengal Presidency, without coming to the conclusion that, by prudent foresight, it might have been to a considerable extent mitigated. If we wished to avert famine in the future we ought to cultivate the vast water resources of the country, which were amply sufficient, if the water, instead of being allowed to run away into the ocean, was everywhere made available for irrigation. And if, in addition to this, the canals were made navigable for steamers, and an inland system of water communication was established throughout the whole of India, then the deficiency of one province would be easily met by the redundancy of another, and thus a famine, such as we have lately witnessed, be rendered impossible. His hon. Friend had alluded to a company which had large works in Orissa—the East India Irrigation Company. In 1861, plans in reference to that very district were submitted to the Government, and obtained the sanction of Lord Canning. They were then sent to the Home Government, and for fifteen long months were hung up in the office in London. He would now read an extract from the Commissioners' Report which would show that some of the responsibility of delay rested on the authorities at home who were, in fact, supreme. The Report stated that—

> "At Cuttack the East India Irrigation Company have large establishments. They had undertaken some years before a great scheme for the irrigation of the delta of the Mahanuddee and the adjoining country, and their works had progressed almost, but unfortunately not quite, to the point when they might have been brought into partial use at the moment when the famine commenced."

This was in great measure owing to the delay of fifteen months. But the value of the works even as far as they did extend was illustrated by the following testimonies in the Report :—

> "They had spent and were spending large sums of money in payment of labour, but their operations in Orissa had been confined almost entirely to the neighbourhood of Cuttack, where their principal head works are ; only one canal having been carried thence to a considerable distance in the direction of Kendraparah. It was probably in a very great measure due to their past and present expenditure, and to their provident provision of grain for the payment of their workpeople, that actual starvation occurred much later in and about Cuttack than in other parts of Orissa ; but the consequence was that the intensity of the calamity came to the immediate sight of the principal European community (in and out of the service of the Government) in the province comparatively late."

Then, again, it was reported—

> "Up to this time there were no Government relief works in the Cuttack district, but the works of the Irrigation Company afforded employment to vastly greater numbers than did the Government works in Pooree. We cannot speak too highly of the humane endeavours of the officers of this company to render their works beneficial to the destitute. In January, when rice was procurable, the numbers were at their highest; and from that month till June, employment being freely offered and more and more needed, the decrease in numbers was, we understand, solely due to the scarcity of rice."

He must, however, say that the noble Lord opposite had from the time he accepted office taken great interest in these works, and done all he could to further them. He had read these extracts, however, in order to impress upon the House that it was sound policy to encourage English capitalists to embark in undertakings of this nature. Again, the Commissioners said—

> "There can be no doubt of the great advantage of the measures of precaution in regard to public works recommended by General Cotton. But it so happened that the great roads running through the length of Orissa had been long ago designed, and useful employment for almost any quantity of labour might have been found on them, in raising great embankments, collecting metal, and such-like works, eminently suited to famine relief. Superintendence and other means might probably have also been found sufficient to enable the Government to employ all who would come upon the works; food only was wanting."

He hoped, therefore, that the late sad events would draw the attention of the Government to this very important question of irrigation, and especially as works of irrigation are more than amply remunerative, if thoroughly carried out. Had those works been in full operation in Orissa the lives of hundreds of thousands of human beings might have been saved.

He had heard with pain the allusion made by the hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) to the supposed feebleness manifested by Sir John Lawrence, contrasted with his former vigour, and he regretted that he was not in his place, or he would assure him that Sir John Lawrence had been advocating works of irrigation ever since his appointment as Governor General. Such remarks were injurious to one who of all others had the best interests of the natives of India at heart; and he only needed scope for his great energies to inaugurate measures adapted to the present exigency.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: Although the course which the hon. Gentleman has adopted upon this occasion is not in accordance with precedent, yet it is one of which I am not disposed to complain, inasmuch as the speech which the hon. Member has just delivered, like almost every speech he addresses to this House, is full of interest and information, while the points to which he draws our attention are in themselves undoubtedly of very considerable importance. I hope, however, the House will not permit itself to be led at this moment into a general discussion of the many subjects which the hon. and learned Member has brought under our notice, but will assent to the Motion that the Speaker should now leave the Chair for the consideration of the financial condition of India, which is the special object of our assembling this evening. It is, no doubt, usual, after the Financial Statement has been made, for hon. Members to draw attention to various subjects connected with the Indian Administration, and perhaps the discussion of those subjects would lead to better results if raised by a formal Motion; but I am afraid that if we were to take up even one of the points which has been introduced by the hon. and learned Member, and to discuss it thoroughly, very little time would be left for the transaction of the business which has immediately brought us together, and I hope that, although I shall feel it my duty to offer a few observations upon the questions which have been raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman they will not be made the subject of any general and prolonged discussion. I will take these questions in the order in which they have been brought forward by the hon. and learned Gentleman himself. In the first place, the hon. and learned Member suggested a different mode of conducting the business in the Council of the Governor General. On that point I need say very little, because the hon. and learned Member is obviously aware that, whatever the law, the practice is very much as he wishes. Improvements might probably be made, and no doubt the law and practice should conform to each other. The six members of the Council are each charged with a department; one takes the financial, another judicial business, a third home, and a fourth military affairs, and so forth. The secretaries of each department refer matters to those members of the Council at the head of their particular departments, and if unimportant they are disposed of without further consultation. More important matters are referred to the Governor General, and questions of such importance as to warrant the description "Cabinet questions" are referred to the Council. That is a reasonable way of doing business, but, perhaps, it should be put upon a more regular footing, and the custom of all the members of the Council signing a despatch, whether they have been at present at the discussion of it or not, is certainly absurd and inconvenient; it is a remnant of the old system, and might well be done away with. The suggestion of the hon. and learned Member that an additional Councillor should be appointed to superintend trade and agriculture, is worthy of consideration; it is true, as he says, that there is a want of organization in certain departments partly consequent on the absence of a leading mind. With regard to the question of irrigation there is no doubt matters are mending, and we may hope for much advantage from the appointment of Colonel Strachey as Commissioner for the general irrigation service of India. Colonel Strachey's duties are not yet exactly fixed; but by the last mail a proposal had been received at the India Office from the Governor General containing definite regulations upon that subject. Colonel Strachey has been visiting Madras and Bombay and other parts of India, and has now come to Calcutta, and a regular system of irrigation, to be conducted by him, has been proposed by the Indian Government, and is now under the consideration of the Secretary of State. No doubt the change proposed will materially improve and concentrate the organization of that important branch of the public service. With regard to the hon. and learned Member's complaint that the first thing the Indian Government does in time of need is to establish a well-paid department, and incur great expense quite out of proportion to the amount of work to be done —at the first blush, the hon. and learned Member's own remedy seems to be devised on the homœopathic principle; for his proposal is that we should have an additional, and, of course, a well-paid officer to administer these matters, which he says require putting on another footing. It appears to me that it is open to consideration whether we ought, at present, to make any addition to the Council of India, and whether it will not be better that we should confine ourselves to an alteration in the distribution of the duties allotted to the members of that body. I agree, however, with the hon. Gentleman that it is most important that a more continuous and more careful attention than has hitherto been given should be applied to those branches of industry to which he has called attention. The third suggestion made by the hon. and learned Member was that the Government of Bengal should be placed on the same footing as the Government of Bombay. Without at the present moment accepting that proposal in its entirety, I am ready to go nearly the whole length with the hon. and learned Member in the comments he has made with respect to the footing on which the Government of Bengal is at present placed. I believe it is an unsatisfactory footing, or that, at all events, it will be unsatisfactory if the Presidency of Bengal is to remain as at present, and include, besides Bengal Proper, the provinces of Assam and Orissa, as well as other outlying districts, where the people are unaccustomed to be governed by the mere operation of law, and where the administration of the law is in the hands of those who are unaccustomed to the ways of the people, and who, fresh from the desk in the Secretary's Office in Calcutta, have not the advantage of those who have been trained by personal contact with the people, nor that of those who go out to India with the training of English statesmen. This question, however, mixes itself up with the question as to what are to be the relations, under the system he proposes, existing between the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal and the Governor General of India, and it raises, also, the very difficult question as to the site of the Government of India and the true position of the capital. It cannot be expected at this period of the Session that we should enter into a deliberate discussion upon questions of this sort. I would also plead, on my own behalf, that although I have now been for several months in my present position, I should require more time, and certainly a great deal more consultation with the authorities in India, before entering upon a discussion of these matters. But they have engaged our attention. I am in correspondence with the Governor General and other members of the public service, on the several points that have been raised, and I can promise the hon. and learned Member that when we meet next Session he will find that I have not neglected the subject, and I shall then be prepared to discuss the matter with him, if he thinks fit to bring it under the notice of the House. There is another question of a different character which the hon. and learned Member has raised, and that is with regard to the constitution of the Council for the Government of India in this country. I can only say that this proposal raises the whole question of the Government of India, and I think it would not be convenient that we should enter upon that subject now. But the time is approaching when we may expect that by the natural course of events vacancies will arise from time to time in the Council for India. It must be recollected that although the Councillors are appointed for life, there is a provision enabling any member who has held office for ten years to quit office on a fair retiring allowance. These ten years have not yet expired, but when the time is reached it is not improbable that there may be members of Council wishing to retire, and thus we shall have from time to time persons brought in to supply their places. The question whether the period of appointment should in future be ten years or any shorter time instead of for life, is one that must require very careful discussion, and no doubt there are arguments on both sides. The argument of the hon. and learned Member is that it is desirable to introduce fresh blood, which I entirely admit; but, on the other hand, by appointing Councillors for life, it is said that you render them more independent and give them greater authority than they would otherwise possess. It is a question, however, upon which I would ask the House not at present to come to any determination. Lastly there is a Resolution, and one more directly germane to the business of the evening, which the hon. and learned Member proposes, in perfect consistency with the remarks which he has made on former occasions, to the effect that we ought not to take up the time of this House merely by asking it to put on record certain facts, but that we ought to introduce some system of voting upon the whole expenditure of India. That, again, is a question of great importance, and one in which I fully admit the hon. and learned Member has a good deal of right on his side in what he has said. But I do not think it can be the wish of the House to take on itself the control of the expenditure of India; that would be rather a delicate task; and in carrying out any such design as appeared to be first pointed at—that of voting the money for carrying on the Home Government — it must be remembered that the money comes from Indian, and not from English sources, and hence there would be considerable difficulty in drawing the line between expenditure which properly would come under the direct control of this House, and expenditure with which this House could not properly deal. I think, however, there would be great advantage in bringing the whole accounts under the more direct supervision and criticism of this House. I am not quite satisfied with the form in which these accounts are drawn up, and I propose, in concert with the Council, to introduce certain alterations, and to lay them before the House of Commons in a shape more easily intelligible. In the first place, I think it desirable that there should be more formality in the way the Estimate of the expenditure for the coming year is prepared. I am about to propose, when the next Estimate is framed, that a statement shall be laid before the Secretary of State in Council, showing in detail the differences between the last year, and the coming year, with an explanation of the reasons for the differences, and that the Secretary of State shall authorize or object to the different proposals that are made. When the year has expired and the auditor audits the accounts, I think it would be desirable that he should not only give a certificate of the money expended with proper authority, but should draw attention, as in the English accounts, to the difference between the sum estimated and the sum expended; because it might happen that an estimate of expenditure having been fixed at £120,000, the Secretary of State would give orders to increase the amount to £130,000 and the attention of the House would not be drawn to it unless some one took the trouble of comparing the accounts for the two successive years, and even then it would require a good deal of information and experience to do so. If upon reflection the House should deem it desirable to go further and, either by a vote or by referring the matter to the Committee of Public Accounts upstairs, desired to look into these matters, that would be a course which might very fairly be considered. I would rather not invite any discussion or decision upon it now, but I mention these things to show that I am attending to the subject, and am of opinion that there is an advantage in having public criticism brought to bear upon expenditure. I believe the Council for India do their duty thoroughly well; and I was sorry that some observations which fell from the hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to imply that the Council are to some extent composed of gentlemen who are past their work, and who are not really doing their duty to India. As far as my experience goes I can most emphatically contradict that statement or that impression. As far as I have any opportunity of observation, I believe every member of the Council is doing his duty conscientiously and very efficiently. But on the question of expenditure, I quite feel that, however excellent may be the intentions of the members of the Council, it is desirable that something in the nature of public discussion should from time to time take place, and in that way those who advocate economy would feel themselves backed up by public support. I have made these observations because I think anything that falls from the hon. and learned Member on Indian questions is deserving of respect. But I hope the House will not pursue the matter, or enter upon a general discussion, but will go into Committee and allow me to make a statement of the usual financial character, upon which any observations can then be offered that hon. Members may be desirous of making.

Mr. LAING said, it appeared to him that the questions which had been raised by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets were of so important a character that it was very desirable that those Members who had formed any decided opinions with respect to them should make those opinions known to the House generally, and to the Members of Her Majesty's Government. In addressing himself to those topics, he should, in the first place, observe that he did not share the belief which the hon. and learned Member seemed to entertain, that our whole system of Indian administration was radically bad, and that it ought completely to be swept away, Of course, he could not deny the existence of defects in the Government of India, such, for instance, as had led to such a calamity as had occurred in Orissa; but he thought they should start with the belief that our government of India had, on the whole, been a great and splendid success. Our Indian Empire had endured for little more than two generations, and yet it now extended from the Himayalas to Cape Comorin, and it contained three times the population of the largest Empires in Europe. Since the termination of the mutiny, India had made greater and more rapid progress in commerce and industry than had perhaps been made within so short a period by any other country. Throughout that extensive area of land, containing about 200,000,000 of souls, the average rate of wages and the average price of landed property of all kinds had, since the extinction of the mutiny, increased between 25 and 30 per cent. He was certainly within the mark when he said that Indian property and labour had risen a third or a fourth in value during the short period he was referring to, and the commerce of the country had also reached a figure which was almost unparaleled in its history. The cases of Canada and Australia were cited; but there was really no comparison between the British miner working at the gold-fields, and living in a fertile country, under a British form of government transplanted there, and the poor Ryot who, from time immemorial, long before our Empire was founded in India, worked for a miserable pittance, receiving not so much per month as the lowest paid European labourer received in a week. [Colonel Sykes: Or a day.] The career of improvement was only at its commencement in India. Railways, telegraphs, and irrigation had been referred to. He thought the manner in which railways had been carried out reflected the very highest credit upon the administration of Lord Dalhousie, who inaugurated the system. If he took the construction of railways in India, and contrasted it with the formation of the same means of communication in Russia, both of which Empires in this matter offered points of similarity, he would find the contrast altogether in favour of India. In each case there was a difficulty in the construction of railways without the assistance of Government money; there were immense tracks of country to be travelled over, and the advantages, both political and commercial, resulting from the formation of a great arterial system of railroads were alike striking in both countries; but, as he had said, the balance of progress was in favour of India. Many years ago, the Government, under the wise inspiration of Lord Dalhousie, concluded that it was of the most absolute importance that railways should be constructed in that country, and capital for that purpose was found by giving the absolute guarantee of the Government. The consequence was that a great system of railway communication had been carried out with a result which was, upon the whole, most signally successful. Great commercial profit had arisen, and would still further arise, from these railways; but it was to be borne in mind that there were questions in India of even greater importance than those of commercial profit. As an illustration, he might cite the case of the extension of the railway from Lahore to Peshawur. That line, as a mere commercial speculation, would not pay; but it was of enormous importance, in a political point of view. He was not one of those who was over - alarmed at the prospect of Russian progress in Central Asia, but at the same time he could not shut his eyes to the fact that if we did not take the precaution of securing our military communications with the frontier, a panic might some day arise; and that we might, as happened in other panics, do foolish things that might cost us in one or two years far more than the entire expense of making the railway. He trusted the right hon. Baronet would take advantage of the present cheapness of money in the market to raise the requisite amount of capital for completing the extension of that line, and such other lines as were necessary for the completion of political communications. With regard to telegraphs he was afraid they could hardly be quoted as a success in India, for the simple reason that they were carried out under Lord Dalhousie, not from commercial but political considerations; and it was notorious that they saved India at the time of the mutiny. There was, therefore, no comparison between the system of telegraphy in India and that of Australia or the United States, where the telegraphs were purely worked as commercial undertakings. The time would undoubtedly shortly come when lines of telegraph for commercial purposes would be instituted between Bombay and Calcutta; but in the meantime they must look upon the network of Indian telegraphs as being employed strictly for political objects. Having said this much upon the railways and telegraphs, he desired to make some observations upon the present state of our political government in India. He could not help thinking that it was exposed to considerable danger from changes which had recently been pursued, arising partly from the abolition of the old East India Company, and still more from changes inevitable in themselves—namely, the approximation of India to London caused by rapid steam communication and the establishment of the telegraph. The result had been greatly to diminish the authority of the Governor General —in fact, it had inaugurated a tendency to reduce his position to that of a chief clerk charged with the duty of enforcing the orders of the Secretary of State and his Council. That was a source of very considerable danger, and it was right that they should fully investigate whether such a tendency was or was not desirable. Before discussing that point he would refer to the special question which had been raised about the Government of Bengal, because he thought that the question raised by a consideration of the local government of Bengal would throw light upon the principles which ought to be observed in the larger matter of the general government of India. In Bengal they had had a grievous break-down in the case of the Orissa famine; nor had the failure of the Government of Bengal to give satisfaction been confined to this occasion alone; but comparing it with other Governments they could not fail to observe that there had been on the whole something slack and unsatisfactory in the Bengal Administration. He was aware that in the Bengal service there were a great many distinguished officers; and there was no reason to suppose that the Civil Service in the Bengal Presidency was worse than in the other provinces. If, therefore, the system had not worked well, they must look for its cause, not in the men, but in the system of government pursued. If they considered the matter thoroughly they would agree with him that an Indian Government, to be successful, must be as far as possible a personal government. As soon as they inaugurated a system of cumbrous routine and red tape, instead of dealing with the men individually—when they came to deal with Councils and Commissions they would find such a form of government radically unsuited for such a class of people as their Indian subjects. In every Indian province that had come under British sway in India there had been three kinds of rule established—the gold, the bronze, and the iron. They all began with the gold. Where a province had been previously misgoverned by Native rulers, and was brought under English sway, the best man that could be procured from one of the old provinces was sent to govern the new; and there introduced a system of government which practically amounted to a personal or patriarchal form of rule. A Chief Commissioner was appointed, who was vested with supreme powers, and the province was partitioned out to other officers—after a fashion, similar to that of the prefects in France—who administered justice according to their English notions of what was right to be done. Under that system order and justice were introduced into all the relations of life, and general prosperity of the country increased. This state was that which the Punjaub, Oude, Nagpore, British Burmah, and many other provinces now enjoyed, and under which they were rapidly acquiring habits of peaceful industry. After two or three years had passed over, and the provinces had tasted the advantages of British rule, the communities became more prosperous, and complicated interests arose so that it was not so easy to continue to govern them upon the personal system. Then came the bronze stage, partly personal, but hampered with rules and regulations, which, having served its time, succumbed finally into the iron stage, which was a system somewhat similar to that which now existed in Bengal. The personal system of government had never existed to such an extent in that province as it had in the other provinces he had enumerated; partly because, the revenue having been collected through the Zemindars, the Ryots had never been brought into so close a connection with the British officers as had been the case elsewhere. The Bengal Government was not so good a form as had prevailed in the provinces, because the Governor General of India resided at Calcutta, and Bengal, being also the residence of a Lieutenant Governor, the same amount of independence could not be exercised by the Lieutenant Governor living next door to the Governor General, as was, for instance, exercised by Sir John Lawrence in the Punjaub thousands of miles away from head-quarters. A system of red-tapism had consequently grown up in Bengal unknown in other parts of India, and a most cumbrous machinery had to be set in motion when any action of importance required to be taken. If local disturbances arose in Oude or the Punjaub (the Indigo riots, for instance) an officer of the Government would mount his horse and ride thirty or forty miles in a single night to see what was going on with his own eyes, and would probably take active and effectual means for their suppression. But in Bengal if such disturbances took place the officer would report to the Board of Revenue, who, in their turn, would probably report to the Lieutenant Governor, and the despatch, after being bandied backwards and forwards between three or four parties, would very likely finally be sent to the Home Government, and instead of immediate action the question would be hopelessly buried in foolscap and red tape, an urgent problem in the meantime remaining unsolved. That, he believed, was very much what had occurred in the lamentable Orissa famine. Without casting particular blame upon the officers on the spot, he could not conceal from himself that if they had been more intimate with the people, as they would have been under a personal form of government, they would have arrived at the actual knowledge of things much sooner than they did. He could not, moreover, help feeling that much evil would have been averted if Sir Cecil Beadon had known the people better. That gentleman he desired to speak of with the greatest respect, for he was a conscientious and intelligent man; but all the last years of his life were spent in the *bureaux* of Calcutta; he had not that experience of the people which he ought to have had, and his health was very considerably impaired when he went to Orissa. The consequence was that he came away from that country with a wrong impression of the state of things. He (Mr. Laing) thought the Governor General (Sir John Lawrence) must be exonerated from any blame in this occurrence, because Sir Cecil Beadon, who had a high character and occupied a high position, was sent to Orissa to investigate affairs on the spot, and came back and reported to Sir John that no extreme famine need be apprehended. Sir John was consequently, as it were, compelled to take for granted what was told him by his emissary, and could not be blamed for the mistake. But what they wanted now was, not to repine over the past, but to draw practical conclusions for the future, and the conclusion he drew was that everything should be done to establish a system of personal responsibility in the government of Bengal. The case of Sir Cecil Beadon also taught them that they should institute some improved mode of retirement for officers holding important stations whose health was not sufficiently good to enable them energetically to discharge their duties, but which was good enough to justify them hanging on. Some system of honourable retirement in the shape of increased pension was a desideratum much needed in connection with the Government of India. He believed, moreover, that the Board of Revenue in Bengal should be suppressed. He had the highest respect for some of the gentlemen forming the Board, but during his own short experience in India he arrived at the conclusion that that Board was an encumbrance, and, as such, mischievous. Had he been a member of Lord Canning's Council six months longer than he was he should certainly have recommended his Lordship to abolish the Board of Revenue. He could not conceive of a single argument that could be adduced in favour of its existence any longer. The question of the assimilation of the Government of Bengal to that of Bombay and Madras was one of great difficulty. It meant the appointing of an English statesman of considerable rank and position to take up a position similar to that held by Lord Napier at Madras. As long as the Governor General resided at Calcutta he foresaw the greatest difficulty in an English statesman occupying the same indedendent position in Bengal as was occupied by the Governor of Madras, for the Lieutenant Governor at Bengal must necessarily be subordinate to the Governor General at Calcutta because he was so close to him. The more practical plan would be, as far as possible, to sever the outlying provinces from the Government of Bengal, and place them under a Chief Commissioner. The only question requiring solution was whether they were not too extensive for the jurisdiction of one Chief Commissioner. As regarded the province of Bengal Proper, he thought it would be wiser to go on under the present system as long as the Governor General resided at Calcutta, doing all that could be done, at the same time to introduce more of personal responsibility, so that when wrong was committed the party who was to blame might be made amenable. Above all, they should strive in the appointment of a Lieutenant Governor for Bengal to send out a man in the prime of life, possessed of sufficient activity to move about and visit the different parts of the extensive dominions intrusted to him and see what was going on with his own eyes. As a general rule, no one was fit to be the governor of a district who could not live under canvas the greater part of the cold season. The remarks which we had made with respect to Bengal were applicable, in his opinion, to the general government of India. They should seek, as far as possible, to carry out personal responsibility. What was wanted was a good Governor General. They wanted the very best man that could be got—a man of the greatest weight, standing, and authority; for the post of governing a country like India demanded higher qualities than were required by the man who held the highest position in the Cabinet at home. Especially was a man required who had a thorough knowledge of mankind, and who was perfectly qualified to select well his instruments and subordinates. That was the great function of a Governor General. If he selected good men, all would go well; but if he selected bad men, the worst results would follow. What they wanted was a Governor General who had a knowledge of mankind, and could pick out the right man for the right place without fear or favour. On this point he thought that Lord Dalhousie was the model of a Governor General. Whatever difference of opinion there might be as to the merits of Lord Dalhousie's policy, there could be none as to the school of statesmen he formed, the tact with which he selected first-rate men, and the firmness with which he upheld his own policy among them. If there was any error in the policy of Lord Canning, it was his tendency to an undue centralization. That was a mischievous thing whether exercised in Calcutta or in Downing Street. What they wanted was a man who would act upon his own responsibility under the consciousness that he would be supported by the central authority when he was right, and even when he was wrong, unless the wrong was so glaring that it required him to be superseded. The great danger in this age of steam communication and telegraph was that men would become afraid of responsibility, or of being hauled over the coals, as it was termed, and thus they would refer every question to a superior, instead of deciding upon it themselves. The great duty, both of the Governor General and of the Secretary of State for India, was to set their face resolutely against all shirking of responsibility, and to encourage their subordinates rather to act for themselves than to check and reprove them for everything. Of course he did not mean to say that if they committed themselves in any way they would be supported in wrongdoing; but if they acted according to the best of their judgment, and in accordance with justice, they would be pretty sure of the support of their superiors. As to the Resolutions of the hon. and learned Gentleman with respect to the conduct of business, the first proposed that the Governor General should consult one Councillor of State upon one special department rather than the whole Council. But he (Mr. Laing) believed that, practically, this was the case at present. He was certainly shocked when he first went to India at the piles of notes and despatches on trifling subjects that were sent for the decision of the Governor General. But Lord Canning consulted him on the point, and it was agreed that the business should be conducted much as it was done in the English Cabinet, each Councillor taking a department and settling by himself all minor questions, taking the opinion of the Governor General on those that were more important, and only bringing before the whole Council those that were of Imperial interest. With respect to the appointment of an additional Councillor as Minister of Trade and Agriculture, he doubted its expediency, and thought that it would be better to leave trade and agriculture alone. So far as trade and agriculture came within the general scope of the Government, as it would in reference to all questions of taxation, trade, and import duties, it would be under the control of the Minister of Finance, who, if he were worth his salt, would be perfectly competent to manage them. The only other matter in which the Government might usefully interfere was that of intercommunication, which required the special knowledge of a Member of Council, who would stand in the position of Minister of Public Works. With regard to irrigation, in particular, it was necessary to have a man well acquainted with the conduct of public works in this country, who should be sent out to India in some important capacity; and although no doubt the work would be continued to carried out chiefly by military engineers, and there were many in India of high talent and great capacity, yet those great works ought not to be left entirely to them. Lord Canning told him that he had often felt the want of such an official when the Government of India were about to raise £10,000,000 or £12,000,000, perhaps at a high rate of interest, for the purpose of spending in public works. The great difficulty in dealing with irrigation was the formation of water reservoirs by means of weirs and dams, because it often happened that what in the dry season was a mere thread meandering through the valleys was in the rainy season a mighty rushing torrent, sweeping away all weirs, and very often changing the course of the stream altogether by seeking out new channels. Under those circumstances it was exceedingly difficult to carry out works of irrigation properly and effectually. At all events such works ought to be placed under the general command of a competent engineer. With respect to the Resolution for altering the composition of the Council at home, he could only say that he always considered a permanent Council highly objectionable. He did not know how it might be now; but he knew that when he was in India they caused great obstruction to business under Lord Canning. If ever they had a weak Governor General and a strong Council they would find that all questions would be referred from India to Downing Street, and nothing would be done till after two or three letters had passed backwards and forwards on the subject. The Government of India, in his opinion, should partake more of the character of personal government, and the relation of the Secretary of State to the Governor General should, as he had said, be habitually one of support and deference on matters which did not involve large questions of policy upon which opinions could be formed in England as well as in India. He knew the difficulty in which a governor was placed who had to sit at the same table with ten or twelve councillors, and the danger there was of being drawn into a position of hostility to them. His feeling then was to diminish as much as possible the influence of the Council in India; and as respected that at home, he thought it would be far better if they could, by giving increased pensions and marks of honour, secure the services of a number of distinguished Indian officers, who had returned home full of honours, who should constitute as it were a body of Privy Councillors for India, to whom the Secretary of State for India might resort for advice upon all points upon which he required it. He thought that such a body would act far better than a permanent Board which was very apt to thwart and annoy the Secretary of State. The subject was one which it was not easy to exhaust, and he could not help thinking that the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets had done essential service in bringing it forward.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR said, he congratulated the House and that portion of the public who took an interest in Indian affairs on the manner in which the Secretary of State had received the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets. The right hon. Gentleman had shown a willingness to listen to suggestions with regard to reforming the system under which our great Indian Empire was conducted which promised the best results, and he was sure the speech of the right hon. Gentleman would be received with the greatest satisfaction in India as well as in this country. We must not forget that all the nations of the world envied us our great Indian Empire, and that in most of them the greatest astonishment was expressed that the interests of this vast mass of population who were the subjects of the British Crown should receive so small a share of the attention of the House of Commons and of the English people. He thought, however, that foreigners were somewhat mistaken upon this point, because although the attendance in that House when Indian subjects came before it was thin in consequence of but few persons being intimately acquainted with the details of Indian affairs, yet when any subject of importance in connection with that country arose, the press of England took the matter up, while the people of this country showed an increasing interest in the welfare of the millions who were subject to our rule. Turning to the suggestion that had been made upon this subject in the course of the debate, he would ask what had been the end of the long line of Viceroys who had been referred to so favourably by some hon. Members? Why, the last of them left India, in 1857, in a state of rebellion. Not that he regarded the present state of apparent peace as being indicative of good government. Nothing could be more fallacious than the results which were produced by what the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) called personal government. Of course, a man of extraordinary genius could make any system work well under his personal supervision. But what was required for India was good laws that could be administered by ordinary mortals, and could be understood by everybody. He was not at all afraid of Russia if we acted wisely, but he should be very much afraid of her if we acted unwisely. The Government of Russia had of late years made considerable, but slow, quiet, and silent advances towards India by pushing forward her posts of Cossacks, and it was in the newspapers of only last week that the creation of two new Russian Governor Generalships in Turkistan were announced. The people of India had year by year a better opportunity of comparing the English with the Russian system, and they could not fail to perceive that while by our system Natives were excluded from all high official places, the Natives of the countries conquered by Russia were able to rise to the highest military and civil dignities in the Empire. The great defect in our system was this exclusion from office of the Natives, and he thought the Government had made a great mistake in instituting the Order of the Star of India instead of permitting the Natives to attain English Orders. It was to the remarkable difference between the policy of Russia and England that he would call attention, because no doubt the Indians much preferred the Russian system, and herein lay our danger. In the time of the Crimean war it was said that Georgians, Caucasians, and the Mussulman countries under her sway would rise against Russia, but they did not; and at the very time the command of the trans-Caucasian army was intrusted to an Armenian, they could not fail to see in the newspapers and in the discussions in the East Indian Association how greatly the Natives preferred the Russian system. It was incumbent upon us to consider whether we had adopted the best system, and not to be deluded by the treacherous calm which might exist. With regard, first of all, to the Governor General, had he sufficient power over the whole of India, and was he assisted by an efficient Council? He would suggest some reforms, which were applicable not only to the Supreme Council, but also to the Councils of the other Presidencies. He had long entertained an opinion that those Councils were not founded upon a right principle. In the first place, they ought not to be composed of gentlemen who were at the end of their service; who took no interest in the future of India; who were afraid of responsibility; who had no fame to gain; and whose chief endeavour was, by a judicious calm and quietness, to get out of the Council and return to their native country. The Governor General wanted men to advise him who were full of vigour and able to do a vast amount of work. Besides that the members of the Council ought to have some definite occupation. With respect to the Executive Council, which he would now speak of specially, he might remark that we ought to regard India as a separate empire, and govern it as empires and kingdoms were governed in all parts of the world where there was anything like a free Government. The members of the Council which assisted the Governor General should form a Cabinet Council for the Indian Empire, and assume the names usually given to Ministers in Europe. He would have no general adviser without any special functions to perform. This plan he would follow in the construction of the Executive Councils at Madras and Bombay, as well as that at Calcutta. Upon the Legislative Councils the Natives ought to be more fully represented than they were at present. The whole system of the Governorships needed revision. The Punjaub ought to be joined with Scinde, and we ought to have separate Governors for the trans-Indus provinces and Central India. All these alterations had, at various times, been recommended by able men, and should at once be carried out. Then would arise the question as to where the seat of government for the whole country should be placed? It ought to be located somewhere where Europeans could enjoy good health. In his opinion it should be upon the sea-coast, and he had no doubt that the proper place was Bombay, which, in addition to many other advantages, had Poonah immediately adjoining it. A Government established at the latter place would be virtually at Bombay. He did not understand why Burmah was ever annexed to India, and recommended that it should at once be placed under the control of the Colonial Office. The changes which he had suggested, especially the introduction of Natives into the Councils, would increase the independence and strength of the Indian Government, and would diminish the danger which the hon. Member for Wick had foreseen, that India might come to be too much governed from this country. It was of great importance to establish one sound and well-defined law which should be supreme in India, and to provide for the education of Natives as lawyers, so that the country might not be entirely dependent upon Europeans. He had always thought that the Council of India consisted of too many members. They ought not to be appointed for life, but after a short time they should give place to others, who might bring into the Council the latest experience from India. Two members from each Presidency would give eight or ten members, an ample number for assisting the Secretary of State in the management of Indian affairs. He agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for the Tower Hamlets that the Estimates for the expenditure of the Home Government of India should be submitted to the House. This would give satisfaction to the Natives of India. England should not require any tribute from India, but should be content to govern her as cheaply as possible.

COLONEL SYKES said, he presumed that the Resolutions of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Ayrton) were to be taken as suggestions, and not as proposals on which he intended to take the opinion of the House. Sir Cecil Beadon was no doubt to blame, to a considerable extent, for the lamentable occurrences in Orissa, because he ought to have adopted such vigorous measures as would have mitigated the evil. But the main fault lay with the local collectors and magistrates, who could not but know that the market rates for grain were rising to famine prices. He regretted to observe in the despatch of the right hon. Gentleman an intimation of some want of energy on the part of the Governor General. It should be remembered that his situation was one of excessive delicacy with regard to interference with local Governors, who were very susceptible of such interference, and he was sorry that any imputation upon the judgment of the Governor General should be conveyed by the Secretary of State. [Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: There was no such imputation, as far as I was concerned.] Personal responsibility ought to be secured, and the government of the non-regulation provinces, under men of experience and reputation, had been more successful in this respect than in the regulation provinces, where the judicial forms involved great delay, if nothing worse. On the question raised by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, whether governors should or should not be assisted by councils, he would remind the House of the opinion of Dr. Johnson, a great Tory, who laid it down as an axiom that the best form of government would be an autocracy, provided only we had angels as governors. But as angels were scarce in these days he would be sorry to have a Secretary of State for India or a Governor General an autocrat, and rejoiced they had the benefit of the advice of men of Indian experience. The hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) had complained that the servants of the Crown in India were allowed to remain there after their faculties had become worn out; but he forgot that by recent regulation thirty-five years was the utmost term of their service, so that if a gentlemen went out at eighteen years of age he could not, under any circumstances, continue in the service of the Government after he was fifty-three years old, an age at which temperate men are usually vigorous, mentally and physically. With regard to the Home Government, the Secretary of State could not spend any of the revenues of India without the consent of his Council, while in other matters he was uncontrolled, and, as in the case of Mysore, for which he applauded him, sometimes acted in opposition to his Council. The restriction as to money matters was highly essential, for otherwise a Secretary might indulge his crotchets in the expenditure of large sums of money, and might even apply money for political purposes in this country. While, however, approving the existence of a Council, he agreed in the objection to appointments for life. The Directors of the East India Company used to retire every four years, and were ineligible for re-election until after twelve months' interval. Although generally, they were not always re-elected; this depending on the efficiency which they had manifested: that *régime* worked well for more than 100 years, and he believed that had it been continued a better feeling would now prevail in India, both amongst the servants of the State and the population of India. The hon. Member for Wick had spoken of the splendid success of the present system, and he would not deny that great material progress had been made, at least so far as was indicated by an increased revenue; but much discontent existed among the Native troops of Madras and Bombay on account of their degradation from regular to irregular troops, notwithstanding their tried loyalty, during the mutiny of the Bengal Army. One word with respect to the future of education. The Indian Colleges were now turning out men equal to those who took a double first at Oxford or a senior wranglership at Cambridge, and it was absurd to suppose that such men, so endowed and so fitted for functions of importance, would be content to stand by with folded arms, while all the posts of dignity or emolument were in the exclusive possession of Englishmen. The Mahomedan conquerors of India always associated Natives with them in the Government, and some of the most distinguished financiers of Akbar and Aurungzebe were Hindoos. Although India as a whole, owing to its division into twenty-one nations and languages and with no common sympathies, had always been, and would continue to be, ruled by foreigners, it behoved us as a matter of policy to associate duly qualified Natives with us in the Government of the country wherever we had an opportunity of doing so.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I should not detain the House from going into Committee but for the observations of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton) on the part taken by the Governor General as to schemes for railways in the North West of India—observations that contain serious, though I am sure quite unintentional inaccuracies. The hon. and learned Gentleman has stated that Sir John Lawrence had pressed somewhat unduly the railway schemes in the North West of India. If it were true that Sir John Lawrence had pressed forward those schemes, I hardly think it would be a matter of reproach to him, for, in my opinion, whenever the financial condition of the country renders it possible to complete them, they will be of the greatest public benefit. When I was in office I was in close correspondence with Sir John Lawrence on this subject, and I am bound to say, as a matter of fact, that on financial grounds Sir John Lawrence was exceedingly adverse to those schemes being proceeded with at present. With reference to the general character of the Motion before us, I agree with the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) that we should carefully avoid language of exaggeration in respect of this matter, and to say that the Indian Government has egregiously failed in any considerable affairs it has undertaken would be a very great exaggeration. On the whole, without reference to such miserable matters as the Orissa famine, which we discussed the other day, it has been brilliantly successful, and I certainly should not have selected the railway system as its vulnerable point. My hon. Friend (Mr. Laing) said it would compare well with the experience of Russia. I might go further and say—though it might be a delicate thing to do so—that it would compare well with the experience of England. Then, as regards the complaint made by my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Ayrton) that a railway which was guaranteed, or could have been guaranteed, by a certain Native Prince, had not been carried out, my impression is that this is not a solitary case, but that, in one or two instances, there had been a desire to construct railways in the territories of Native Princes; but that had not been acceded to owing to considerations of policy, the force of which even my hon. and learned Friend will hardly be disposed to deny. Those railways, as a rule do not pay; they are only constructed from considerations of the prosperity they are calculated to bring to the people through whose territory they pass, and obviously it is the first duty of the Government that money paid out of the Exchequer for this purpose shall be spent in the construction of lines through the territory under our immediate rule. When this end has been accomplished, we must then turn our thoughts to the assistance of railway projects in the territory of the Nizam or of the Maharajah Holkar. There is another point in which the Indian Government has been deficient, and that is the point of irrigation. We are blamed —and in that lies one of the mysteries of the India Office which I have not been able to fathom, and which I do not believe anybody else will—for not having done as much as we ought in the way of irrigation. There certainly was a misunderstanding on the subject. Sir Charles Wood was, I believe, very anxious about irrigation, and I know Sir John Lawrence was; but, however, neither could convince the other that he was anxious about it, and it is impossible to say how the misunderstanding arose. But in reference to the smaller works of irrigation, the cause of delay in these cases is, I believe, the disposition of officials to refer everything, however insignificant, to the authorities at Calcutta, occasioning thereby a large amount, not only of delay, but of unnecessary irritation. The evil is a growing one, and it prevails now to a terrible extent, and when I say this I am breaking no official confidence, for I have received information on the subject since I left office. I have heard of cases in which the Imperial Government has been worried about an expenditure of £18 or £20. The very smallest matters are referred to them—even such as the erection of a sentry-box outside the Government House. I believe a great deal of the delay and inefficiency of which the hon. and learned Gentleman complains is due to the extreme and exaggerated contralization which prevails at Calcutta. My right hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) could do no better service to India than by restricting, as far as possible, the powers of the Central Government to matters of large importance. Divide the territory of India as much as you can, place areas of small extent under the Governors, and then let the Central Government find out how much money it can spare to each and give them the liberty to spend it as they think best. It is not merely the waste of time that must take place, or the ignorance that must be shown by officials at Calcutta of the affairs throughout the rest of India that is so important; but it is this—that unless you give free action to carry out the work to which they are devoted to the men whose business it is to do so, their spirits sink, the work is done in a perfunctory manner, and you can never replace that zeal which enthusiasm alone can give. I believe that to be the secret of the failure in carrying out the small public works in India. With reference to the other subjects which have been discussed, I cannot hope to rival the clearness of expression of my hon. Friend the Member for Wick, who has so admirably laid down the principle of personal responsibility—a principle that ought to be deeply graven on the heart of every one connected with the Government of India. There is one subject, however, upon which I wish to say a few words, and that is the question of the position of the Indian Council, and the amount of power to be entrusted to it. We all know that this Council was constituted at a time of considerable difficulty, and that it was the result of Parliamentary compromise; therefore *à priori*, we cannot expect that it will work as well as a scheme matured under better auspices. That it has worked as well as it has done is due not only to the very great ability of the individuals who compose the Council, but to the singular and marvellous reserve with which they have exercised the powers which Parliament has placed in their hands. You cannot always expect, if you choose to place extravagant powers in a particular body, that those powers will not be sometimes misused. I do not deny that there must be a control over the Secretary of State, who is under the temptation to spend money improperly in two ways. In the first place he is under the pressure to make India pay for what England ought properly to pay. In the next place he is under the pressure of hon. Gentlemen, whom I very much respect—such as the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Kinnaird), the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton), and the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Crawford) — Gentlemen connected with very great industrial undertakings in India, undertakings which are worthy of every protection and encouragement. But Gentlemen take a partial view of the special affairs with which they are connected, and if they had entirely their own way they might perhaps sometimes get more money out of the Secretary of State than they ought; and there is also the danger, which has been referred to, that the Secretary of State for India might spend money out of the revenues of India for the purpose indirectly of obtaining political support at home. I think, therefore, the protection of a Council which has power to limit the expenditure is desirable, and should be sustained; but the point to which I take exception is that the responsibility for that expenditure is not thrown on the Council. I will take an instance which will bring my meaning home. We had lately a discussion about the irrigation works, and we did not know whom to blame. One hon. Gentleman concluded that the hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) was to blame, another that Sir Charles Wood was to blame, or Sir John Lawrence. But nobody suggested that it might possibly be the Indian Council. I do not say it was; I only speak hypothetically, and have no knowledge on the subject. But remember that the Council have every item of expenditure, large and small, under their control, and every act of the Government which can involve expenditure—that is to say, the vast majority of its acts. But you never blame the Council if the Government of India goes wrong. You blame the Secretary of State; he is the figure that stands before Parliament. You find irrigation works not carried on, you find a great province starving, and for all you know it may be the Council which prevents the Secretary of State from taking any measures at all. [Colonel SYKES: The Council have the control of pecuniary measures?] Yes, of everything which involves expenditure, directly or indirectly. When I was in office I took the best opinion on the subject. Now, these are hypothetical suggestions which I have made; what I wish to do is to impress upon the House that you hold the Secretary of State responsible for a policy in India and what it produces; but you never know whether he carries out his own policy, or a policy imposed upon him, either by the absolute votes of his Council or by a clear indication of their will. It seems to me that if the Council is to control the Secretary of State, the Council ought to bear the responsibility. Let every man bear his own burden. If the Secretary of State approve a certain policy, let him embody in it a despatch, and send it out, without any questions as to whether the Council approved of it or not before it was written, and if the Council thinks him wrong, let them write a despatch which shall arrest that policy. It is not fair to hold the Secretary of State responsible and keep him in the foreground while they lie in the background and really control the Indian policy. It seems a small matter, and until hon. Gentlemen have thought it over I fear it is impossible to impress on them its importance. As the case stands at present, the policy which governs India has no distinct authorship or parent; it is a joint product, and the Secretary of State is responsible for it only in this sense, that he is "the whipping-boy" on whom the blows must fall if that policy fails. I do not believe you will ever have any wide, general principles applied to the Government of India so long as there is that indistinct and confused apportionment of responsibility and power. I quite agree with the hon. and learned Gentleman that a shorter tenure of office might be desirable in the case of the members of the Council; but only on the understanding that a thoroughly good retiring pension is given to those who go out, because unless you make some provision of that kind you will not, in the first instance, get the best men to sit upon the Council. But all these matters must come under the review of the Government, and therefore although we have kept my right hon. Friend (Sir Stafford Northcote) for some time from his Financial Statement, I shall not be sorry if we have thereby been able to direct his mind to the importance of overhauling, both here and in India, the machinery by which that great dependency is governed, so that he may present to us, if possible, next year some scheme which shall correct the errors signalized in the debate to-night—a scheme which shall carry out in England and in India more completely the great principle laid down by the hon. Member for Wick—that personal responsibility is the thing requisite in the government of India.

MR. J. STUART MILL said, that as the House, notwithstanding the deprecation of the Minister for India, had drifted into a debate on general policy, and as the right hon. Gentleman would be expected next year to bring forward a measure which might effect changes in the machinery of government, he could not help expressing his fear lest some of the changes which had been recommended would make the administration of India worse than it was at present. The use and importance of Councils had, in particular, been undervalued. No doubt it was a most important principle of representation that responsibility should rest as far as possible on one person, and that that person should not be screened by a Board or Council. But he apprehended that this principle applied only to one department of the Government —the Executive. Now, the work of Government was twofold ; it was executive and deliberative : and in the Indian Government the deliberative was quite as extensive as the executive work, and even more important. As was stated by the hon. Member for Wick, there was no place in the world where so much depended on the personal qualities of the particular officer who was intrusted with power in all the important appointments. Upon the person who was at the head of the administration in any one district of India the prosperity of that district, to a very large extent, depended. But it did not follow that you had only to choose the best man, and then leave him to do as he liked. You should not rely solely upon the policy of one man, and that a man who filled office only for a brief period. Before any important act was done in India, there should be a full and complete statement, as far as possible, of the different sides of the question ; the *pros* and *cons* should be brought forward by different people, and not solely by the particular officer concerned. Especially should this be so in the case of the Governor General. He perfectly agreed in the opinion that those who were entrusted with the chief power in India should not in general be persons who had passed their lives there. India ought to furnish knowledge of detail ; but knowledge of principles and general statesmanship should be found more easily and in greater abundance in England, and here it should be sought. But when this officer went out to India, however able he might be, he rarely knew anything of his business. No doubt an able man would learn his business quicker than another man ; but meanwhile he must be more or less dependent on the opinion of other people. That opinion, if he had not a well-chosen and sufficiently numerous Council, must be the opinion of the executive officers under him. Such opinions were often very valuable, but those who gave them were under no responsibility for the advice thus given. Now, if there was one thing more than another to which the great success of our Indian administration was due—for notwithstanding many defects it was on the whole a successful administration—it was to the fact that the Government had, to so large an extent, been carried on in writing; that no important act had been done the reasons for which had not been fully stated on paper, so that those at a distance were able to study them, and to decide upon the validity of the arguments by which the responsible officers justified their acts. It was not enough to trust to one despatch from the one officer who was so responsible ; there should be a substantial discussion in the place itself, so that if different opinions were held on the subject, all of them should be placed before the functionary who was to decide in the last resort. It was this necessity which justified not only the existence of Councils, but of numerous Councils. He did not agree with his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Ayrton) that the Government of Bengal had been a Government of inefficient, superannuated people. He did not wish to say anything of Sir Cecil Beadon, whose conduct had been so much canvassed of late, because he did not know much of that gentleman ; but those who preceded him were, first, Mr. Halliday, and then Sir J. P. Grant, and two more efficient, enlightened administrators than those gentlemen were, it would be difficult to find in any service. Like all the great officers in India, these men were over-worked ; and this was the great excuse for their shortcomings. The Governor of Bengal had never had the benefit of a Council. He (Mr. Stuart Mill) thought it was desirable that he should have one. If that Governor had had the benefit of an efficient Council, perhaps that great calamity which had lately occurred in a particular district of India would have been averted. One reason the more for a Council in Bengal would be supplied if it were determined that a member of the Civil Service should not be at the head of this Government, and that Bengal should be put on the same footing in this respect as Bombay and Madras. In that case it would be all the more necessary that the Governor should have some members of the Civil Service to assist him. He believed that such a Council would have been created in Bengal if it had not been for the expense. It was from motives of economy that a Council had not hitherto been appointed. As the Governor General and his Council were nearer to the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal than to the Governments of Bombay and Madras, it was thought that in Bengal a local Council could be dispensed with. But he was afraid that this would be found, and had, indeed, been found, a mistake. In appointing to the great office of Governor General or Viceroy, it might be said with truth that every Government had, as a general rule, chosen one of the best of themselves—a man who might aspire to a high or even to the highest office in this country. In that respect there had been no failure of duty, though mistakes had now and then been made. But his experience did not tell him that the same care and conscientiousness had been shown in England in choosing men to be the Governors of the minor Presidencies. He had known stupid men, careless, frivolous men, idle men, appointed to both the minor Presidencies—men so little fitted for the business of government that if it had not been for their Councils he did not know how the government of those Presidencies would have gone on. It seemed to him, therefore, that if instead of a Lieutenant Governor there was to be a Governor of Bengal and a Governor of the North-Western Provinces, it was more important than ever that each of them should have a Council. One word now as to the Council of India in this country. The difficulty raised by the noble Lord opposite was real, and required serious consideration. On the one hand, it was of the highest importance to have a Council which should be a check upon the Secretary of State in matters of expense. On the other hand, it was true, as the noble Lord said, that the Secretary of State was in some degree compelled to bear a responsibility which might not be his own. How this difficulty should be overcome—if it could be overcome—was a matter well deserving the consideration of the House. But with regard to the necessity of a Council, and even of a numerous Council, not only to prevent the waste of the money of India, but also for the purpose of enlightening the Secretary of State on the general affairs of India, it appeared to him (Mr. Stuart Mill) to be clearer than many hon. Gentlemen seemed to think. He believed that many persons looked at it as if the question was, whether the Secretary of State should prevail or the Council, overlooking the fact that the Council would most probably not be all of one mind. The great advantage of a Council was that it represented many minds, that it embodied many of the opinions existing among public men. This was the case in the Court of Directors of the East India Company. They comprised permanent settlement men, village settlement men, and Ryotwar men: and again, in judicial matters, men who were for the regulation system, men who were for the non-regulation system, and men who were for the Native system. Indeed, every variety of Indian policy was there represented. There was no leading variety of Indian policy, the reasons for and against which were not certain to be stated very strongly by persons who had studied the subject, and were capable of urging the best arguments in favour of the views they advocated. It was surely an advantage to the Secretary of State, who could seldom know much about India when he took office for the first time, to obtain on the best authority that various knowledge which the great diversities of people and civilization rendered necessary. When he (Mr. Stuart Mill) was concerned, in a subordinate capacity, in the administration of India, he found that those who were at the centre of government in England really knew India, as a whole, better than those who were in India. Gentlemen knew their own Presidencies, and those who were concerned in the administration of one had more or less of prejudice against the system which prevailed in another. Those who were resident in Bengal knew less of Madras and Bombay, and *vice versâ*, than those who had access to the records of all the Presidencies and were accustomed to deliberate upon and discuss them, and to write about them; and so with regard to each of the Presidencies. He believed that a much more unprejudiced view of Indian affairs would be found in a Council than in any one of the local Governments, or even in the Governor General, if he were not acting with a Central Board. He thought that no Secretary of State who was aware of the imperfection of his own knowledge when he entered office, would wish to deprive himself of the advantage which he was likely to derive from an experienced Council. It was, however, another question whether the members of that Council should hold their office for life. It would be better, in his opinion, that they should give up office at intervals; but, nevertheless, he thought that they should be eligible for re-election; and therefore power should be given to the Council to re-elect and to the Crown to re-appoint any member who was still in the vigour of his intellect and capable of rendering good service to the country. Those were the observations he was desirous of making.

MR. J. B. SMITH said, the House was indebted to the notice of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton) for this interesting debate on Indian affairs. It was disgraceful to the country and insulting to our fellow-subjects in India that the important questions which had been discussed this evening should have been delayed to the last week in the Session; and he desired to give notice that he should early in the ensuing Session, unless in the meantime something was done in the matter, call the attention of the House to the importance of making up the Indian accounts to such a period as would enable the Secretary of State for India to bring forward his Budget at the beginning instead of the end of the Session as had become his custom, and thus afford the opportunity of more frequently and more fully discussing Indian questions. There could be no doubt that India had made great material progress within the last few years since the partial opening out of roads, railways, and water communications, which had enabled her more fully to develop her vast resources. The results thus obtained were a great encouragement to proceed in the same direction. The civil war in the United States had led to an enormous increase of our trade with India for cotton. In 1856 the value of our imports of cotton from India amounted only to £3,500,000; last year we imported from thence to the value of £25,000,000. It was the extraordinary influx of the precious metals into that country in payment for cotton, and the large profits on its cultivation, that had enabled the poor Ryots to free themselves from debt, and to rise from a position of absolute poverty to comparative independence. The extreme high prices for cotton ceased with the American war, and henceforth India will have to compete with that country, and unless she can produce cotton as good and as cheap as America she will lose that trade. Twenty years ago his hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham obtained the appointment of a Committee of this House to inquire into the question of the growth of cotton in India, with the view of rendering this country more independent of supplies from the United States, which were always precarious from the existence of slavery there. Results have proved the wisdom of that step; but although the Committee reported that the cultivation of cotton in India might be greatly improved and rendered a valuable article for our manufacturers, strange to say every effort in that direction had been discouraged by the Government, who had actually employed persons to write books to show the impossibility of improving the growth of cotton in India. True, the East India Company had tried the cultivation by American planters with little success; but Mr. Shaw, their collector at Dharwar, in spite of the difficulties thrown in his way, had, by his dogged perseverance, proved that India was capable of producing cotton from American seed, equal in quality to common American cotton. That gentleman at length succeeded in persuading the Government to allow him to purchase 500 bales of cotton grown from Indian seed, and the same quantity grown in Dharwar from American seed, with the view of testing the value of each by selling them by public auction at Bombay. The American planters employed by the East India Company pronounced the cotton grown from Indian seed to be the best, and the merchants at Bombay concurred in that opinion by giving a higher price for it by public auction than for that grown from American seed. When, however, this cotton found its way to Liverpool that grown from Indian seed sold for 3½*d.* per lb. only, while that grown from American seed sold for 6¼*d.* per lb. He (Mr. Smith) had for years past, year by year, accompanied deputations from the Chamber of Commerce and from the Cotton Supply Association of Manchester to lay these facts before the Government of India without effect, and also to impress upon it that it was necessary to the improvement of the quality of any Indian produce to combine European skill with Indian labour, as had been successfully done in the cases of indigo, silk, sugar, and other articles. It was necessary to the improved cultivation of cotton in India that an European agency should be established, and that it should be supported by the influence of the Government. At length, with great difficulty, the Government had been induced to try the experiment of appointing a special agent in the province of Kandeish; and mark the extraordinary results. Mr. Ashburner, the collector of Kandeish, persuaded the people to change their seed, and to sow Oomrawattie instead of Kandeish seed; the result was that the value of the crop grown from the new seed was more by £569,000 than that of the indigenous seed—that is to say, the introduction of Berar seed into Kandeish has been equivalent to a remission of the whole land revenue amounting to £324,283, with a bonus added of upwards of £240,000, which is left in the hands of the Ryots and local dealers. What has been done in Kandeish may be done elsewhere; and the time is arrived when every facility should be given to the Indian grower of cotton to enable him fairly to compete with the American. At present the best quality of Indian cotton is grown in Berar, 500 miles from Bombay, the port of shipment, and the cost of carriage even by railway would not be less than 1*d.* per lb.; whereas, if the water communication by the Godavery River to Corringa were opened out, it might be conveyed to a port of shipment for half a farthing per lb.; thus enabling the Indian growers of cotton to compete with the American planters, who get their cotton carried 1,000 miles down the Mississippi to New Orleans for that sum. It was of the greatest importance to secure to India our market for the sale of their cotton; and he hoped this question would seriously engage the attention of the Indian Government.

Mr. AYRTON said, that after having received an assurance from the Secretary of State for India that the subjects which he had introduced to the House had engaged his attention, and would continue to do so during the recess, and that the House should have an opportunity of maturely considering the whole subject during the next Session, he felt that the only course open to him was to ask leave to withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

East India Revenue Accounts *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said: I hope the long and interesting discussion which has taken place on Indian affairs will not have so completely exhausted the attention and energies of hon. Members as to prevent them from giving a few minutes' attention to the question of the financial position of that country. I rise under considerable disadvantage, after the more interesting and general discussion which has taken place, in order to make what is comparatively a dry and uninteresting statement. But hon. Gentlemen will remember that there is nothing so essential to the prosperity of any country, or certainly nothing more essential, than that its finances should be in good order; and therefore I trust hon. Gentlemen who have shown an interest in the previous discussion will allow me to state, as briefly as I can, the financial position of India. As hon. Members are aware, the ordinary method of stating the Indian Budget is, first of all, to speak, not of the year just expired, but of the year before it, of which we have what is called the actual account. The last actual account we have received is for the year 1865-6, terminating on the 30th of April, 1866. With regard to that, it can hardly be necessary that I should enter into any very lengthened statement, because the time is so far gone past that the interest that might be felt in the finances of the period must nearly have passed away. In fact, I do not think I should have found it necessary to say anything of the finances of that year but for the remarkable statement with which Mr. Massey opened his Budget in March last. Mr. Massey said—speaking of 1865-6 — that whereas about four months before the termination of the year he had estimated for a deficiency of £300,000, he found that the result showed not only no deficiency, but a surplus of £2,740,000. That certainly appears rather remarkable; but when you come to look into it more closely the wonder is very much diminished, and it resolves itself into a question of the manner in which the Indian accounts have been kept. In the first place, the surplus in part arose from the transfer of the loan account from the Treasury to the Bank of Bengal. These accounts had been kept in a rather loose manner; the money advanced on loan was paid into the Treasury, and after a time application was made for securities to be issued in respect of it; but the securities were often not issued for a considerable time after the money had been lodged; and when it was thought desirable to transfer the accounts from the Government Treasuries to the Banks, and to enter them according to the new system of accounting in the Government books, it so happened that the amount which had been received at that particular time was somewhat more than £1,000,000 above what appeared on the other side as the amount of securities issued, and consequently the year's receipts were made to appear to be upwards of £1,000,000 more than was really the case. We must therefore set that amount aside as having nothing to do with the finance of the country. Another case in which the surplus mentioned in Mr. Massey's statement was founded upon an error of computation arose in the matter of stores. Mr. Massey stated that there had been a saving of something like £500,000 in the stores passed from England; but there was no real saving at all. Instead of there having been £500,000 less spent, the expenditure had been £15,000 more; because certain sums had been charged in the accounts here, and had not been transferred into Mr. Massey's account. Then there was a very large sum brought into the revenue of 1865-6 which did not properly belong to it. A large balance had been kept at the private banks on account of the railway companies; these balances should not have been kept there; they were transferred to the Government account, and so came in aid of the revenue of 1865-6, but though they certainly came in aid of the finances of that year they did not belong to it, and this was an accidental advantage which should not be accepted as indicative of an improvement in the resources of India. Then there was a sum of £300,000 on account of land revenue, properly belonging to the following year, which came into that year by anticipation, swelling the receipts, and diminishing the receipts of the next year. These receipts all helped entirely to alter the nature of the financial balance at the end of 1865-6; but of course it is necessary to do no more than mention the facts; they do not call for discussion. With regard to the year 1866-7, the Budget Estimate was originally framed with the anticipation that there would be a tolerably even balance of receipts and expenditure. It was estimated that the receipts would be £46,752,800, and that the expenditure would be £46,825,600, so that it would be necessary to provide for the deficit of £72,800. We will now compare the actual results with the Budget Estimate. The year 1866-7 was curtailed by one month for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of State to bring forward the Budget sooner; but I am afraid, so far as this year is concerned, the experiment has not been brilliantly successful. In bringing forward the Indian Budget, however, much more depends upon the pressure of public business in this country than upon the time at which the information comes from India, which is usually much earlier than is convenient for its discussion in this House. Some observations fell from the hon. Member opposite (Mr. J. B. Smith) as to the period of the present debate; but I am sure that, late in the Session as it may be, there is now a more attentive and efficient audience than there would have been at any earlier season. I regret myself that when they were changing the financial year the time was not carried further back, so as to make the year close on the 31st of December. I have not yet been able to ascertain why this cannot be done, though probably it is my own fault, for everybody else says it is out of the question. At all events, the change having been made, it would be unadvisable now, without some strong ground, to disturb the present arrangement, under which the year closes at the same time as the English financial year—namely, on the 31st of March. In consequence of the change actually made we are unable to make a very fair comparison between the receipts and expenditure of the eleven months of 1866-7 and the Estimate formed for the whole twelve months; but we know the general result, and I am sorry to say that it is unsatisfactory. According to the Budget Estimate, for twelve months, the deficiency should have been £70,000, but the regular Estimate for eleven months shows a deficiency of £2,400,000. That deficit is due to several circumstances, and, in the first place, to the deficiency of the revenue. In opium the deficiency, after allowing for the month which was not brought into the fiscal year, was £952,000. There was a deficiency of £140,000 in the mint receipts, owing to the small amount of silver and copper coinage; and a further deficiency under the head of receipts for public works to the extent of £524,000, caused by the failure of the land sales in Bombay. Hon. Gentlemen are aware that very considerable works of reclamation and improvement were lately in progress in Bombay, and it was anticipated that large sales of the reclaimed land would be made at high prices, so as to pay for the works done; but the year 1866-7 was one, as we all know, of great commercial distress, which specially affected Bombay, and consequently the receipts from these sales fell very far short of the anticipations which had been formed. These three heads of deficiency affect the revenue to the extent of £1,600,000; and then, again, there are two items of excess of expenditure on the railway account amounting to about £400,000. When I say excess of expenditure, I ought properly to call it deficiency of revenue, for the net payment on account of the railways was greater by £400,000 than it was expected to be, not because of the charge for interest being higher, but because of the traffic receipts being less. The year was one of considerable physical as well as commercial trouble; floods and other circumstances interrupted the traffic, and from one cause or other the receipts fell short. Another, and a very heavy, item of expenditure comes upon the home charges for the year; £580,000 for the new transports provided for the troop service between this country and India. Taking these items, the deficiency of revenue and the excess of expenditure together, they will more than account for the figures which I have already given. On the other hand, there are some important items of improvement. There is one that I notice with particular pleasure, because it shows that although the year was, as we know, an unfortunate one, yet there was a considerable amount of comfort, of affluence even, among the labouring classes of India. The item is that of the revenue from salt; and I am happy to say that the revenue from salt in eleven months exceeded the amount that had been estimated for the entire year by no less than £279,000, and if the entire twelve months had been run out the excess would have been £330,000. This shows that there is a great consuming power among the labouring classes. In this country we look to the revenue from customs and excise as a test of the condition of the country; in India the revenue from salt is that which we look upon as a test of the well-being of the labouring classes. That is the result, generally speaking, of the finances of the year 1866-7. Of course, we are now speaking of what is called the regular Estimate, and it is possible that when we get the finally completed account it may turn out that there will be some difference between what I have stated and the actual sums; but it is not probable that you will have again such great differences as marked the year 1865-6. The year has been one of deficiency. Some of the causes of the deficiency are of a temporary character, and we may hope that when we have to deal with a year of a more regular and average character, we shall not have the recurrence of such a deficiency. At the same time, the fact of so large a deficiency does give us cause to look with some anxiety at the state of our accounts, and naturally and necessarily to consider whether there are any measures which can be taken to bring about a better condition of our finances. The first question, of course, is whether it is possible to reduce the expenditure of the country. I desired that an account might be made out of the expenditure of India, taking the year 1865-6 of which we had the latest complete accounts, and dividing the expenditure into two or three large heads, so that we might compare them with the expenditure of the United Kingdom, and ascertain the proportion which they bear. These heads are necessarily very rough, but some points of the comparison are interesting. The Indian expenditure upon the army, adding to this the cost of the marine and transport services, appears to be about 39 per cent of the whole expenditure in 1865-6, whereas in the United Kingdom for the same year the whole military expenditure, including the army and the navy, amounted only to about 37 per cent. It appears, therefore, that the military expenditure of India somewhat exceeds the proportion of the military expenditure of the United Kingdom. That is a little startling at first, because we must remember that India does not keep up a navy or hardly anything in the shape of a marine, except a few transport vessels. But when we come to consider whether anything can be done in the way of reducing this large head of expenditure, I am bound to say that I am not very sanguine of being able to bring about any large reduction. Of course, there are only two ways in which reductions can be effected. Either we must reduce the amount of our forces, or we must in some way economize in the mode of paying and maintaining them. I do not feel that I can hold out to the House or to the country any very great hopes that it would be safe or possible largely to reduce our force. I do not mean to say that there might not be reductions here and there; but when we consider the nature of our tenure of India, and see how much depends, not only on our being strong, but on our being thought to be strong, and what serious consequences might follow from any unwise reductions, either by the encouragement of domestic troubles, or anything in the nature of troubles from without, it is a very serious question whether we ought to attempt any diminution of our strength. I do not rest this matter on my own opinion merely, which I should give with extreme diffidence, but I rely greatly on the opinion of the Governor General, to which, under all the circumstances, we ought peculiarly to trust. The Governor General, who is personally responsible for maintaining the peace of India, and who, from his position, can form an opinion far better than we are capable of doing, must at all times be regarded as a very high authority. And Sir John Lawrence is a man whose opinion upon such a question ought to weigh very greatly indeed. In the first place Sir John Lawrence is a man of large Indian experience. He knows what both the domestic—if I may use the term—necessities of India are, and what are her wants in respect of security against her border neighbours. Then, he is a man who is by no means chargeable with having an extravagant turn of mind. If there is a fault charged against him in matters of expenditure, it is much more commonly said that he is disposed to be too critical and economical than that his tendency is towards extravagance. Again, if you look to his foreign policy, I think you will find it difficult to point to any Governor General who has been more opposed to aggression and to foreign war than Sir John Lawrence. Well, then, finding, as I do find—I will not say as regards some minor points, but taking the matter broadly — that Sir John Lawrence is against any material reduction in the army, I do not feel justified in looking to such a reduction for a decrease in our Indian expenditure. Then comes the question whether, if we are to maintain the same force, we can reduce the cost of the establishment? There, again, I am sorry to say, my ideas are anything but encouraging. We must bear in mind that the cost of living and all other expenses are largely increasing in India, and, consequently, we can scarcely expect that any establishment, whether civil or military, can be kept up at a less cost than heretofore. Even in this country you have found it necessary to increase the pay of our soldiers, and, though what you have done in that respect does not directly involve an increase to our troops in India, there is no doubt that we shall have to do the same thing in the case of the European soldiers in India, so that there is the likelihood of an increase rather than of a diminution in the cost of the establishment in our Indian Empire. Then there are those sanitary questions which are most important, and which are in a true sense economical. I believe it is true economy to spend money wisely to improve the health and the accommodation of your troops; but I cannot say that it is likely to enable you to reduce the amount of the expenditure which you must be prepared to make. Something has been said to-night on the subject of the railways which are in contemplation for the North West Provinces. I must entirely and cordially endorse the opinion which has been expressed that it is of the highest importance we should, as far as possible, strengthen those provinces by pushing those railways on; but, in reference to what fell from the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, I think I may assure the hon. Gentleman that, owing to other works which have to be carried on, especially with regard to the Indus Valley and the Rajpootana lines, there is no danger of that hurry which he seems to apprehend in the case of those railways. At the same time, I repeat that the Government are quite alive to the importance of doing all in their power to facilitate the transport of troops, because by this means we economize, as we enable a smaller number of men to do the work of a greater number. It is for this reason our new transports and our lines of telegraph by bringing India practically nearer to London are of a very great importance in an economical, as well as in a political, sense. Though we may not be able to reduce the cost of our military service, we may be able by degrees to improve and increase its efficiency very materially. I believe myself that we have nothing to fear from foreign aggression; but, at the same time, the more we strengthen ourselves and husband our resources, the greater will be the security of our Indian Empire. Our army and marine service in India is not costing much more now than it did before the mutiny, and nothing like so much as when the expenditure for this branch was at its highest. In 1856-7 the army and marine cost £12,400,000; in 1858-9 it was £22,000,000; for the last year it was £13,207,000, with some addition for stores and new transports. The next item of expenditure is the collection of the revenue which amounts to 18 per cent. That appears large, because in the United Kingdom the cost is only 9 per cent; but the collection of the revenue in India is something very different from the collection of the revenue in England; because, in the former case, the collection of the taxes on opium and salt comprises in some places the cultivation of the opium and the manufacture of the salt. Then in the collection of the land revenue there is expenditure which ought not properly to come under that head. With regard to all those services which may be put together under the head "Law, Police, Education, &c., Civil Service, and Miscellaneous," while the expenditure in the United Kingdom is 14 per cent, in India it amounts to 20 per cent; but here a great deal is charged on local taxation, which in India falls on the Government. As it is with regard to the military service, so it is with the civil. The expense is increasing. Great demands are made in consequence of the improvements in your system of government. You cannot carry on those improvements without enlarging your establishments; and, though you may revise here and there, and lop off superfluous Commissioners and Boards, yet, if you carry out law, justice, education, and sanitary measures, to which an enormous importance attaches, properly, you must be prepared to extend your establishments liberally, and, in order to make your servants do your work satisfactorily, you must pay them adequately, so that neither in this department do I see any great prospect of a reduction of the expenditure. The total amount of salaries and expenses of the Public Department was, in 1860-1, £3,900,000; last year it was £3,824,000. A considerable addition has, however, been made within the last few months owing to an increase in the salaries. I have had a statement made out which I think shows that the additions to salaries made since the Budget statement of last year come to something like £200,000. I may observe that all these matters are closely scrutinized by the Government of India. For the most part, the additions are made by the local Government. They are then revised, and, it is said, rather rigorously, by the supreme Government of India, and subsequently they are sent home for the opinion of the Secretary of State in England. I do not think that as they pass through the mill in this way any great extravagance can prevail. Under another head of expenditure—the interest of debt — India compares more favourably with England. The interest on the debt of the United Kingdom is 39 per cent on the expenditure. The interest on the debt of India is only 11 per cent on the expenditure. It is true that the debt has been increasing of late years; but I do not think it has been increasing in greater proportion than the revenue, and we see satisfactorily in one point how liabilities which rose some years ago are now falling again. I refer to the guaranteed interest upon railways, on which, in 1863-4 the net amount paid was £1,669,000; in 1867-8 it was only £580,000. The hon. Member for Wick says it is not of very much importance that the debt of a country is increasing if her revenue is increasing at the same time. Now, while I do not admit that as a rule of general application, I do think that in India, where the debt only bears a moderate proportion to the resources of the country, and where the latter are largely developing, there is no reason to be alarmed at the advance which the debt has made. I observe that the public are not alarmed, because the prices of Indian securities keep their position extremely well in comparison with Consols. I have taken Consols as the standard in our public credit, and compared with them the Indian Rupee Paper—a security in which there has been no change, no alteration of the rate of interest, and no postponement or other dealing which would affect the price of the stock. I found that in January, 1861, the price of Consols was 92¾; the price of Indian Rupee Paper 95. Last January Consols stood at 90½, or more than 2 per cent below what they were in January, 1861; but Indian Rupee Paper brought 101, or 6 per cent more than it stood at in January, 1861. In the same way the relative value of British and Indian securities shows that the Indian credit is by no means overstrained. The only other head of expenditure to which I shall refer is that for public works. In 1865-6 it was in India 12 per cent, while in the United Kingdom it was set down at 1 per cent. I inquired what particular items of expenditure were taken into account in England, and was informed that the only item was that for fortifications. There is, however, as we all know, other expenditures in England on public works. There is a great amount of expenditure in England for the maintenance of bridges and public buildings in various localities. There is also much money expended by private companies and railway companies, with which the State has nothing to do; and we know that, to a considerable extent, the expenditure of private individuals and private companies is aided by the State in the shape of loans, such as, for instance, the Drainage loans, and the annual loans from the Exchequer Loan Commissioners. But in India the large expenditure for public works is nearly all conducted by the Government of India, and by the Home Government. This is an important distinction, but as it is a matter on which a good deal has already been said, I shall pass it over more briefly than I otherwise would. I endorse, however, what has been said by my noble Friend (Viscount Cranborne) with regard to the difficulties and hesitations which have occurred in carrying out that policy, which everyone would acknowledge to be a right policy—namely, a fair and liberal development of the resources of India by a great extension of public works, and especially of irrigation. I am sure that upon this head there is no one to whom India owes a greater debt of gratitude than to my noble Friend, for during his short tenure of office, he gave an impulse to public works generally, and to the irrigation service in particular, and though it would be ungenerous to throw any slur on the Government in India, or to suppose that they were not earnest, and anxious to push this matter forward and to carry out the policy in a manner adequate to the wants of the country, yet all who have read the documents on the table and who know what has taken place, will admit that the impulse which my noble Friend gave to the execution of public works is likely to produce excellent results. All have seen, no doubt, serious difficulties in carrying out irrigation works, and though it may be easy to say that many of these difficulties were such as a man of energy would overcome, yet experience in India has made it manifest that while irrigation works should be pressed forward vigorously, yet we must be very prudent as to the mode in which we carry out the necessary policy. There was a question raised as to the possibility of obtaining labour, and, no doubt, with respect to certain periods and certain works, there was a great difficulty in obtaining a sufficiency of labour. There is also a considerable risk of improvident works being entered upon. If you send out engineers to report on the commencement of irrigation works, you will find able but sanguine men, who see everything in rosy colours, prepared to recommend schemes which, if intrusted to their execution, would produce credit to themselves, but which, on proper examination, prove financially more or less delusive. I will mention one scheme to which my attention was called, and I will quote the authority of one of our Governors, Lord Napier, who takes great interest in this question of irrigation. While he tells us that there are portions of the Madras Presidency where irrigation may be carried on with great advantage, such, for instance, as the deltas of the Kistna and the Cauvery, he also speaks in a different tone of some other projects. He mentions the Bellary project, the first estimate for which was £1,000,000 for irrigating 250,000 acres; but another estimate increased the sum to £1,500,000, and reduced the acreage to 150,000 acres. I do not know whether this latter estimate is correct, it may prove to be not a sufficiently sanguine estimate, and I mention this case not for the purpose of saying anything against the Bellary project, but simply as an example of what one hears from time to time from different quarters. Lord Napier mentions it as an instance, in which a more sanguine view was taken some months ago than is now adopted, and as a proof of the necessity of taking care how far you commit yourselves to large schemes of this sort, until you are certain what the cost will be and what advantage it will produce. It is quite certain that this whole matter is being put on a more organized and better footing than before. An officer (Colonel Strachey) has been appointed to give it his special attention. He is an officer who has taken a great interest on the subject, and he has been going over the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay, and has now gone to Bengal. His exact position is not finally determined. We have now before us a despatch setting forth the footing on which the Government of India wish the irrigation service to be carried on. Mr. Seymour Fitzgerald has been actively engaged in this matter at Bombay, and has appointed an officer to take the special direction of the irrigation works there. There is no doubt that a great deal will be done next year in Scinde and Bombay, and we know that in the North West Provinces much is being effected. The attention of the Government of India is being roused to the work, which will have the steady and hearty support of the Government at home. There is no fear, then, that this matter will be allowed to languish; but there should be considerable caution, and in some respects, scepticism, with respect to the projects proposed, so that nothing may be undertaken without a fair and good prospect of success. A great change which has taken place in this matter has reference to the mode in which the expenses are to be charged, for it was proposed by the Government in India last winter, when the Estimates were being prepared (and the proposition was agreed to by my noble Friend) that the expense of the irrigation and other reproductive works should be charged not to income but to capital, thus treating India as a proprietor treats his estate who, in undertaking works of improvement which cost more than the annual income, might deem it a good and economical arrangement to borrow money at a moderate rate of interest for improvements, from which a return would be obtained not only covering the interest, but replacing the capital. The principle was sanctioned by the Home Government, and has been recognized in the Budget Estimate I am now about to refer to—the Estimate for 1867-8. Mr. Massey, in his statement of last March, begins by calling attention to this change, and observes that on its being sanctioned, the Government of India applied to the different Presidencies for a statement of the amount proposed to be expended on irrigation. Mr. Massey states their demands at £700,000, and he naturally says that is comparatively a small demand, and he had hoped that it might have been larger; but it was to the credit of the Governments of the Presidencies that they did not immediately send up crude schemes, but took time to have them thoroughly sifted and examined. That demand then amounted to £700,000, and in addition to it Mr. Massey stated that he was about to borrow certain sums of money for the purpose of making advances to Bombay and Calcutta. In Bombay, in consequence of the commercial distress there, the progress of the land sales has been delayed; and, as it was thought unwise to delay the public works, the prosecution of which was dependent on the proceeds of those sales, the Government of India determined that they would carry on those works, borrowing certain sums in order to effect that object. They borrowed altogether £1,000,000 to give to Bombay; but that amount is in the nature of an advance to Bombay, and therefore not in the nature of a permanent addition to the debt of the year. In the case of Madras and Calcutta, they have agreed to advance a sum of £520,500, for three years, for executing the waterworks there; but that sum will be speedily repaid. Taking those sums together, Mr. Massey's estimate was that he should have to borrow about £2,000,000—and this amount he did not propose to reckon in his Budget Estimate. He calculated that his expenditure, including what are known as public works extraordinary, but exclusive of the sums to be borrowed for irrigation, would amount to £47,340,000; his revenue, including the charges on customs' revenue and on stamps, he estimated at £46,283,000, thus showing a deficiency of £1,057,000. In order to meet that deficiency, he proposed to levy a licence tax, the amount of which he calculated at £500,000. The deficiency would by that means be reduced to £557,000. The balance he proposed to make right, not by adding anything to taxation, but in the following manner:—The Government of India are now engaged in re-modelling the barracks and in building new ones. A sum of nearly £2,000,000 will be required for that purpose during the present year. Instead of taking that sum out of revenue, Mr. Massey transfers £1,000,000 of it to loan, and in that way shows a surplus of about £500,000. The expenditure on barracks in India has an analogy to the expenditure on fortifications in this country. It is undoubtedly difficult to meet so large an expenditure out of annual revenue, and I am not prepared to say that Mr. Massey was not justified in spreading the cost of those barracks over a somewhat longer period than is necessary for their completion. Assuming it to be necessary that they should be completed with great rapidity—say in a period of five or six years, it is not unreasonable, I think, to spread the re-payment of the sum required for the purpose over a period of ten or twelve years, providing for portions of the expenditure by means of temporary loans. I am, at the same time, of opinion that an outlay of this description ought to be met within a definite and a short period, and that an addition to the permanent debt of the country ought not to be made for such an object as the construction of barracks. That would be a most dangerous policy, and it will therefore be incumbent on the Government of India to keep up a considerable surplus of income over expenditure, in order to clear off that amount of debt, unless they find it possible to adopt our system of terminable annuities, in which case the debt would be extinguished within a limited time. I draw a broad distinction, I may add, between a debt of this kind and one incurred for the purpose of carrying out reproductive works, for which you may take a loan with great safety, because you may reckon on their producing a profit sufficient to cover the interest of that loan. At the same time, even with regard to those works, I am anxious that some system should be established, by means of which the money borrowed to execute them should be repaid through the operation of something like a sinking fund. I should like to see something in the nature of those provisions made in England in the case of drainage and other advances, if possible, carried out in India, so that the loans to which I am referring might be repaid within a certain period. I will now mention a few other items which I look upon as worthy of notice in a statement of the revenue and expenditure of India for the current year. In the land revenue there is an increase of £200,000, notwithstanding the remissions which have been made in Orissa and elsewhere. [Mr. CRAWFORD: What is the total amount of the land revenue?] The total amount of the land revenue was estimated at £20,054,000. In the customs' duties, as the House is aware, considerable changes have been made. A Commission was appointed, which revised the tariff, and the result has been that whereas formerly all articles not specially exempted were charged with duty, now all articles not specially mentioned are free from duty. Upwards of forty articles have, I believe, been exempted from import duties, and there are only ninety-five articles in sixty-five classes on which those duties are now charged. There are at the same time many articles which were formerly subject to export duties on which those duties are no longer levied. There are, I believe, eighty-eight articles on which they have been abolished, and only nine on which they are charged. These changes brought about an estimated loss to the revenue, including the loss on saltpetre, of £140,000. To make up for that loss the Government of India laid an additional export duty of one anna per maund on grain. It is not a very heavy charge, and I do not like to question the discretion of the Indian Government in the matter, but I regret that they have felt themselves obliged to take such a step. With regard to other items I am happy to be able to state that the revenue from salt is estimated for the present at a higher figure by £544,770 than in the previous year. The estimated revenue from opium is, however, much more moderate, being taken at £7,713,750, instead of £8,500,000. That is a moderate estimate, and I have every reason to believe that it will not only be fully reached, but, in all probability, exceeded. With respect to stamps, a revision has taken place, which will increase the revenue from that source by about £500,000. The receipts from public works are estimated to fall very far short of those for last year. They then amounted to £978,000, whereas the Estimate for this year is £480,000. That decrease is attributable to the exclusion of the Bombay land sales. I will not trouble the Committee with the various items of the increase and decrease in the expenditure. There is a considerable advance for the supply of grain to Orissa; it amounts altogether to £410,000, of which about £150,000 will be lost—that is to say, it will be spent in the relief of destitution. Again, the transport service is estimated to cost £240,000 more than in the previous year, and there is a decrease for the army of £520,000, which is due to the removal of Berar from the accounts, and the reduction of the charge for the home transport service. Having gone through these points I come to a question which is perhaps still more immediately interesting to India, and also to many in this country; I allude to the licence tax. This tax, although it is not estimated to produce a large amount, affects a considerable number of people in India. Its imposition has caused so great a sensation that several memorials have been addressed to me praying that I would disallow the tax. It is, I may add, in the power of the Secretary of State in Council to take that course, and the power was exercised by Sir Charles Wood in the case of certain export duties. This, however, is not an occasion on which I should deem it right to follow his example. I cannot but feel the force of what Sir Charles Wood said, that a Secretary of State should control but not direct the finances of India. That is a view which, in my opinion, ought always to be borne in mind. We must recollect that the responsibility of fixing the taxation of a country must rest with those who are on the spot, who are best able to judge of its wants, and of the amount of the burden which it can bear. I could not say, looking at the state of the Estimates for the present year, that it was not right to make some provision in the shape of additional taxation, and I cordially agreed with the Government of India that that addition ought not to take the form of an increase of the salt tax. Nor do I see very well in what way it could be levied except in the way of direct taxation. There are, of course, various forms of direct taxation, and this addition might have assumed that of an income tax, a succession duty, or a licence tax, which, to a certain extent, is familiar to the people of India; and in some districts, at all events, it is a kind of taxation which is not unpopular among them. I am not prepared to contend that the particular form given to the present licence tax is the best which could be selected. I have no doubt that it was, to a certain extent, tentative; and, indeed, Mr. Massey speaks of it as an experiment, which would probably require hereafter some modification. I am sorry, however, to see that he has mixed up rather too much, as I think, the principle of the income tax with the principle of a licence tax. He has made what seems to me a mistake in taxing incomes derived from salaries on a principle inapplicable to an income tax. The mistake, I think, is this, that all men are made to pay the same amount if their incomes are in excess of a certain fixed sum. I can understand a graduated tax upon trading interests in which a man who carries on a large business and lives in a superior house is rated at a higher sum than a man in the class below. There are no doubt instances in which this might be done, and when you deal only with traders, and when it is an object to collect the tax without inquiring too minutely into a man's private affairs, there is an advantage in gradation and division into classes, which must not be lost sight of. But when you come to apply that principle to salaries the injustice becomes apparent, because if a Secretary of State, for instance, with £5,000 a year, pay the same amount as the Under Secretary, with £2,000, or a clerk with £1,000, it must necessarily lead to soreness and a feeling of dissatisfaction. I feel sure that this is an oversight, and that, upon the attention of the Government of India being called to the matter, a remedy will be applied; at all events if the tax is to become a permanent one. But the question of its permanent maintenance is one upon which I cannot undertake to decide, and which I must leave to be dealt with by the Indian Government according to their discretion. It will be for them, taking into consideration the circumstances of the country, looking at the state of the debt, the amount to be laid out on reproductive works, and the prospects of improvement to the revenue, to say whether it will be necessary or desirable to keep up a system of direct taxation, and if to a large amount, whether they must not go to the income tax? I now come back for a moment to the question of irrigation, or I should rather say of irrigation finance, and I wish to connect with that subject a passage in Mr. Massey's speech. Mr. Massey said—

> "I must add that the Government, without giving a definite pledge, does not propose that this tax (the licence tax) shall form a permanent source of the Imperial revenue. During the first year the duties will be collected and credited like any other tax; but in our opinion a tax of this nature is better suited to local purposes than to the general purposes of the State. We intend, therefore, in another year to transfer it modified, if experience should suggest such a modification, together with the corresponding amount of charges of a local character, to the several local governments and administrations."

I think I see in that passage the germ of the solution of several difficulties. It seems to me that a tax like this licence tax, which, applied to the whole of India, causes a great deal of heart-burning and discontent, while, at the same time, it yields but a small result, may, though unpopular and unpleasing in some parts of the country, be accepted in other parts as a recognized and convenient form of taxation. I think, moreover, if you were to adopt the principle of transferring the power of local taxation to a limited extent to the different local Governments, you might enable those local bodies to adapt their taxation to the prepossessions and the prejudices of those with whom they have to deal, while you would at the same time enlist those bodies themselves in the pursuit of the objects you desired to see attained, and free them from those annoyances to which my noble Friend has referred—annoyances which grate harshly upon their feelings, but from which it is at present difficult to relieve them, because as long as the whole expenditure of the country is thrown upon the Government of India, that Government will of course be occasionally compelled to interfere in matters which at first sight may appear trifling and vexatious. I am inclined to think that in that way it would be possible to accomplish another object—namely, that of making your advances for reproductive works upon a footing which would enable you, in a *bonâ fide* and perfectly legitimate manner, gradually to recover the money so advanced. I do not profess to have elaborated any scheme upon this subject. I only throw out this suggestion for consideration. I am disposed to think that, connecting it with other measures which we may, perhaps, take for the development of local government throughout India, we may be able by its means to do great good. I am quite sure that the painful matters to which the attention of the House has been directed within the last few days ought to have left upon our minds the impression that it is our duty to take such measures as we are able, in order to give fairer and fuller play for the development of the resources of the country in its remoter districts, and that we can scarcely accomplish unless we are prepared to a certain extent to relax the principle of centralization by which we have have been so long guided. I am most anxious to pay attention to the valuable recommendations contained in the Report of the Commissioners in Orissa, to see measures introduced something after the manner of our own Poor Laws, some attempt, that is to say, to provide for the maintenance of those who accidentally become destitute. I should also be glad to see some alteration introduced in the relations between the Zemindars and the Ryots, so as to secure the latter class a fair share in the benefit of that great settlement of which the Zemindars at present seem to have the lion's share. Looking at this, and remembering to what an extent local knowledge, local interest, and local control are valuable in carrying out such matters as those to which I have adverted, I am very anxious to organize some system of that kind. And though I possess the highest respect for the great abilities and merits of the gentlemen who have been spoken of as holding high offices in Bengal, and though the system of government in that province has led to a great respect for the law among the inhabitants, I cannot forget that Bengal is not India, and that we must endeavour so to shape our measures and our policy as to give full play to all portions of the country committed to our charge. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by proposing the formal Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 30th day of April 1866 was £48,935,220; the total of the direct claims and demands upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium, was £8,452,153; the charges in India, including Interest on Debt and the value of Stores received from England, were £32,668,771; the charges in England were £4,981,185; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £67,043, making a total charge for the same year of £46,169,152; and there was an excess of Income over Expenditure in that year amounting to £2,766,068."—(*Sir Stafford Northcote.*)

MR. CRAWFORD said, he begged leave to congratulate the right hon. Baronet upon the exceedingly clear manner in which he had, after so short an experience of the department, brought before the Committee the details of the financial condition of India. He had listened to a great many financial explanations in relation to the revenues both of this country and of India, and he had never yet heard the details of receipt and expenditure more clearly laid before the House. He wished to refer to the manner in which the Government of India had acted in respect to the imposition of export duties. A Committee had been appointed by the Government in Calcutta to consider the tariff arrangements of India; and he was glad to find that the conclusions of that Committee were not unanimous, at all events as regarded recommending increased import duties on the produce of India. On that Committee were the officiating Commissioner of Customs at Bombay and several other gentlemen acquainted with mercantile matters. Among them was a relative of his own, and he was happy to find from his clear Minute that he had taken a view entirely opposed to that of the Committee at large. It was generally held to be an axiom in matters of taxation that it was exceedingly unwise to levy an export duty on the raw produce of a country, and to expose its producers to a competition which placed them in an unfavourable position with reference to the products of other countries not subject to such taxation. He had a letter from a gentleman at the head of a large commercial establishment at Madras, in which, at his request, the writer reviewed the Report of the Tariff Commissioners of Calcutta. That gentleman reminded him of the fact that some few years ago, when the late Mr. Wilson went to India, he selected the article of saltpetre for taxation, and raised its price about £6 per ton. When the news of that proceeding on the part of Mr. Wilson arrived in this country, he himself took the liberty of stating in that House that the effect of that increase of duty would be to set the inventive genius of chemists and other persons in Europe at work in order to produce some commodity that would take the place of saltpetre, the price of which would be enhanced in consequence of the increased export duty. Well, what he then stated had been completely borne out by the event. The chemists of Europe had turned their attention to the matter, and had succeeded in producing a substitute applicable to most of the uses to which saltpetre was formerly applied. The Tariff Committee, in their Report, recommended the Government of India to retain the duties on certain articles which they enumerated, and to free other articles from duty, including saltpetre, the trade in which had been almost destroyed by the effect of the high taxation upon it. A similar result had followed a similar policy adopted in Ceylon in regard to cinnamon, upon which a high duty was imposed; and now the trade in cinnamon from Ceylon was reduced comparatively to next to nothing. Another example of the same kind was afforded some years ago by the article of sulphur, on which the Government of the Two Sicilies, thinking it had a monopoly of that article, placed a very heavy export duty. The same consequence would ensue if the proposed high export duties were levied on the produce of India. He would take the case of indigo. In the Madras Presidency a kind of indigo was grown which was subject in the markets of Europe to competition with a description of indigo that was produced in the State of Guatemala, in Central America. The Guatemala trade in indigo had been gradually increasing, having within the last ten years nearly trebled itself. While the Madras indigo was subject to competition in our market with the indigo of Guatemala, it was now to continue to be burdened with a heavy impost on leaving India. There had already been a considerable decrease in the exports of that particular description of indigo from Madras, though, no doubt, the falling off was due in some degree to the circumstances of the season. The Secretary of State had told them that the land revenue of India produced £20,054,000 out of a total of upwards of £46,000,000. It could not be denied that a very considerable portion of that revenue fell upon the articles produced from the land, and he was informed by an experienced authority that the cultivator of indigo after paying 30 per cent on his produce in the shape of land-tax was mulcted at the port of shipment of three rupees per maund. Then, again, the export duty on grain was to be raised from two to three annas, or 50 per cent. Such a tax was entirely wrong in principle, and what ground was put forward by the Tariff Committee for levying such a duty on grain? Because it suited the people of the Mauritius to charge a duty on the rice imported into that colony, was it therefore necessarily a wise and prudent thing, or a proceeding consistent with the principles of political economy, to levy an export duty on its leaving Calcutta? He hoped that the right hon, Baronet would see the propriety of expressing to the Government of India his views on that subject in terms which would induce it to reconsider the matter. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the very favourable position of the revenue arising from the salt duties during the past year. That might arise in some degree from the great facilities afforded to the consumers by the railways, by which salt was conveyed up the country from Calcutta at very moderate rates. He was glad to hear what the right hon. Gentleman had stated in regard to the licence tax. It was exceedingly unpopular in India, not so much because it was a personal tax, as on account of the irregularities and inequalities to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred. It appeared that the Home Government did not propose to deal with the tax, and when that intelligence reached India the Governor General would no doubt make up his mind to receive some vigorous applications for its removal. He also heard with satisfaction the plan which it was proposed to adopt to replace the money expended in the construction of irrigation works, not only because it would tend to make taxation for such purposes local, but because it would help to relieve the subordinate Presidencies, as they were termed, from their position of dependence on the superior Government. There was nothing more irritating or vexatious than the feeling which prevailed in these subordinate Presidencies that no item of expenditure, however insignificant, could be incurred without the matter being brought under the cognizance of the supreme Government. The fact was that the manner in which these small items of expenditure were bandied about from one department to another in the Governments of India was something approaching the ridiculous. He rejoiced, therefore, that the principle advocated by the right hon. Baronet would tend to free the subordinate Governments of India from the state of dependence upon the supreme Government in which they were placed at present upon matters of the most ordinary expenditure. With respect to new railways he was not sorry to hear that the Government would take time to consider the plans brought under their notice. He (Mr. Crawford) viewed with some distrust the execution of the works proposed in connection with the Valley of the Indus line. There were, it was true, many reasons commercial and political which commended it to support; but at the present moment, when a rival scheme was propounded, it would be impolitic to favour one at the expense of the other. They should at least wait until the respective merits of both were fully ascertained. As to other railways, he hoped that the Secretary for India would set his face against any undue extension of the existing system. He wished to see the existing companies have time to mature their plans, and then the public would see at no distant day these railways returning an income, as compared with their expenditure, far exceeding anything known in this country. There were two railways in India, with a mileage of 2,500 miles between them, which, with an outlay of £45,000,000, were now earning the full amount of their guaranteed dividend, and if the existing companies were allowed to perfect their system, and were not called upon to add branches beyond the scope of their original schemes, the time was close at hand when the most sanguine anticipations of the predecessors of the right hon. Gentleman would be realized as to the receipts added from these sources to the credit of the Indian Government. He would not further detain the House except to express his personal satisfaction with the statements of the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. LAING said, he wished to say a few words on the special question of finance, and he would confine himself to the special topic of the new taxes imposed. A material part of the Budget statement of last year was that new taxes of a very objectionable and unpopular character had been imposed. He concurred in what had fallen from the hon. Member for the City of London as to the injurious effect of some of the export duties, especially with reference to the article of saltpetre, and he regretted nothing more than that when he was in India he did not take the opportunity of reducing the duties on that article, for an important branch of Indian industry had been almost destroyed by that tax. The House could hardly understand how unpopular the licence tax was in India. Any system of levying any considerable revenue by means of direct taxation met with such an amount of opposition and excited so much unpopularity as it was impossible for any person with European notions to conceive. A plan of direct taxation of this kind was partially introduced into Oude as an experiment, and several cases of suicide occurred on the part of petty dealers because they were subject to a licence tax of something like half-a-crown. This was almost inconceivable to European minds. One reason of the oppressiveness of a tax of this sort was that it had necessarily to be levied by local agents, who acted on the fears of an ignorant and excited population, threatening them with something ruinous unless they paid a *douceur*. He had occasion when in India to consider the operation of a licence tax, and he found that the average amount imposed on every small trader would not exceed 4*s.* or 5*s.*, so that 4,000,000 persons must be taxed to raise £1,000,000, and, taking these as heads of families, 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 would be subjected to alarm and extortion for the sake of £1,000,000 of revenue. In Lord Canning's time, by strict economy, not only was no new tax imposed, but the tax on small incomes was reduced, and he regretted that Mr. Massey should have introduced a licence tax without waiting, at any rate, another year to see whether it was necessary to avert a permanent financial deficit. It was true there was an apparent deficit on the present year, but Indian Budgets materially depended on the estimate of opium and on the way in which various large items were brought in, and for the last five or six years there had been small surpluses and small deficits, the former slightly preponderating. Practically there had been an equilibrium, although a large amount had been charged to revenue for public works and interest on unfinished railways. A great deal of the mischief had arisen from the unwise reduction of the cash balances, which should always be considerable, so that in case of any fluctuation in the revenue, or unforeseen contingency, it might not be necessary to resort to additional taxation. He thought there was room for further economy, especially in the army expenditure. In the model years of 1861-2-3, when expenditure was reduced to the lowest point in every department, the cost of the army was brought down to about £12,500,000, the European force being 72,000 men. That force was now 10,000 less, which ought to involve a saving of £1,000,000, and a difference of £500,000 had been made by a transfer as to stores, which were now paid for in this country. Instead, however, of the army expenditure being reduced to £11,000,000, it exceeded £13,000,000. There had no doubt been some increase of charge on account of the rise in the price of provisions and other causes; but still he thought that a military expenditure in India exceeding £13,000,000 was higher than it ought to be. Had that amount been reduced it would have been possible to dispense with the licence tax; and if such an impost was necessary at all it ought to have been levied, not as an Imperial, but, as was at one time contemplated by Lord Canning's Government, as a local tax, so that it might be modified to suit the varying circumstances of different districts. He did not, however, blame the Secretary of State for not exercising his veto, which he could hardly have done unless he had been backed by the private opinion of the Governor General; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would use his influence so as either to dispense with the tax before another year by strict economy, or else to leave direct taxation to the local Governments, which would be the next best thing.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he thought the hon. Member for Wick (Mr. Laing) had taken a somewhat optimist view of the state of India, especially during the last twelve months, when 750,000 people had died of famine. He had argued the prosperity of the country from the fact that wages and prices were both rising; but unless wages were rising in a greater ratio than prices this test was obviously inconclusive. The rise of prices showed a depreciation in the value of money, consequently the expenses of the Government must increase and were actually increasing. Now, considering that a greater portion of the revenue arose from the land tax, which was a rent paid to the Government for its proprietary rights in the soil, and that the policy had been to commute proprietary rights for fixed monetary payments, the prospects of Indian finance were somewhat serious. If money depreciated, and if our chief source of revenue was commuted for a fixed payment we should become poorer every year. Commutation ought, therefore, to be avoided. He agreed with the hon. Member for the City (Mr. Crawford) in condemning the export duty on grain; but he did not agree with him as to the feasibility of increasing the salt tax, for this was one of the worst imports ever devised, and Indian finances would not arrive at a satisfactory condition until we were able to get rid of it altogether. As to the licence tax the correspondence he had received from many of his friends showed it to be exceedingly unpopular. It was, moreover, most unequal, for he believed an income of £250 a year paid as much as one of £1,250. The man who paid a land tax was not really taxed; he was simply paying rent to the Government; therefore it seemed extraordinary that the licence should not be applied to land. In the debates which had taken place on the famine in Orissa, almost all the time was taken up with personal atttacks, one finding fault with the Governor General, and another with Sir Cecil Beadon. He had listened to those attacks with pain, because both men had rendered illustrious services to India. A question of much more importance, however, had been left out of the discussion. The famine had been produced entirely by physical causes, over which we had no control. There was not a sufficiency of rain, and the crops failed. No doubt everything that ought to have been done was not done to relieve the famine, but those who had most experience of India would agree with him when he said that, considering the utter failure of the crops in Orissa, however the Government officials in Calcutta or Orissa might have exerted themselves, nothing could have prevented wide-spread distress and suffering. But what he wanted to know now was, whether the Government were taking any steps to obviate the recurrence of such a calamity? During the last twenty years four or five famines had taken place in India, and in the famine of 1860, though admittedly everything possible had been done by the local authorities, there was a loss of life estimated at between 100,000 and 200,000. The important question, therefore, was, whether it was not possible to bring to our aid the resources of England and of modern science to prevent those fearful calamities which were certain to recur in a tropical climate like India, unless we husbanded the water, and made it to produce fertility, when rain in sufficient quantity was not forthcoming.

Mr. M'LAREN wished to say a few words on a matter which appeared to him of great importance. By the Resolution before the House they were called upon to affirm the proposition that there was an excess of income over expenditure in the Indian revenue of £2,766,068. The right hon. Baronet began by telling the House that this was a statement sent home by Mr. Massey, and he went on to show that Mr. Massey had made several errors to the extent of £200,000 and £300,000, and ended by showing that, when the accounts were properly stated, there really was a deficit of £500,000. He did not see how the House, after hearing the statement of the right hon. Baronet could honestly affirm the Resolution, for it had been shown by the right hon. Baronet himself that there was no such surplus, and he should be sorry to see such a Resolution placed on the Journals of the House when the statement it embodied was contrary to the fact. He thought the right hon. Baronet would have done much better if he had formally corrected the erroneous statement of Mr. Massey, and given the House, in his Resolution, the real facts as to the income and expenditure; and he maintained that it would be wrong to put a statement on the Journals which was notoriously contrary to the fact.

Mr. BAZLEY condemned the delay and procrastination which had taken place in bringing forward the Indian Budget. He approved the suggestion that an Indian Minister of Trade and Agriculture should be appointed, and condemned the notion of congratulating ourselves upon the fact that India had 3,600 miles of railway communication, seeing that we had in this country 12,000 miles, and America had 40,000. The statement of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets was very interesting and important, especially that portion which related to the railway accommodation, and he contended that the accommodation was by no means adequate to the wants of 200,000,000 of people. He recommended the medical service of India to the best consideration of Government, and contended that the old medical officers had great injustice done them. The exports of India had increased in seven years from £14,000,000 to £70,000,000 — a fact which showed that the people of that country were ready to labour in the improvement of the land, and deserved every encouragement. Owing, however, to the want of public works the progress of the country had been retarded. If a Minister of Trade and Agriculture was appointed it would be his duty to give every information with respect to such public works as ought to be carried on, and that would lead to the increased productiveness of the country, and to that augmented revenue for which the Indian Minister was now sighing. He trusted that in the next Session the accounts would be laid before the House at an earlier period. It was not creditable to the dignity or deliberations of that House that a few hours only in one night should be all that was devoted to the financial and general interests of India.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE said, in reference to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren), that he must admit the justice of his criticism as applied to the Resolution in its present shape. He proposed to amend it by inserting the words—" That it appears from the accounts laid before the House." There was unquestionably the error he had pointed out, but the other items were correct. With respect to the suggestion offered by the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Fawcett), he had to say that a great deal of work was now being done in the way of irrigation, and a considerable expenditure was in progress, which he trusted would have the effect of averting the calamity of famine in future years.

Amendment proposed, in line 1, after the word " That," to insert the words "it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that."

Question " That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Resolved, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 30th day of April 1866 was £48,935,220; the total of the direct claims and demands upon the Revenue, including charges of collection and cost of Salt and Opium, was £8,452,153; the charges in India, including interest on Debt and the value of Stores received from England, were £32,668,771; the charges in England were £4,981,185; the Guaranteed Interest on the Capital of Railway and other Companies, in India and in England, deducting net Traffic Receipts, was £67,043, making a total charge for the same year of £46,169,152; and there was an excess of Income over Expenditure in that year amounting to £2,766,068.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*, at Two of the Clock.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) (*re-committed*) BILL (*Lords*)—[Bill 228.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 12, 13, and 14 *struck out*: other Clauses inserted in lieu thereof.

Clause 45 (Regulations respecting landing, &c., of Foreign Animals).

Mr. CORRANCE: * In rising at this hour of the evening to move important Amendments upon this clause, I do so under some disadvantage, and certainly with a wish that so important a duty should have devolved upon some older and abler Member of this House. For some time after the introduction of this Bill, I awaited notices to this effect. There was up to such time but one which at all seemed to reach this case, and this, or at least, what seemed to me the most important part of it, was subsequently withdrawn. Upon this I shall have occasion hereafter to revert. Now, Sir, this matter is one which well deserves the attention of this House, and I cannot help thinking that we should have been somewhat remiss in the performance of our duties here, if, after the strong expression of public feeling which has reached us all, and which has already found considerable utterance through Chambers of Agriculture and other public bodies—if, I say, the present question had not assumed a practical form, and challenged a practical issue in this House. Under these circumstances, I have placed my present Amendment on the list. One word as to this; in it I seek to bring matters to a direct and practical conclusion upon three principal points. Of these, the first is: At what ports it shall be lawful to introduce foreign stock, leaving the number of such ports discretionary with the Privy Council itself? Secondly, the defined period for which this shall be so fixed. And, thirdly, the regulations under which such importations shall take place. For all these, I shall hope to be able to afford some reasons which will be satisfactory to the House. Previous to doing so, let me address myself to some remarks which fell from the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) the other night, as these seem to me capable of raising some prejudices unfavourable to my case. The noble Lord was very positive on one or two points. First, our dependence upon the foreign supply, and its increasing importance to us. There is no doubt of the fact; but he certainly did not show us that any arrangements he proposed to make could at all affect or limit that supply; nor did he use one argument to prove that his most unjust assumption, that we wanted to place fetters on the foreign trade in order to free ourselves, was founded on any data of a substantial class. Why, Sir, what is the fact? That, notwithstanding all the restrictions and regulations placed upon this foreign trade during the last year, and, beyond all, in and under the uncertainty which successive Orders in Council have produced, this foreign trade has continued, and does continue to increase. Sir, let me supply the noble Lord with some data as to this. In the Customs Report for the past year, we find it stated as worthy of note, that—

> "Singularly enough, the oxen, bulls, and cows subject to the prohibitions and restrictions rendered necessary by cattle plague, and which have had to compete with the dead-meat trade, have risen in number from 128,601 to 144,952, an increase of 12½ per cent."

It continues to say—

> "Nor are the Returns under dead meat less remarkable, standing thus: 1864, 47,044; 1865, 49,824; 1866, 144,064 tons."

Well, Sir, these are the facts with which we have to deal, and I leave it to the House to say how far they bear out the imputations as to our motives thrown out by the noble Lord—at least, we proceed with knowledge in this case. Well, Sir, we come next to the great losses to be apprehended from waste of offal, and the hardships thus entailed upon the poor man. Now, let me re-assure the noble Lord as to this. For this assumption, there is scarcely a foundation in fact, especially under the improved arrangements which any permanent settlement of this question will enable us to carry out. Of these, there is no doubt, the poor man will share the benefit with us; and admitting, as I do, the full force of the noble Lord's appeal, I may, perhaps, ask him to afford to us equal credit upon such behalf. To confirm these views, let me call attention to the remarks recently made by the noble Duke at the head of this department (the Duke of Buckingham) in "another place." He speaks thus—

> "Another remarkable circumstance as regards the social comfort of the people was well worthy of mention. It was gratifying to find that the restrictions necessary had not had any injurious effect in raising the price of meat, as shown by the quotation of the Metropolitan Market, the average price of beef being from 1st January, 1866, 6¾*d.* per lb., and from April 29th to May 26th, when the restrictive measures were in full force it was the same."

And now, Sir, for the last assertion, that it is in some sort a measure of class legislation which we seek. Nothing can be less well founded than this, or that this is a party measure of any sort. On this subject, I appeal as boldly to that side of the House as I do to this—nay, with even more confidence than to the noble Lord himself. This circumstance lightens my task, that this question is no longer narrowed to a party issue, nor esteemed a mere class interest. On all sides its importance is admitted, not only to the producers, but to the consumers, to be a matter of serious concern. But what can best be done is our only real object in this case. But, Sir, if the noble Lord has failed to adduce any reasons to shake our belief in the necessity of the regulations we seek to have carried out, he has not failed to furnish us with additional arguments for our case. What has the noble Lord told us concerning this? Why, that through the regulations which—partial and imperfect as they are—we have been forced to carry out, that we have been protected, not only from cattle plague, but diseases of a no less formidable class—that pleuro-pneumonia, as well as foot-and-mouth disease, are on the decrease. Let our Irish friends remember this. Sir, we are told that occasionally our losses from such causes have amounted in value to the whole of the imported stock; and there is reliable data as to this. Ought this to form no consideration in such a case? And now, Sir, having said so much in reply to the observations of the noble Lord, let us ask the attention of the House to considerations of another class. Sir, I have said that I regretted that this more general part of the question has been omitted or withdrawn from the Amendment moved by the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ayrton). I have so for two reasons. First, that his powerful advocacy of such a cause should be lost; and, secondly, that it may lead the House *à priori* to suppose that he abandons it from a sense of the impracticability of the proposition I am about to make. Sir, it may be so; and this we shall learn from him no doubt; but I am inclined to think that one main reason which may have led him to abandon the cause is to me an additional reason for wishing it at least to be discussed. He doubtless found what I found also on inquiry at these ports, that a great objection to the plan proposed was founded upon the imperfect nature of the accommodation and the defective arrangements at the several ports. Now, I would have the House mark this; for, owing to some circumstances to which I must call especial attention, this very fact, which may have seemed to the hon. Member an obstacle in the path, seems to me an argument the most cogent and conclusive against things as they are, and as tending to confirm the necessity of the Amendment in this clause which I have the honour to move. Now, Sir, what is the reason of the absence of these provisions? They are fairly stated in some letters I hold in my hand; and which, had time permitted, I should have read to the House. Well, Sir, they are one and all conclusive to one effect; that no such provision can be made so long as the present uncertainty as to the intentions and Orders of the Privy Council exist. There are but two means by which such provisions could be made — either through the agency of Government itself, or by the voluntary action of individuals or companies. But, Sir, under what circumstances can we look for this—that of reasonable security and confidence in the investment made? Do Orders in Council, revocable as here proposed from time to time, inspire this? After the experiences of the last three years it is idle to ask. No one will incur the risk of investment in such a case. From every quarter comes evidence as to this, as contained in the letters I have alluded to, from persons and companies at Harwich, Southampton, Liverpool, and London itself. But on the other hand they say that under any Act of Parliament sufficiently precise they will undertake to provide in a manner most complete and satisfactory for every want which can exist, and I have no doubt that the plans are in the hands of the Government itself. Sir, in the presence of such facts we cannot admit the plea set up. These difficulties are such as we help to create, and I surely am fully justified in saying that they rather confirm than shake, rather establish than destroy, my case. It seems to me that from the very first one constant mistake has pervaded all our legislation upon this —namely, as regards the permanent nature of the provision we should be obliged to make. Blunder after blunder has arisen from this cause to the most deplorable effect, not without due warning often repeated from sources thoroughly competent. In the Report of the Commission there is evidence most condemnatory of the merely temporary provisions which exist, and the kind of legislation it is now proposed to introduce. Sir, are hon. Members unconvinced? Do not think it is so; but in case this should be so, let me call attention to some further facts which may serve to convince them that this is not a mere occurrence of a casual or fortuitous class. We are told by those who hold this opinion that since the year 1756 there had been no outbreak of cattle plague in this country. And it is by no means unimportant to know the circumstances under which this exemption took place; for during the whole of the intervening period it prevailed in Galicia and several of the lower provinces of the Austrian Empire. Now, what was our protection for it then? There is every reason to believe that it arose, first, from the admirable quarantine and precautionary measures carried on along the whole frontier of Germany down to the confines of Russia; and secondly, to the lengthened transit of animals, in order to reach England by any other route, which gave time for the development and destruction of the animal by the disease as the period during which it can lie dormant is about fourteen days. But when the Continental system of railways became complete, the probationary period became shortened, and it was evident that the seeds of such a disease could reach us through an ill-guarded side—I say it was evident; for, in fact, it was predicted by scientific men long before its appearance here, and the Government were warned that such a danger did exist. At last it came, and we all know with what deplorable results here. And why? Because we resisted evidence which we did not like; because we refused to believe that which all knowledge and experience affirmed—a course which we have pursued up to the present time under the influence of some feeling, which has blinded our eyes to the real state of the case. Sir, I have said that I believe that such feelings as this have now but small place, at least, in this House. From what I have said it must be admitted that our liability to constant re-importation of this disease is actually on the increase, and that tardily we must come to the conviction that not only is this matter one of mere temporary interest, but that it must be dealt with as a question of permanent and increasing importance to all members of the community to which we belong. But, Sir, it may be said that our present provisions are sufficient to protect us from serious loss. This I cannot admit. In every county these restrictions are productive of very serious loss, and an enhanced price is paid by every consumer on that account. These losses are indirect; but this is not all, for they form a very serious item on the county rates, as most county magistrates will prove, amounting to from £300 to £500 a year in most counties. It must not be supposed either that the country alone suffers from this, for that the supply to the metropolis is also seriously curtailed there is no doubt. Who will send up beasts to this market during the existence of regulations which make it a mere trap from which they cannot get out? Surely it is impossible to suppose that such regulations should remain permanently in force, or that they are the lesser of two evils, of which we have the choice. With the slaughter of all foreign beasts at the ports, this would cease. On the other hand, let me say this, that I believe the time is come for some more effectual and permanent measures to meet this case. I cannot, for the reason given, attach much weight to the objections raised. They are such as we create for ourselves—give the security, and the difficulties will cease. Sir, one concluding remark; I have not proposed this Amendment in any spirit of hostility to the Government plan. I have reason to hope that in thus raising the question I am assisting its endeavour to provide some suitable plan. In all our proceedings and instances upon this head, let me testify to the courtesy and care with which those instances have been met, both by the noble Duke at the head of this department, and the noble Lord who represents it in this House. But, Sir, in this case, the anxiety of those without, as well as the real importance of the subject itself, seem to me to create a paramount necessity for the adoption of some further measures of the nature, if not in the form, of that I have the honour to support. Sir, it may be in the power of the Government to defeat the Amendment proposed, in the absence of many by whom it would have met with support; but I would urge their re-consideration of this case, as one in which, if met with a direct negative, they accept a heavy responsibility, against not only public opinion, but that of men who speak from knowledge, and on authority it is not wise to neglect. I beg to move the Amendment of which I have given notice.

Amendment proposed,

In page 11, line 9, after the word "Council," to insert the words "shall by order declare at what port or ports, or part or parts of such port or ports, it shall be lawful to import foreign animals, and further to confirm the same for a period of not less than three years, or to such further time as it shall be held expedient to continue this Act in force: And."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. AYRTON explained that he had given notice of an Amendment on this subject, because he had been informed by several persons interested in the matter that this clause should be compulsory, instead of merely permissive. Subsequently, however, he had received additional information from persons who took an interest in the matter, and who thought it inexpedient that the clause should be absolute and permanent, instead of permissive. After careful consideration he had come to the conclusion that an absolute clause was undesirable at the present time, and he had consequently determined to withdraw his Amendment. In all probability it would eventually become necessary to make some permanent arrangement with respect to the complete separation of the home from the foreign trade in cattle, though he did not think the proposal of the hon. Gentleman conferring powers for three years only would meet the requirements of the case.

MR. READ most heartily supported the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for East Suffolk; but before he particularly considered that Amendment, it would be incumbent on him to answer some observations and expose a few contradictions of the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council. His Lordship stated that the vexatious restrictions now in force tended to raise the value of meat, and then quoted figures to prove that they did not. He then went on to say how impossible it was to slaughter the foreign stock at the outports, and in the same breath told us how easily the whole of the kingdom, without any previous notice, was turned into a dead meat market last spring, without raising the price to the consumer; and finished the refutations of his previous statement by mentioning the quantities of dead meat that Scotland sent to London. [Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: I explained how that Scotch meat was sent.] Yes, the noble Lord certainly explained by making a grave mis-statement. The noble Lord told us that all the beef from Aberdeen was sent to London at the risk of the consignee; whereas it is a well known fact that a carcase of beef, whether sent from Scotland or Norfolk, was forwarded at the risk of the sender. Further, the noble Lord said it would be impossible that Harwich and Southampton could supply London with dead meat, and then quoted returns which showed that the direct importation of foreign cattle into the metropolis amounted to 160,000, while those of Harwich and Southampton were each under 5,000. Next the noble Lord showed the hardship of the present restrictions, which placed the owner of cattle at the mercy of the buyer, as they had to be slaughtered in a few days; and failed to perceive that by establishing separate markets and lairs for foreign stock, where cattle could be kept alive any reasonable time, both the importer and the home grazier would be freed from this restriction. Finally, the noble Lord told us that foot-and-mouth disease and *pleuro pneumonia* were imported from abroad; that the suppression of the least formidable of these diseases would save annually one million's worth of food, and showed that the losses from *pleuro pneumonia* alone, were almost equal to our importations, and yet refused to shut the door against a foreign disease ten thousand times more deadly, which in a few months had destroyed 250,000 of our cattle, and which if allowed to find a permanent home in this country would probably exterminate all our cattle. He (Mr. Read) would not go into the history of the outbreak of cattle plague in Great Britain, but he would remind the Committee that it was not till they embodied in an Act of Parliament the main recommendations of the first Report of the Cattle Plague Commissioners that they were able to grapple with the disease, and speedily to stamp it out; and they were now asked to carry out the second Report of the Commissioners, and, by slaughtering the foreign stock at the ports of debarkation to keep the cattle plague from again invading this country. In his opinion but few hon. Genmen opposite really understood the losses sustained by the agriculturists and the public from the ravages of the cattle plague. The returns numbered 335,000 victims, but these reports did not embrace by a long way the total number sacrificed, which was much nearer 500,000 ; but the popular manner of valuing the loss was to take these returns and multiply them by £10 or £12, and say that the farmer's loss is some £3,000,000, £4,000,000, or £5,000,000. Now, if the cattle thus destroyed were simply grazing stock, that might be a fair estimation ; but as unfortunately the greater portion were cows, there was not only the actual loss of the cattle, but future means of supplies were greatly crippled. He repudiated most strongly the idea of the noble Lord that the farmers of England were crying out for "protection :" they were perfectly resigned to free trade in meat, but they strongly objected, in the words of the hon. Member for Carmarthenshire, to "free trade in foreign diseases." The British grazier was exposed to the competition of the whole world, and it was the duty of the Government, both for the interest of the consumer as well as of the farmer, to take every precaution to maintain the health of the herds of Great Britain. He (Mr. Read) considered it was all-important to make this slaughter at the outports statutory ; it was idle to expect, till some permanency was given by Act of Parliament to the present Orders, that any corporation or company could invest a farthing in building water-side markets or slaughter-houses ; besides which, the Privy Council was at all times open to the pressure of the great towns, while their Orders were unconstitutional, uncertain, and tyrannical. There was no reason why the noble Duke, the Lord President of the Council, should not during the recess issue an Order revoking the slaughter of plague stricken cattle, and, reverting to his original opinion, attempt the cure of the cattle plague by the administration of infinitesimal doses of poison in the popular form of homœopathic globules. Then as to the benefits the Amendment of his hon. Friend would ensure. First, the British farmer would regain confidence, knowing that the only reasonable plan for keeping out the rinderpest was adopted ; all fairs and markets might at once be opened, and all the vexatious restrictions on the movement of his cattle, which he has now endured most patiently for near two years, could be at once removed. The consumer, if he would not now have cheaper, would certainly have better meat, and the future supply could be rendered more permanent and more reliable. Great as might be the advantages the public derived from the importations of foreign cattle, it yet should be borne in mind that the supply from abroad did not yet amount to one-tenth of the cattle supplied by the British farmer. The foreign grazier would know what law would regulate his importations, and send them more freely and more regularly, being freed from the present rigorous but capricious inspection, and would have no necessity to kill his cattle so soon after their landing, but might give them time to recover their sea voyage, or take his chance of better markets. Neither need there be less competition for his stock from being separated from the English cattle, as the markets in London would, of course, be held on different days. Now, from whom did the chief oppostition come ? Mainly from the small butchers, foreign-salesmen, and the owners of lairs about the Metropolitan Market. The arguments used were that the independent retail trader would be annihilated, the great carcase-butchers have it all their own way, that consequently all consumers would suffer, and the poor of London be deprived of the offal. Now, as offal was sent from Holland, it could certainly reach the East of London from Blackwall, and it should be remembered that precisely similar arguments were used when the Smithfield market was removed to Islington, and none of these disasters followed. Then the whole force of the Corporation of London was arrayed against them; but he believed the members of that distinguished body would not allow their interest to stand in the way of a great national good. Directly, too, London would gain. The Metropolitan Market, if reserved for British stock, would speedily recover from the depression which the exclusion of the country butchers and the present restrictions had caused ; there need be no cattle-plague rate, which must at times be heavy, as in this May and June nearly 500 cows were slaughtered by the inspectors in the metropolis ; the army of 300 policemen which now watched the outer limits of the metropolis night and day might be reduced to a dozen inspectors of the new foreign market ; a large portion of the blood and garbage which now polluted the city and escaped into the sewers could be utilized, and the nuisance of cattle being driven through the streets could be mitigated. It was proved that seven-eighths of the foreign cattle came to London, and three-fourths of that supply were slaughtered in the East of London. It was formerly the practice for cattle to be landed in the region of Blackwall, to be driven six or seven miles to the Metropolitan Market, and then hurried back again half that distance to the beastly slaughter-houses of Whitechapel, and there to be killed in a state of prostration and fever, which was most detrimental to the health of the people. The slaughter-houses of London were a disgrace to any civilized country, and in Paris no beast was allowed to be slaughtered without a certificate from the inspector that the animal was in a state of health. He (Mr. Read) believed that he should live to see both slaughter-houses and cow-sheds banished to the out-skirts of the metropolis. In conclusion, he would respectfully urge upon all Irish Members to protect their 4,000,000 of cattle from this most insidious disease, and as a Norfolk grazier he particularly expressed this hope, as his county drew annually from Ireland 40,000 or 50,000 head of store stock ; he would entreat the representatives of Scotland, if any were present, to preserve their healthy, hardy, prime-meated herds ; he would ask the Members for the great towns, if they did not apprehend the failure of the present home supplies of meat, to think of the teeming millions who might at no distant day be deprived of them, and he appealed earnestly and confidently to the Government, composed as it was of the leaders of the great country party—of those who had ever been regarded as the farmers' friends—to support this Amendment, not from any favour or affection to the agricultural interest, but on the far higher claims of broad and even-handed justice.

Mr. BRUCE suggested that the Bill should be made to continue for one year, and that in the meantime the Government should consider what permanent negotiations should be enforced respecting slaughtering cattle in the ports.

Mr. HENLEY said, that the real object they had was to supply the people with food, and keep out disease—whether a few cattle dealers and farmers should suffer a little inconvenience rather than that the whole country should suffer. The importation of cattle had remained pretty much the same for some three or four years, and, as nearly as many beasts had died in this country of the disease as had been imported, it was plain that the reason why meat had been dearer arose from that cause. There was, no doubt, that want of energy on the part of the Government had admitted the cattle disease to the country, and it behoved them to prevent a recurrence of the lamentable events of last year. He contended that until a separation was made by the slaughter of all imported cattle, they never would get rid of the disease. Hitherto the country had cheerfully submitted to the most onerous restrictions ; but, if they carried them on when there was no disease—and they were only carried on for the benefit of a few cattle dealers—people would get very discontented. Now that the disease had been got rid of they would not submit to restriction when it was plain that there was the greatest danger of re-introducing it by means of importation. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bruce) that this Bill should be continued for one year; and he hoped the Government would assent to the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. Corrance).

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he approved of the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Bruce). The question, however, should not be looked at exclusively from one point of view. Now, though it was true that the agricultural interests had sent up numerous deputations to the Government to remove the restrictions in the country districts, the speakers had failed to mention that the Government had received more numerous and more important deputations from inhabitants of towns to open the ports. The object of the Amendment really was to make the Government retrace its steps. It was the pressure of the poor of London that caused the opening of the ports of London, Southampton, and Harwich, and the cattle came thence to London, and London alone. He would beg to remind the House of the numerous interests that would suffer if cattle were not allowed to come in. There were many trades in London—the glue makers, the shoe makers, the refining trades, and others—which would be brought to a stand-still if the substance snecessary as raw material were not allowed to be brought into the metropolis. The poorest part of the population undoubtedly fed upon the inferior parts of the animal, the offal, which would not be brought here if cattle were killed at the ports. Not to have opened the ports would, therefore, have greatly distressed the poor. The twelve hours' rest before inspection, and the four days' law before being brought to market for immediate slaughter, were a sufficient security against the introduction of the cattle plague. It must be borne in mind also that the Government had constantly received deputations from inland towns like Manchester and Birmingham, which desired to import cattle from Spain and other places where no cattle plague existed. He suggested that the hon. Member (Mr. Corrance) should withdraw his Amendment, and that on the Report the operation of the Bill should be limited to one year.

MR. WATKIN moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress."

MAJOR JERVIS expressed his surprise at the statements made by the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council. So far from the rules laid down by the Privy Council cheapening the food for the poor they had the exact contrary effect. The restrictions on the movements of home cattle, consequent on the free introduction of foreign beasts into Islington market, naturally raised the price. There was no reason whatever why offal should not be brought up by railway and be as cheap and cheaper than by the present system. Why, what was already taking place? During the year ending December, 1866, the Great Northern had brought 20,963 tons of meat to London, of which not less than 9,963 tons were from Scotland, and butchers freely acknowledged that the dead meat so brought was better than the live. The Great Western had brought 7,055 tons, some even from Cornwall. The Great Eastern brought 18,000 tons, one-half of which came even from Holland, and the skins and offal of the Dutch beasts found their way to London; how much more would they do so if killed at the ports. He really could not understand who furnished information to the noble Lord on the subject; but whoever did do so was either utterly ignorant of his business, or preferred the interests of certain cattle dealers to that of the real welfare of the people of this country. Why, to show how the cat jumped, the noble Lord said Harwich was licensed to sell and slaughter foreign cattle. Now, the very contrary was the fact—the application had been refused, and every obstacle put in the way of obtaining it.

MR. M'LAREN opposed the Amendment.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, it was not surprising that their friends from the country should be discontented with a state of affairs very vexatious to them, and extremely injurious to their interests. They had borne the restrictions in a very cheerful spirit, and their conduct was deserving of public approbation, and the time had come when they might fairly expect relief. The truth, however, was that the matter required grave deliberation on the part of the Government and much discussion by the House before anything like a permanent and satisfactory settlement could be arrived at. At this period of the Session it was impossible that the requisite amount of attention could be bestowed upon it. Anything like a precipitate conclusion on a matter so important as that dealt with by the Amendment ought to be deprecated. He thought the suggestion made by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bruce) was well worthy of the consideration of the House. It was necessary to make some provision for the exigency of the moment; but if his hon. Friend the Member for Suffolk (Mr. Corrance) withdrew his Motion, he would undertake on the part of the Government that the matter should receive their best attention during the recess, with the view of adopting a plan which might afford security against the spread of the disease, and, at the same time, terminate or greatly mitigate the restrictions.

Motion to report Progress, by leave of the House, *withdrawn.*

MR. NEWDEGATE objected to having the Act continued for a year, because he had known Acts continued from Session to Session eight or nine years, and he was told that if they did not act now they would never have the opportunity of doing so. The restrictions, which were so hard upon the farmer, were not felt by the class represented by the hon. Member for Edinburgh. There were hundreds of places suffering from the operation of the rise of prices owing to the restrictions. He moved an Amendment, which would give the Government six months' time to make their arrangements.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, by inserting after the word "shall," the words "within six months from the passing of this Act."—(*Mr. Newdegate.*)

Colonel NORTH thought it was a fair proposal of the hon. Member for East Suffolk to limit the operation of his Amendment to one year.

Mr. BRUCE urged the hon. Member for North Warwickshire to withdraw his Amendment, which would prevent the Government from bringing in a Bill next year.

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *negatived.*

Mr. CORRANCE: *As the mover of this clause, perhaps, I may be permitted to make a few concluding remarks, addressed to those which have been made by hon. Members, by whom I am opposed in this case. When I commenced my address I said that I was well aware that I must, from the lateness of the hour, do so at a great disadvantage in this case, for by it I should be precluded from substantiating my statements by documents, with which I could not then trouble the House. The speech of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets has made me more sensible of this, for he has thrown a doubt upon statements, which, if thus supported, could not have failed to convince the House. He says that—

> "There is great doubt whether, even under the circumstances I suggest, proper provisions would exist at these ports."

The documents I hold in my hand must infallibly set such a doubt at rest, for they are undertakings of a definite class, and from quarters beyond all suspicion or doubt. Give the security, and the provisions will exist. Then what does the noble Lord tell us?—First, that if the order for slaughter is peremptory, that the seller must be at the mercy of the buyer, by delay. But does experience confirm this? The buyer must eat, and within a limited time; and the supply must be much beyond the demand to prevent this. At this time this provision does exist at all ports except Harwich and Southampton; and, let me ask him, do the facts bear him out? With meat at 10*d.* per lb, there is no symptom of this. Take a much more flagrant case—that of cattle brought within the metropolitan area, where they are caught as in a trap. There might be something to complain of here; but the prices do not bear this out. Consumers pay for the inconvenience no doubt—a matter of some concern to them, as I think. The noble Lord asks us to perpetuate these provisional Council Orders from time to time, revocable at will. He asks us to perpetuate the plague; he may be assured of this. He makes a plea for the poor man upon grounds which I have shown do not exist. Are we satisfied with things as they are? and are we to rest in endurance of regulations of so costly a class? Why, who can estimate the indirect effects of such restrictions, no less than those which are calculable and direct? There is at present scarcely a county in England where the local expenses do not amount to £300 or £500, thrown as a burden on the rates. Lastly, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He tells us that time will not permit these changes to be carried out. Surely this is not our fault, who have waited day by day for the entrance of this Bill into the Committee of the House for these three weeks past. Nor will time mend matters if left, as is now proposed, in uncertainty and doubt. The right hon. Gentleman has made a proposal—he will limit the duration of the Bill to one year. He urges our acceptance of this. I accept it on one understanding—that it shall include my clause for the same time; and I shall therefore beg to insert the words "one year" to this effect. I trust that it may meet with his assent.

Words inserted limiting the operation of the Act to one year.

Then it was *moved* that the Clause, as amended, be *agreed to.*

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 42; Noes 54: Majority 12.

Amendment *negatived.*

Committee report Progress, to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

House adjourned at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, August 13, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Companies Act (1862) Amendment * (333).

Committee—Master and Servant * (325 & 334); Army Reserve * (320); Militia Reserve * (314); Public Works (Ireland) * (315).

Report—Local Government Supplemental (No.6)* (289); Militia Reserve * (314); Army Reserve * (320); Public Works (Ireland) * (315).

Third Reading—Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act (1865) Amendment * (247); Factory Acts Extension (296); Courts of Law Fees, &c.* (286); Admiralty Court (Ireland) * (326);

Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal* (312); Sewage* (328); Railways (Ireland)* (316); Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c.* (332).

FACTORY ACTS EXTENSION BILL.

(No. 296.)—(*The Earl of Devon.*)

THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^a."—(*The Earl of Devon.*)

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD asked, whether there was any probability that the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill would come before the House this Session?

THE EARL OF DEVON: No chance whatever.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD said, that on the occasion of the second reading of the measure then under consideration, a noble Earl (the Earl of Shaftesbury), to whom the country was mainly, if not entirely, indebted for legislation on the subject, stated that its provisions would affect no less than 1,500,000 young women and children. He (the Earl of Lichfield), however, asserted that it was not so: the fact was that the Bill before the House would affect only large factories in which above fifty hands were employed. It was, in other words, but a part, though he admitted a very considerable part, of a general scheme of legislation which he had hoped to see carried into effect for the purpose of bringing under the operation of the Factory Acts, all those trades which had hitherto been excluded from its scope. He was surprised to hear that there was no chance of the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill coming before the House this Session, as he thought that the two Bills ought to be considered together; he was not, however, satisfied with the machinery provided for carrying out the regulations under the Hours of Labour Bill, as, under a system of local inspection, the persons in whose workshops and factories less than fifty hands were employed, would probably be the very persons responsible for carrying out the regulations. It was, he also thought, a somewhat unreasonable proposal to tax certain districts in which only a small number of hands were engaged in the workshops, while other districts were left entirely free from any such local rate. The system of local inspection had already been tried and failed. Although the system of factory legislation could not be applied without very considerable inconvenience to the employers of labour, the manufacturers had been found ready to put up with it, seeing the benefits which were derived by those whom they employed; but he did not think it was at all fair or right or reasonable that persons who employed fifty hands or upwards in the same trade should be placed under stringent regulations, and subjected to inconvenience, while those who employed forty-eight or forty-nine would be placed under no restrictions whatever. He had no doubt in his own mind that, generally speaking, the large manufactories throughout the country were better managed, and the people engaged in them in a better condition in all respects, than those engaged in workshops where less than fifty were employed; and, therefore, he must say that if any legislation of that kind was necessary at all it certainly ought to be applied to workshops containing fewer than fifty, as well as to larger establishments. He had received a letter from a foreman engaged in certain large works in his own district, in which the button trade and the fancy ornament trade were carried on. The writer informed him that in that and in other similar establishments, employing several hundred hands, voluntary regulation of the hours of labour and other matters had of late years been adopted. That was a proof that there were many cases in which the *employés* of large factories were well cared for. He should certainly be the last person in that House to get up and find fault with any legislation in the direction of the Bill before them; but he could not permit the third reading to pass without expressing his opinion on what he must think was, to a certain extent, the very unfair and unsatisfactory character of the measure as it now stood. He admitted the working of the legislation of 1864 with respect to the Potteries had worked very beneficially; but this was attributable to the fact that the Act applied to the whole of the trade, and the only defect in its working was that it did not take in all the trades carried on in that district. This showed that the same system ought to be applied to the whole of every trade without making a distinction between the large and the small establishments, and he asserted, upon the testimony of practical witnesses, that the workshops employing a few people were generally more in need of supervision than the larger factories. He felt certain, therefore, that the proposed legislation would not work satisfactorily if it were allowed for any length of time to stand alone. Two Bills in reference to this subject had been brought before the Commons; and he thought their Lordships must be aware that there had not been a meeting held in any part of the country, whether composed of manufacturers or workpeople, in which the principle of distinction to which he had adverted had not been complained of and condemned. A meeting of manufacturers took place a few months ago at Birmingham on that subject, and among the resolutions passed on that occasion was one declaring that any Act for the regulation of labour in that town should apply alike to all manufactories and workshops, irrespective of the numbers employed in them, and that they should all be subject to the same restrictions. From what had taken place in other parts of the country he believed that a larger measure, comprising the whole of the trades, would have passed through the other House, and that so far as the public were concerned they would have been infinitely better satisfied with a measure which would have comprehended all factories and workshops. He was told that Amendments might still be inserted in the Bill; but although he felt great improvements might be made in it, that yet, rather than interfere with the passing of the measure, he should not press his objections. He believed it to be the unanimous opinion throughout the country that this Bill, if it were allowed to stand alone, bore upon its face the marks of so much inconsistency, injustice, and he would even go so far as to say so much absurdity, that it would entirely fail in its operation, even if it did not do positive harm in some respects.

THE EARL OF DEVON said, he could not at that moment positively say that there was no chance of the other Bill—the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill—coming up in time to receive their Lordships' sanction this Session—all, in fact, would depend upon the progress it made that evening. The views expressed by the noble Earl were fully shared in by Her Majesty's Government, who had taken every means to ensure the simultaneous progress of the two measures; and if the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill had been somewhat delayed, it arose from circumstance wholly beyond their control, and they had thought it right to proceed with this measure even in the absence of the other Bill. He had no doubt whatever that even if the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill failed to become law this year, it would pass at an early period of next Session. He fully concurred in thinking that the success of any legislation on this subject must depend upon the cordial co-operation of the masters, and he rejoiced to think how warmly that co-operation had hitherto been bestowed. He trusted that when the whole scheme became law it would be received in the same spirit.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY thought it would have been impossible to legislate on this question this Session, if they had endeavoured to comprise in a single measure all the industrial occupations to which such a Bill as the present might be applied. This Bill affected 150 trades, all requiring particular regulations, and it comprised glass and iron works and every other industry which was carried on on a large scale. It was originally proposed to draw the line at workshops employing 100 persons; but he thought the House of Commons had done well in reducing the figure to fifty. The trades under this line were mostly of a minor character. Had a more comprehensive measure been brought in it would have been difficult to find at once a sufficient number of Inspectors to superintend the various departments, and he believed the whole thing would have fallen through. He was twitted in 1833 for dealing only with textile fabrics; but his reply was that it was impossible to embrace every branch of industry in a single Bill, but that in time, with God's blessing, he would deal with them all. The same remark applied to this measure; and he hoped that the Workshops Bill would come up to their Lordships to-night or to-morrow, and that by gradually coming down to establishments employing thirty, twenty, and ten workmen, the education and moral and physical welfare of the whole labouring population would be satisfactorily provided for.

THE EARL OF LICHFIELD said, he was glad to hear that the other Bill would speedily come up to their Lordships' House, but he regretted that such important measures had been introduced so late in the Session that it was impossible to amend them.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read 3^a accordingly, and *passed.*

JAMAICA—CASE OF MR. EYRE.

QUESTION.

THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY rose to bring the case of Mr. Eyre under the consideration of the House, and to ask the Secretary for the Colonies, Whether the Government were prepared to adopt the opinion of the late Attorney General in regard to the criminal prosecution of Mr. Eyre, as published in the newspapers of July 29, and whether, in consequence of that opinion, and taking into consideration the fact of more than one abortive attempt having been made by persons styling themselves the Jamaica Committee to carry out the object they had in view, the Government would now undertake to defend Mr. Eyre against any further persecution? In bringing the Question forward, he might be permitted to state that he regarded it as one of the greatest importance, not only to the individual to whom his Motion had special reference, but also to all Governors of our colonies. He would not detain the House by going through the long history of the case, which was well known, and had been thoroughly sifted by the public; he would simply point out that ex-Governor Eyre had received from various sources, especially from the late Government and the Commissioners who were sent out to Jamaica, abundant marks of their approbation of his conduct. Mr. Eyre had been before the public in posts of great trust for twenty-five years, and during all that time his conduct in many parts of the world had received the approval of the Governments of the time being. He would refer to one or two passages in confirmation of what he said. In 1841 Mr. Eyre was first employed as stipendiary magistrate on the Murray River, in South Australia, and in that capacity his experience of the colony and knowledge of the aboriginal character enabled him to perform valuable services in controlling the fierce tribes of the Murray and the Darling rivers. In 1846 Mr. Eyre was transferred by Earl Grey from South Australia to the post of Lieutenant Governor of New Zealand, and in appointing him that noble Earl said—

> "Since I saw you, shortly after my appointment to this office, I have been very anxious to find some employment of a superior kind to that which you have had in South Australia which it might be in my power to offer you, but hitherto without success. I am, however, happy to say that an occasion has at last presented itself which enables me to make you an offer which I trust may be agreeable to you. It is intended to appoint a Lieutenant Governor for the southern part of the colony of New Zealand, to act in the absence of the Governor. In the present state of affairs this situation is a very important one, and it is expedient that the person to whom it is intrusted should proceed to the colony with the least possible delay."

Mr. Eyre remained in New Zealand until 1853, and Earl Grey, in a letter to Governor Sir George Grey, expressed his approbation of Mr. Eyre's services in these words—

> "I have the same favourable opinion of the zeal and intelligence of Mr. Eyre's administration, which I am happy to see that you entertain."

In October, 1854, Sir George Grey, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, appointed Mr. Eyre Lieutenant Governor of St. Vincent, under Sir W. Colebrooke, who was Governor-in-Chief of the Windward Islands; and in this position likewise Mr. Eyre obtained the approval of his immediate superior "for the zealous and able manner" in which he had conducted the administration. In 1859 Mr. Eyre was appointed by the Colonial Secretary of the day, Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, to administer, during the absence of the Governor, the government-in-chief of the Leeward Islands, and in that position also the conduct of Mr. Eyre gave great satisfaction. In 1861 Mr. Eyre was selected by the late Duke of Newcastle to administer, during the absence of the Governor, the government of Jamaica, confessedly the most unmanageable of all our colonies. Mr. Eyre in this post met with the most determined opposition, and a petition was presented to Her Majesty praying for his recall; but such was the high opinion which the Duke of Newcastle entertained of his merits that the petition was practically answered by the immediate appointment of Mr. Eyre as Captain-General and Commander-in-Chief over the Island of Jamaica. He came now to the occurrences relative to the insurrection in Jamaica in the autumn of 1865. When the news of that event arrived Mr. Cardwell was Secretary of State for the Colonies, and in a despatch dated the 17th of November, 1865, Mr. Cardwell said—

> "I have next to convey to you my high approval of the spirit, energy, and judgment with which you have acted in your measures for repressing and preventing the spread of the insurrection. I have also to express my gratification at the clear and succinct manner in which, under all the great difficulties of your position, you have been enabled to communicate to Her Majesty's Government the narrative of the transactions. It was the first duty of your government to take, as

you did, effectual measures for the suppression of the horrible rebellion, and I congratulate you on the rapid success by which those measures appear to have been attended."

Then a change came over the scene. A deputation from what was called "the Jamaica Committee" waited upon the Secretary for the Colonies. Whether the late Government was afraid of alienating Parliamentary support was not for him to say; but, in consequence of the importunity of that Committee, a Commission was sent out to Jamaica to inquire into all the circumstances of the case. And what did the Commissioners say? In the body of their Report they stated—

> "That the disturbances in St. Thomas-in-the East had their immediate origin in a planned resistance to lawful authority; that the causes leading to the determination to offer that resistance were manifold; that the principal object of the disturbers of order was the obtaining of land free from the payment of rent; that an additional incentive to the violation of the law arose from the want of confidence generally felt by the labouring class in the tribunals before which most of the disputes affecting their interests were carried for adjudication; that some, moreover, were animated by feelings of hostility towards political and personal opponents, while not a few contemplated the attainment of their ends by the death or expulsion of the white inhabitants of the island; that the original design for the overthrow of constituted authority was confined to a small portion of St. Thomas-in-the-East, yet the disorder, in fact, spread with singular rapidity over an extensive tract of country, and that such was the state of excitement prevailing in other parts of the island that had more than a momentary success been obtained by the insurgents their ultimate overthrow would have been attended with a still more fearful loss of life and property; that praise is due to Governor Eyre for the skill, promptitude, and vigour which he manifested during the early stages of the insurrection, to the exercise of which qualities its speedy termination is in a great degree to be attributed; that the military and naval operations appear to us to have been prompt and judicious."

Mr. Cardwell, on receiving the Report of the Commissioners, wrote as follows:—

> "Governor Eyre fully deserves all the commendation bestowed upon him; Her Majesty's Government agree in your conclusion that the naval and military operations were prompt and judicious, and considering the large share personally taken by Governor Eyre in the direction of those operations, they attribute to him a large share also of the credit which is due for their success. The addresses of the Legislative Council, of the House of Assembly, of the various parishes of the island, and of others testify the sense generally entertained by the white and coloured inhabitants of their obligation to Governor Eyre for the promptitude and vigour of those measures."

One of the charges made against Mr. Eyre was that he was too ready to apply martial law all over the island; but upon that point Mr. Cardwell used these words—

> "Nor must it be forgotten that he resisted the proposal urgently made to him by the custos and magistrates to proclaim Kingston; that he refused to accede to the suggestion of Colonel Whitfield to proclaim the parishes of Trelawny, St. James, Hanover, and Westmoreland, or that of Major-General O'Connor, who thought that from the first the whole island ought to have been placed under martial law; and that in respect both to the assistance offered by the Governor of Cuba, and to the summoning of British troops from Halifax, Nova Scotia, he showed himself superior to feelings of alarm expressed and entertained by those around him."

In passing, he might remark, that addresses of congratulation and approval were presented to Mr. Eyre from both Houses of the Legislature in the Island, and from persons of every religious denomination, all of whom concurred in declaring that it was owing to Mr. Eyre's promptitude, energy, wisdom, and decision that the lives of the whole white and coloured population were saved. An Act of Indemnity was passed by both Houses of the Legislature in Jamaica, and confirmed by the Privy Council in this country. It was not for him to give an opinion about martial law. That subject had been discussed in a most learned Charge by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, whose opinion as a lawyer must carry great weight, and be treated with every respect. But there were persons who disputed the accuracy of the judgment of that learned functionary, and contended that some of the positions which he had laid down in his Charge were not correct. But whether martial law was legal or not, it was not the opinion of any one in Jamaica that it was illegal, nor was it in his judgment the opinion of anybody anywhere else. Where a great danger arose assuredly there must be some remedy and the Government in case of emergency must act in self-defence. He was only contending that, whatever the law of the realm in the matter was, Mr. Eyre was bound to act according to what appeared to him to be the best course. He denied that Mr. Eyre had kept out of the way on his return to his country; he remained in town a considerable time, his address was well known and he could have been found at any time. Mr. Eyre knew that the Jamaica Committee wanted to attack him, and he published his address and also came up to town and attended one of Her Majesty's levées. There was no ground for any imputation that he shirked any legal consequences of his conduct. Mr. Eyre was suddenly superseded by the Secretary for the Colonies, and this decision of the Secretary of State threw Mr. Eyre out of employment, after his long services, totally unprovided for. The position of Colonial Governors was a very hard one. Military or naval officers at any rate had their half-pay to fall back upon; but there was no such provision in the case of Governors, and Mr. Eyre had not served quite the time necessary to entitle him to a pension. Much had been said of great and undue severities which had taken place in Jamaica; but it was necessary to consider the critical position in which Mr. Eyre was at the time. A map of the Island had been prepared showing the points of attack, and the military and naval forces available, and the fact was that when the outbreak took place the whole Island was upon a volcano. A despatch was sent out by his noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon) to Sir John Peter Grant, in which his Lordship drew the attention of Sir John Peter Grant to the Return of the sentences inflicted by the Special Commission, held at Kingston, between the 24th of January and the 9th of March 1866, and added that he found that many of the sentences were of great severity—that thirteen men and two women were sentenced to penal servitude for life, and seven men and four women to penal servitude for twenty years. Lord Carnarvon then added that as the investigation of the Royal Commission had enabled the Government to appreciate more clearly than was possible at the time, the nature of the recent disturbances, and the guilt of those implicated in them, it would be desirable that the proceedings of the Commission specially appointed to try those persons should now be revised; and he wished Sir John Peter Grant, therefore, to call for the Judge's notes; and, after consultation with the presiding Judge under that Commission, to report his opinion whether in any of the cases there were grounds for remitting any portion of the sentences. This despatch was more or less of an implication upon Mr. Eyre, and was therefore made the most of by people in this country. But Sir John Peter Grant, in his reply, said—

> "Having given the case of every one of these prisoners my best attention, it is my opinion that considerations of justice will not admit of any remission of the punishment in some of the cases; and that in others of them, though the mercy of the Crown may be extended to them at a future time, it would not be advisable, for the reasons to which I have above ventured to point, to announce any remission of punishment for a long time to come; and then only if the state of feeling in the colony recovers its tone."

This was a tacit reproof of the charges made against Mr. Eyre, and served to exonerate him from any reflection on this score. To show the spirit in which the prosecution of Mr. Eyre had been carried on, he might mention that lately it had come to light that Captain Edenborough, who was the captain of a Confederate armed vessel, and had been in this country, had made an affidavit that Gordon, the principal person implicated in these transactions—the man, who in his (the Earl of Shrewsbury's) opinion, laid the train and got others to fire it—came to Captain Edenborough and wished to buy his vessel and arms and bring over Haytians and proclaim rebellion in Jamaica. Captain Edenborough did not know the person at that time, but afterwards saw Gordon's photograph, and identified him. The animus against Mr. Eyre was shown by this strong fact—that when Captain Edenborough wished to leave this country every effort was made to prevent the reception of his evidence, and induce him to retract what he said. This attempt, however had been defeated; his affidavit was sworn, and he was afterwards cross-examined. He (the Earl of Shrewsbury) rejoiced that the magistrates of Market Drayton, with true English manliness and fairness, had not been led away by any outside clamour, but had honestly and firmly done their duty. This was not the first time that there had been clamour and oppression against an individual. There was an insurrection in Ceylon during the time that Lord Torrington was Governor, and when it was proposed to send out a Commission to inquire into the cruelty which was alleged to have been exercised in suppressing the rebellion, Earl Russell made use of this language in the House of Commons—

> "I believe, whatever that decision may be, that the rules and maxims that we have laid down must be the rules and maxims by which any Government will be guided which seeks to preserve this Empire, and that if any Government was to take the dastardly part of sacrificing a Governor because there was a clamour raised against him, got up with great perseverance and industry—I believe that the Government, while it would sacrifice the colonies, would meet with the reprobation, the deserved reprobation, of the people of England."

Thus, Earl Russell at that time threw the shield of his authority over Lord Torrington; yet he was at the head of the Government that gave way to the clamour raised by the Jamaica Committee, and sacrificed Governor Eyre. He (the Earl of Shrewsbury) had not brought this case before their Lordships on account of any previous knowledge of Mr. Eyre. He had only taken up his cause thinking him an oppressed public servant, and believing that all who were in authority should be backed up by their respective Governments. How was a man to do his duty in a crisis if he had, as it were, a rope round his neck; if he knew that he would be attacked should he not do his duty, and should he do his duty, that then he would be maligned and ruined? It was due to an injured man that some reparation should be made to him. It was only when a violent outcry had been made against him in this country that the authorities had refused him the reparation which they ought to make, and which he hoped they would make to Mr. Eyre. He begged to ask the noble Duke—and trusted the answer would be a satisfactory one—Whether the Government were prepared to adopt the opinion of the late Attorney General with regard to the criminal prosecution of Mr. Eyre, as published in the newspapers of the 29th of July; and whether, in consequence of that opinion, and taking into consideration the fact that more than one abortive attempt had been made by persons styling themselves the Jamaica Committee to carry out the objects they had in view, the Government would now undertake to defend Mr. Eyre against any further prosecution?

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM: It is quite unnecessary for me to follow the noble Earl through the various points raised by him in the early part of his statement. No one disputes, or has ever disputed, the ability with which Mr. Eyre has served the country in the many previous positions in which he was entrusted with official responsibility; but the question which Her Majesty's Government have had to decide, and to which the Question of the noble Earl refers, was the course to be taken with regard to proceedings in which Mr. Eyre found himself involved, not by any act of the Government, but by the act of individuals in this country on his return from Jamaica. That question arose while my noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon), who is not now present, held the office which I have now the honour to hold. At that time the Government decided what should be done under the circumstances in which Mr. Eyre was placed—namely, that of being threatened with a criminal prosecution for certain acts said to be done under his orders during the outbreak in Jamaica. The course which the Government thought it right to take was to give every facility to Mr. Eyre for his defence in any proceedings that might be brought against him; but that it was not the duty of the Government in such a case to intervene between Mr. Eyre and the persons who might endeavour to set the law in motion against him in this country in respect of any acts which he had done. The Government felt that the proper course in such a case was to leave matters to the ordinary course of law, feeling confident that if the proceedings were unfounded they would only recoil on the heads of those who had taken them; and, on the other hand, that if there were any foundation whatever for them the charges brought ought to be subjected to the test of the strict forms of procedure in this country, where *ex parte* statements would not be allowed any weight until they had been tested by the rules of evidence, and those who made them had been subjected to the ordeal of cross-examination in open court. It seems to me that if that course were right then, it ought still to be persevered in. The present position of matters is this—certain criminal proceedings against Mr. Eyre have signally failed; yet certain persons consider they have claims against Mr. Eyre for damages in respect of proceedings he took against them during the disturbances in Jamaica. At the present moment, two actions are pending against Mr. Eyre. One appears to have been proceeded with no further than the mere issuing of the writ. The other case is proceeding, and there has been recently taken the evidence to which the noble Earl has referred as having an important bearing upon the state of affairs in Jamaica—namely, the evidence of Captain Edenborough of the Confederate navy. I confess it appears to me that while these actions are pending, and examinations proceeding, it would not be right for the Government to step in and, in the words of the Question of the noble Earl, "undertake to defend Mr. Eyre against any further persecution." It seems to me that the only right course for the Government to pursue—and the best for Mr. Eyre—is to allow the proceedings that have been commenced against him to be brought to their legitimate conclusion, and to allow the evidence upon which they are founded to be sifted in a Court of Law. Then, and not until then, will it be right for the Government to decide any question which might arise with reference to Mr. Eyre. The noble Earl thought proper to allude to a despatch of my predecessor (the Earl of Carnarvon), calling upon the Government of Jamaica to explain certain sentences passed, not during martial law, but by the civil authority, upon certain rioters, which sentences appeared to be characterized by excessive severity; and the noble Earl read some extracts from the answer of the present Governor, pointing out the reasons for these sentences, and why they should be persevered in, and otherwise referred to this despatch as indirect confirmation that a state of things prevailed in Jamaica which justified the course pursued by Mr. Eyre. I should not have referred to this despatch, because it does not appear to bear in any manner on the question before your Lordships, but for the printed statement placed in my hands this afternoon, which the noble Earl has quoted, and which, indeed, bears his signature. This document conveys the impression that the Government to which I belong have withheld from the public documents which could throw light on the subject; for it states that Lord Carnarvon's despatch has been inserted in the newspapers, and has obtained wide publicity, while similar publicity has not been given to the reply of Sir John Peter Grant, which contains matter of the highest importance in vindication of Mr. Eyre. I regret that the statement should have been made in such a form, because a reference to the blue book would have shown that this despatch is published *in extenso*, together with Lord Carnarvon's despatch. I do not, however, see that these despatches in any way bear upon the case of Governor Eyre. With regard to the particular Question put to me, I think that the proper time for Mr. Eyre to bring any question he may desire to raise with regard to his own conduct under the notice of the Government will be when the proceedings now pending against him have closed. At the same time, I shall feel at liberty to discuss the matter with much more freedom when I can refer to evidence, which I do not feel justified in doing while the cases are before Courts of Law. While admitting the embarrassing position in which Mr. Eyre is placed, and appreciating the feelings of disappointment which must necessarily overwhelm an officer who, after serving his country faithfully and honourably so many years in various colonies, finds himself the object of criminal and civil prosecutions, I cannot forget that the liability to be exposed to such vicissitudes is necessarily attached to the high position which Mr. Eyre assumed. It has been his misfortune to fall upon a time of trouble and difficulties—difficulties which he surmounted—and disturbances during which he showed great vigour and energy. For what he did he has had the misfortune to be arraigned by certain persons, and the legal proceedings must take their course, and the evidence be sifted for the facts before the Government can form any opinion as to the course to be pursued by them with reference to Mr. Eyre.

THE EARL OF SHREWSBURY, in explanation, said, he did not mean to imply that the Government had withheld the despatch of the present Governor from publicity, but that the newspapers had done so. He could not say that the Answer of the noble Duke was very satisfactory. Mr. Eyre seemed to be the victim of a persecution by a party, one half of whom seemed to wish for his blood, while the other half coveted any money he might possess — and, in fact, wished to ruin him.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
till Thursday next, half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, August 13, 1867.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Committee*—Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (*re-comm.*) [301]; Parks Regulation (*re-comm.*) [273] [R.P.]; Consolidated Fund Appropriation*; Courts of Referees* [311]; Hours of Labour Regulation* (*re-comm.*) [258]; County Courts Acts Amendment* [212]; Railway Companies (Scotland)* [292]; Consecration of Churches and Churchyards* [276] [R.P.].

Report—Skipton Grammar School* [290]; Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (*re-comm.*) [301]; Consolidated Fund Appropriation*; Courts of Referees* [311]; Hours of Labour Regulation* (*re-comm.*) [258]; County Courts Acts Amendment* [212]; Railway Companies (Scotland)* [292].

Considered as amended—Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (*re-comm.*) [301].

Third Reading—Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (*re-comm.*) [301].

The House met at Two of the Clock.

CASE OF THE "TORNADO."

QUESTION.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can state what decision the Spanish Council of State has arrived at in the case of the *Tornado?*

Lord STANLEY said, in reply, that he could not give the information asked for by the hon. Member, as he had received no official communication on the subject. From private communications which had reached him, however, he was given to understand that the decision would be announced in a very short time.

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE.

QUESTION.

Mr. LOCKE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has received any information regarding the insufficiency of the Metropolitan Police Force; whether any steps are likely to be taken for increasing the number of Constables; and whether there is any balance unappropriated in the hands of the Receiver for such Force; and, if so, whether he has any objection to state the amount of such balance?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: Sir, for several years the police force in the metropolis has been deficient in numbers. In January last there was a deficiency of 300 men; but since the augmentation of pay that then took place, the force has been brought up to its full amount. It is necessary that there should always be a balance of £70,000 in the hands of the Receiver, as otherwise there would be no means for paying the wages and pensions of the men in advance, before the sum levied on the different parishes, which takes six weeks to collect, is received. Last year there was a balance of £104,000, out of which £11,000 was required to supply the deficiencies of the usual expenses. There is now a balance of £92,850 in the hands of the Receiver, out of which, as I have before said, £70,000 is required for the pay in advance of the men and the pensioners. The force having been brought up to the proper numbers, the resources at the disposal of the police authorities have been exhausted.

Mr. LOCKE said, he would beg to ask, Whether the right hon. Gentleman has received any information regarding the insufficiency of the Metropolitan Police Force?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: I have not received any particular information on this subject. The Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police certainly told me that he had been spoken to as to the insufficiency of the supply of men at different places, but this would apply not to the whole force, but to its distribution in certain localities.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE POOR LAWS.

QUESTION.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he wished to ask the Secretary of the Poor Law Board, If it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill early next Session to amend and consolidate the many Acts which regulate the administration of Relief to the Poor?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill for the Amendment of the Poor Laws next Session. The question of consolidation of the Poor Laws was a very large one, and would receive the attention of the Poor Law Board during the recess.

COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH AUSTRIA.

QUESTION.

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that the negotiations for a Commercial Treaty with Austria have failed; and, whether he is prepared to lay upon the table of the House the Correspondence on the subject?

Lord STANLEY: Strictly speaking, Sir, the negotiations now going on between the Government of this country and that of Austria, are not negotiations for the conclusion of a Commercial Treaty, seeing that that treaty was concluded in 1865. The object of the present negotiations is as to the means of carrying into effect that part of the treaty which relates to the tariff dues, and it is not the fact, as stated by the hon. Member in his Question, that the negotiations have failed. Those negotiations are still going on. Certain propositions have been made by the Government of Austria, to which in their present form we do not think ourselves justified in assenting. We have stated to what points our objections apply, and the matter is still under discussion. When the negotiations are concluded I shall have no objection to lay the Correspondence on the table, but before then it would be unadvisable and unusual to do so.

ARMY—REWARDS FOR MILITARY SERVICE.—QUESTION.

Captain VIVIAN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is intended to make the recent regulation whereby cavalry and infantry soldiers are henceforth to serve the same number of years to qualify for pension and for the good conduct medal retrospective in its operation as regards the medal; so as to enable cavalry soldiers of twenty-one years' service to obtain a good conduct medal on the same terms as the infantry soldier, who under the old regulation was entitled to this reward after eighteen years' service; the connection between the period of service required for pension and that required for the medal being purely arbitrary?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he did not quite understand the scope of the hon. and gallant Member's Question; but he thought he should meet the object he had in view by stating that the cavalry and the infantry had been placed on an equal footing as regarded the pensions and good conduct medals, and that members of both services would be eligible to receive them after eighteen years' service.

Captain VIVIAN: Will that be retrospective?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: Yes.

CASE OF HAYES AND BARRY.
QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a statement in the newspapers that the policemen Hayes and Barry, prosecuted and convicted of perjury in the case of the lads Dye and Pearce, had been reinstated in the police force on full pay under the circumstance that Mr. Ivory, the prosecutor, had been unable to sustain the cost of carrying on the proceedings through the Court of Queen's Bench; whether he considers that the case demands his attention; and, whether he is informed of the proceedings taken by the Police Commissioners, and to communicate the same to the House?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, in reply, that the Question of the hon. Member did not state the facts quite correctly. The prosecution was instituted against the boys Dye and Pearce, who were convicted chiefly on the evidence of the two policemen. Afterwards an indictment for perjury and conspiracy was preferred against the policemen, and Hayes was convicted and Barry acquitted of the charge of perjury under precisely similar circumstances. The trial for conspiracy was pending up to May last, when no one appearing to prosecute they were both acquitted. Hayes had not been called up for judgment, nor was there any intention of calling him up. Under these circumstances, the Chief Commissioner (Sir Richard Mayne) had to consider the proper course to pursue, and the matter was submitted to him (Mr. G. Hardy), with a recommendation from the magistrate acquainted with the facts, that the men should, under the circumstances, be reinstated in their situations. In accordance with that recommendation the men had been reinstated, and they were now receiving full pay.

ARMY—PROMOTION IN THE 96th REGIMENT.—QUESTION.

Captain HAYTER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the *Gazette* of the 19th ultimo, in which three officers of the 96th Regiment were promoted by purchase in succession to Major Cuppage of that regiment, who is stated in the *Indian Mail* to have died on the 12th of the preceding month; and whether, should such promotions be found to have been irregular as regards the medical certificate, the Secretary of State for War will advise their cancelling, in order that the senior Officers of each rank may succeed, without purchase, to the vacant steps?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, in reply, that the circumstances of the case had been brought under his notice. At first, he had thought it was open to objection; but on further investigation he found that the rules of the service had been complied with; that he did not feel justified in interfering; and that, consequently, the purchase and sale could not be cancelled.

DISTRICT METROPOLITAN LUNATIC ASYLUMS.—QUESTION.

Colonel HOGG said, he wished to ask the Secretary of the Poor Law Board, Whether the cost of the District Asylums in the Metropolis for Lunatics will not greatly exceed the original estimated rate of £50 for each inmate; whether the Poor Law Board will sanction the erection of buildings for more than 2,000 Lunatics, the number stated to be sufficient for the requirements of the Metropolis; and whether, if it should appear that the total charge upon the Metropolitan ratepayers is likely to be more than double the sum of £400,000, as originally estimated, the Board would sanction the erection of buildings so greatly in excess of those which Parliament was led to believe would be necessary?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, he was sorry he had no information on the subject to which the hon. and gallant Member referred that would enable him to give a direct Answer to the Question that had been put to him. The subject to which the Question referred was in the hands of the Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum Districts, two-thirds of whom were appointed by the guardians of the different metropolitan unions, and who might be said to represent the interests of the ratepayers. The managers were understood to have appointed a committee, to whom had been referred the question of accommodation necessary for the imbecile poor of the different metropolitan workhouses. That committee had not made its report, and consequently no report had been received from them by the Poor Law Board. He could assure the hon. and gallant Gentleman that the Board would not sanction any excessive or unnecessary expenditure; but, on the contrary, they were disposed to encourage and enforce economy by every means in their power in the expenditure of the common fund of the metropolitan parishes as far as was consistent with a due regard to the important objects aimed at by the Act of this Session.

ARMY ENLISTMENT BILL.—QUESTION.

General DUNNE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will take into consideration the case of those soldiers now serving who were enlisted for a longer period than twenty-one years, with a view to giving them the advantage of the terms of enlistment under the Bill of this Session.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, in reply, said, he had not as yet thought it right to make the change suggested by the Question of the hon. and gallant Member, but he would make inquiries into the matter.

METROPOLIS—STRAY DOGS.

QUESTION.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been directed to a letter in *The Times* newspaper, of Monday, headed "Street Dogs," in which the writer stated—

> "That, when in the vicinity of the Royal Exchange, on Friday last, he saw a lad severely bitten in the hand and leg by a large stray dog, and the foot passengers flying in all directions from the same animal."

And, whether it is his intention to give instructions to the Police authorities to cause all unclaimed stray dogs to be removed from the public streets? He understood this was not a solitary case, but that several similar cases had occurred in the Metropolis.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he was sorry to say that his attention had only been directed to the letter referred to shortly before he came down to the House; but, as it was a question of great importance what should be done with stray dogs found in the metropolis, he would cause inquiries to be made into the subject.

INDIAN PRIZE MONEY.—QUESTION.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, What occasions the delay in the distribution of the prize money due to the Central Indian Army; and when such distribution may be expected?

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, in reply, said, he was under the impression that the distribution had already commenced in India, but no communication on the subject had been yet received in this country. He was, however, daily expecting the arrival of such a communication.

METROPOLIS—BETHNAL GREEN WORKHOUSE.—QUESTION.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Whether his attention has been called to a report of an inquest held on a pauper inmate of Bethnal Green Workhouse, named William Rosomon, aged seventy-six years, and who, while labouring under asthma, was stated to have been employed by Mr. Baddeley, the official superintendent of labour in the workhouse, at very severe labour, the verdict of the jury being—

> "That the old man's death was occasioned by exposure to the weather, and that Mr. Baddeley was extremely censurable for having set the old man to work in the manner described;"

Whether it is true that Mr. Baddeley, having resigned, the Bethnal Green Board gave him a "suitable testimonial;" and to inquire, in the event of such report being found accurate, the Poor Law Board will express its censure on the state of administration appearing by the report to exist in Bethnal Green Workhouse, and will caution the Guardians to be more careful in future as regards the mode of treatment pursued towards aged and infirm paupers?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH replied that the attention of the Poor Law Board had been called to this case, the circumstances of which were pretty much in accordance with the statement of the hon. Gentleman. Immediately on receiving information on the subject the Poor Law Board sent their Inspector to the Workhouse at Bethnal Green, and the Inspector reported that Mr. Baddeley had resigned his situation and that his resignation had been accepted by the Guardians, but nothing was said in the Inspector's Report about the presentation of a "suitable testimonial" to Mr. Baddeley. A coroner's inquest had been held on the poor man Rosomon, and the Poor Law Board had written to the coroner for a copy of the depositions. On the receipt of them the Board would form their opinion on the whole case, and would not hesitate to express that opinion.

PARKS REGULATION (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Mr. Attorney General.*)

[Bill 273.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

On Question, "That the Preamble be postponed,"

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR rose to move that the Chairman leave the Chair. When some time back he moved the second reading be deferred for three months, he indicated his intention to take every means which the forms of the House would allow to prevent the Bill becoming law, The lateness of the Session, and the consequent emptiness of the Benches, probably might be alone sufficient for asking that a Bill of so much importance should not now be pressed. He was no friend to government by minority, either in or out of that House; still less was he in favour of government by minorities in that House. He was quite aware, therefore, that in taking a step so unusual as that which he now proposed, he was bound to show ample and all-sufficient reason for what he was doing. But it would be acknowledged by every Gentleman in that House that there had been occasions in the past, and might be again in the future, when their liberties had been maintained, and the rights of the people secured from aggression, by a minority taking upon itself the duty which the opponents of this measure were now taking upon themselves. The Government had proved by repeated experiments, and by what he must designate their "meddle-and-muddle" policy, that they had not a single leg to stand upon in the measure they were now proposing. They had proved, beyond all possibility of doubt, that the meetings of the people, when left alone, were as regular, as orderly, and as moderate as any known in our history. But when the Government endeavoured, by action or threat, to prevent the meetings, they were unable to preserve order, and were compelled to call upon the very League, by whom those meetings were convened, to protect them and the public from outrage. The Government had shown that there was but one potentiality which belonged to them with respect to these meetings, and that was, that they could, as they had done, succeed in turning a peaceful and orderly meeting into a scene of disgraceful riot and outrage. He had admitted that the minority in that House were bound to show the majority in that House—if, indeed, a majority existed—that there were substantial reasons for the course they proposed to pursue; but it should be recollected that that minority, if it were, indeed, a minority in the House of Commons, had the good fortune to represent the great masses of the people of this country. ["No, no!"] Again, he admitted that a minority would not be justified in withstanding the will and opinion of the majority in proposing a change in the legislation of the country. A minority would not be justified in acting coercively, if they sought to wring from the people a new position. But in the present case the minority stood upon the *status quo:* they stood upon the old ways and traditions of the Constitution—the right of the people to hold public meetings. Under whatever guise this Bill was brought in, it was nothing but an attempt to say to the people of England, "You shall hold no more public meetings." ["No, no!"] To say that the people might hold public meetings, but that they should have no central locality in which to hold them, was only a tricky and indirect way of saying "You shall not hold meetings at all." Hyde Park was the only place in London where the people could conveniently hold their meetings. In spite of the suave and courteous manner of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. G. Hardy) and his assertion that the Bill was intended to get rid of troublesome preachers and the congregation of gamblers under the trees, the language of the press which supported the Government, of the Lobby, and of the Clubs, all concurred in saying that the object of the Bill was that what hon. Gentlemen opposite called the London mob should be prevented from in future holding political meetings in the Park. It had been asked, "Why do not the people go to Primrose Hill, or to Battersea Park?" Because centrality and locality were of the first importance in public demonstrations. He wondered why no hon. Member rose in his place and said to the people of London when they wanted to meet for the discussion of political matters, "Let them, like the late Mr. Norval, take their stand upon the Grampian Hills." In the Parliament of 1819, distinguished by a most corrupt and tyrannical majority and by a most noble, true-hearted, and not small minority, the right of public meetings was upheld to an extent that we did not now attain. In the course of the debate which took place in that year upon the Seditious Meetings Prevention Bill, Mr. Ricardo said—

> "He thought that in the course of this discussion sufficient attention had not been given to the importance of the right to be contended. If the people's right of meeting and petitioning consisted only in the right of meeting to petition for the removal of grievances, it was not of so much importance, and the curtailment of it was not of such serious interest. But the right was a right of meeting in such numbers and showing such a front to Ministers as would afford a hope that bad measures would be abandoned, and that public opinion would be respected."—[1 *Hansard*, xli. 769.]

Mr. Macdonald stated—

> "The measure now before them went to deprive the people of this country of a privilege without which there would have been no House of Commons sitting there at that moment—the privilege of meeting to petition—or at least to reduce the exercise of that privilege to the limits of a parish vestry room."—[1 *Hansard*, xli. 616.]

It was not, therefore, the first time that they who sat on those (the Liberal) Benches might fairly claim to be standing in the old ways of the Constitution. Another justification for the action of the minority in the present case was that the measure before them was not well-defined, nor had it been well discussed. It had been brought before them in the most miserable and piecemeal way. According to an old authority, the laws of England were not to be lightly changed. This Bill had gone through several phases; and now, within a few days of the closing of the Session, the right hon. Gentleman opposite had placed new Amendments on the Paper, so that it was difficult to recognize the measure as that which had been two months ago read a first time. The Bill was not well defined; it was simply a ridiculous and a silly Bill. The Preamble of the Bill stated that the parks and gardens named in the schedule had been used for the enjoyment and recreation of Her Majesty's subjects. Now, that was just the point of the opponents of the Bill. They had had the use of the Park, and they saw no need of any new regulations. They did not desire to see their privileges extended. But the Preamble went on to say, that it was expedient to make further provision for securing that enjoyment and recreation; and they then proceeded to place a limitation upon the use of the Park, and to say that it should not be used for public meetings. The title of the Bill ought to be a "Bill for Preventing Public Meetings in London." If that be not its object, and its justification were based upon the other ground which was commonly put forward, namely—that of the exclusive use of the Park for the "upper ten thousand," who wanted Rotten Row for the purpose of riding, the Serpentine drive for their carriages, and a greensward for their nurserymaids and children the Bill became more insulting still. In order to obtain these very slight advantages, were they to be asked to pass a measure for doing away with the great constitutional principle of the right of the people to hold public meetings? Such a measure as the present should at all events be passed in a representative House; the few Members who then occupied the Benches did not represent the existing House of Commons. Where was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire and all his Friends who had opposed the second reading of this Bill? They had gone to their amusements, not supposing that the Government would be mad enough to persevere in the Bill. That House had acknowledged that it did not fitly and entirely represent the people of England, and how much better therefore would it not be, before attempting to deprive the people of the right they had exercised for centuries, to wait till they had a House of Commons which would largely and approximately represent the English people? Could Her Majesty's Government say, with Lord Castlereagh, when opposing a factious minority in 1819—

> "But it was a great error to suppose that those on his side had understood, that, after such a division, any hon. Members would think it consistent with their public duty to put in force this power of renewing Motions for Adjournment. In his conscience he believed that the public safety was deeply involved in the immediate progress of this measure."—[1 *Hansard*, xli. 849.]

Would the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary say that the public safety depended upon leaving in the hands of the Government the power of turning a peaceful meeting into a tumult—an object which they had once already succeeded in accomplishing? If the right hon. Gentleman contended for that he (Mr. Taylor) would then ask his attention to the words addressed by Oliver Cromwell to Parliament—

> "When matters of necessity come, then without guilt extraordinary remedies may be applied; but if necessity be pretended there is so much the more sin."

What was the object of the right hon. Gentleman in pressing forward this Bill at the present time? Was it the fact that the right hon. Gentleman was pushed on by his more hot-headed followers? Was it true that they could not endure the thought of a long Session of humiliation without having a little bit of vengeance put in at the end? ["Oh, oh!"] Could it really be true, although a measure of Reform had been wrung from the Tories, yet that, true to their traditions, they neither loved nor trusted the people to whom they were giving political emancipation? *The Times*, just previous to the last triumphant and peaceful meeting held in Hyde Park, contained words so very appropriate to the condition of the right hon. Gentleman, that with the permission of the House he would read them.—

> "But suppose the Bill which Mr. Hardy will bring on 'whenever he has the opportunity,' had already passed, and that the demonstration was to protest against an Act of Parliament giving the power to arrest and fine intruding and obstinate orators. It would be impossible then to pass over the conduct and to decline the challenge of Mr. Beales; and at this moment the telegraph would probably be in action to summon troops to London, and the Chief Commissioner of Police would be preparing the disposition of his force. What is the use of legislation which is only efficient in such petty cases as are well enough provided for under the present law, and which is powerless when any demagogue can persuade a mob to abet him in defying it.

In 1819 the Government of that day did not dare to do what the right hon. Gentleman was now proposing. They did not dare to say that the people had no right to hold public meetings; but they came to the conclusion that the meetings which were at that time being held were in themselves dangerous, inasmuch as the people came to them armed, and they believed that revolution would be the inevitable result if steps were not taken to put them down. The Solicitor General, on the Seditious Meetings Prevention Bill, stated—

> "There was reason to suppose that a conspiracy of a most alarming and extensive character would burst forth unless great precautions were taken to suppress it; and it was stated to be matter of absolute certainty that revolution was the aim of those who were engaged in it."—[1 *Hansard*, xli. 597.]

The Government of 1819 did not venture to attack in theory the right of public meeting. Again, according to this Bill, as he understood it, the fact of the meeting being held without permission having been first given made it *ipso facto*, an illegal meeting—an extent to which Lord Castlereagh did not go. Lord Castlereagh, speaking in 1819 on the Seditious Meetings Prevention Bill, said—

> "If the influx of strangers had a tendency to endanger the peace or change the nature of the meeting, they (the magistrates) should read a proclamation ordering all strangers to withdraw, If this proclamation was not obeyed, they might then pronounce the meeting to be illegal and dissolve it. A quarter of at hour would be allowed for the strangers to retire, and half an hour for the meeting to disperse."—[1 *Hansard*, xli. 391.]

He felt assured that what the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary was doing was not of his own good-will, and he ought to thank the minority for relieving him from a false position, and also prevent a renewal of that feeling of anger and bitterness which the passing of this measure would create. The Government would thank the minority for rescuing them from the counsels of their hot-headed Friends, among whom, if he was not very wrong, was the noble Lord the Member for Haddington (Lord Elcho). There was no doubt the Government could not have a more dangerous adviser than the noble Lord. His speeches of the last two years showed that. The House would remember the declaration of the noble Lord that the people of this country—whom he knew so well—did not want Reform at all, and that, with the exception of a few demagogues in the House and out of the House, Reform was always a sham and a delusion. ["Oh, oh!"] It must not be forgotten that the noble Lord came down to the House, with a beaming countenance, and produced a letter written by a live working man, who was permitted to say, "My dear Elcho," or perhaps it was more Parliamentary to say, "My dear Lord." The noble Lord had produced to the House that letter of a real live working man, who showed his real democratic tendencies by fixing his residence in the United States of America, but whose conduct was in harmony with that of too many, in calumniating those among whom he resided. Whether the noble Lord had changed his opinion as to Reform he (Mr. Taylor) did not know; but the noble Lord had detailed to admiring audiences how he had got the democratic leaders under his feet,—["Question!"]—and no effort of his should be wanting to keep them there. The noble Lord no doubt told them to only let the meetings of the people be declared illegal, and the Volunteers would then soon see the law put in force. ["No!"] As a leader from the first of the Volunteer movement, he hoped the noble Lord had not thought or said such a thing. The noble Lord might know many of the Volunteers; but he (Mr. Taylor) could answer for it that he did not know the spirit of all of them. He believed the first shot fired against the people by the Volunteers would put an end to the Volunteer force. He would conclude with a few words which he adopted entirely as his own—the protest of noble Lords against the Seditious Meetings Prevention Bill in September, 1819. The protest, which was signed "Vassall Holland, Augustus Frederick, Thanet, Donoughmore, Grosvenor, Erskine," was as follows:—

> "Because the Commons of England, when duty enforced, have always been found sufficient to prevent any confusion arising from popular meetings, or to punish any disturbers of the public peace, and a too ready acquiescence in the suggestions of Ministers for imposing new restraints upon the rights and usage of the people (even if the provisions of this Bill were in themselves neither harsh nor unreasonable) appears to us more calculated to add weight to calumny and to exasperate discontent into hostility than to defeat the designs of turbulent men, or to reclaim the alienated affections of a mistaken multitude."

He begged to move that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

LORD ELCHO: It is not my intention to imitate the hon. Member by bringing into the debate the names of Cromwell, Shylock, Sidmouth, or Castlereagh; neither shall I think it necessary to defend my own character or conduct in or out of the House, being prepared to be judged in the one case by my fellow-Members, in the other by my fellow-countrymen. But there is one point upon which I feel bound to say a word. That is with reference to the language attributed to me in connection with the Volunteers and this question of Hyde Park. I read in the *Star* newspaper a letter—a friend told me of it—which was signed "A Man in the Streets." In this the writer—and we can have little doubt now who the writer of that letter is—says he has reason to believe that Lord Elcho intends to support the Government with the Volunteer force as far as his influence extends. A calumny such as that under cover of an anonymous scribbler in the *Star* I did not think it worth while to notice. The *Star* seems addicted to taking false views of what persons do, and I have often been libelled in its pages as an enemy of the people, and charged with having vilified and maligned the people. But when such things are repeated in this House, statements which might affect the Volunteer force, I feel it my duty to give, in the most distinct and positive manner that the Parliamentary mode of speech admits of, a clear and definite denial to such statements. I can appeal to hon. Members, and I can appeal to the Secretary of State for War, whether publicly in this House, and privately in conversation, wherever there has been any question of the employment of the Volunteers in any way in suppressing a disturbance, I have not urged on the part of the Volunteer force that they ought not to be employed in any such manner, and whether I have not done everything in my power to render their employment in such a matter impossible? [Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: Hear.] I think it my imperative duty to support the Government on this occasion. To listen to the speeches of hon. Gentlemen, the opponents of this measure, one would suppose that the question at issue was the right of public meeting, and that some infringement of the public liberties, some tyrannical act on the part of Her Majesty's Government, was attempted. But what is the case? There are certain parks with reference to which the impression existed on the part of the Government, and existed also on the part of these very Gentlemen, that the Government had power to control their user. The best proof which I can adduce is the conduct of Mr. Beales and the Reform League on the occasion that the railings were pulled down. Was it their intention to force their way into the Park? By no means. They intended, and announced that they intended, to go there for the purpose of asking for admission, and, if refused, then of testing the question at law. An accident—the weakness of the railings—precipitated the event and compromised the position. Upon inquiry it turned out that the Government, in the opinion of their Law Officers, were not in the position which they had believed, and which the Reform League had believed. Then it was thought desirable that power to regulate the user of the Parks, intended for the recreation and enjoyment of all, should be vested incontestably in the Crown. There is no intention to infringe in the slightest degree upon the rights of the people. The Bill is introduced in the interests of the people themselves. The Bill is not promoted in the interests of the aristocracy, or of the nurserymaids, or of the upper ten thousand. Whether it passes or not, persons of all classes who can keep a horse will ride in Rotten Row, and every person who can keep a carriage, I presume, will drive in the Park. The parks are for the benefit of all persons, whether resident in London or coming from the country, and whether high or low. The Government say that these parks are intended for recreation and enjoyment, and are not suitable for crowded meetings or for preaching. Have they any precedents for saying so? The hon. Baronet the Member for the West Riding (Sir Francis Crossley) and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Mr. Bass) with great generosity and liberality towards the people in their own neighbourhoods, have given parks for the public recreation. And what did they stipulate in each case? In the deed of conveyance a clause was inserted providing that the park should not be used for the purposes of public meetings—the very purposes now under discussion. Across the Atlantic what do you find? In the Park at New York a similar clause exists. The principal opponents of the present measure declare that they are not opposing it upon principle. The hon. and learned Member for Southwark bases his opposition on the question of time merely; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire, though he voted against proceeding with the Bill, justified his course upon considerations affecting the period of the Session, and never once alluded to principle. He went further. The right hon. Gentleman suggested not merely that the user of the public parks, but the passing of processions through the streets was a matter which ought to be regulated. The late Home Secretary (Sir George Grey) and the late Minister of Works (Mr. Cowper) said that it was necessary and desirable that a Bill of this kind should pass for the benefit of the people. I believe that the Government are entitled to gratitude for bringing forward a measure of which the majority of the House of Commons has shown its approval, and which is clearly for the benefit of the majority of the people. I go further, and say that what has occurred on this question without the walls of this House renders it necessary for the character, the honour, and the dignity of this House, and for the maintenance of law and order in this country, that we should persevere with this Bill. What has occurred without the walls of Parliament? There has been a meeting held in the Tea-room of this House—a meeting which Mr. Speaker has ruled to be contrary to the forms and precedents of the House of Commons. I find in the *Globe* newspaper a report of that meeting. It represents Mr. Beales as having protested that if the Bill were sanctioned by Parliament the Reform League would, if necessary, resort to physical force to prevent its provisions being carried into effect. Mr. Bright is reported to have said that such language was just the way to insure the passing of the Bill. I now come to the Reform meeting in Hyde Park. There can be no mistake about that. There is no denying it, because it was on a printed bill circulated before the meeting was held. It was headed, "To your tents, O Israel!" It then proceeded—

"A monster Meeting of the Working Men and other inhabitants of the Metropolis will be held in Hyde Park on Monday next, August 5, at 7 o'clock, under the presidency of the Reform League, to express the public indignation at the prohibitive Bill attempted to be passed through an expiring and self-condemned Parliament, by the enemies of all popular rights, and also to protest against the attempt of the House of Lords to rob the lodger of his franchise. Please distribute these bills through every workshop, and induce as many as possible to attend and preserve to our children the rights handed down by our forefathers."

At that meeting Mr. Beales is reported to have said—

> "We positively refuse to be excluded altogether from meeting in the Park at the arbitrary will of any class or any Government whatsoever, and we caution all concerned that there may be danger in attempting to legalize or enforce any such unlawful and unconstitutional measure."

Colonel Dickson proposed the first Resolution—

> "That this meeting protests against such a Bill being made law, and declares its determination to resist that Bill to the utmost."

Colonel Dickson is further represented to have declared that the House of Commons was composed of a few good men, a large number of bad, and a great many fools. He spoke in a like strain of the Upper House. It is also reported that subsequently, at a meeting in the Hanover Square Rooms, presided over by the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens), Mr. Beales said—

> "That if the obnoxious Park Bill was proceeded with they would hold another meeting in Hyde Park, and they might then find it necessary to pursue a course of proceeding which would remove all possibility of misrepresentation, and would not leave the slightest doubt of what was meant by the men of London, what their temper was, and what their numbers were, and of their determination to resist this measure."

I submit to the House that what I have just read substantiates what I previously said to the House. I wish to remind the House that Parliament has always shown itself very jealous of attempts by any to overawe the Legislature in its course of legislation. In this instance an attempt is being made to overawe Parliament. An Act passed in 1795, 36 *Geo.* III., declares that any attempt at printing any writing for the purpose of intimidating or overawing Parliament shall be deemed a felony. That statute was extended by an Act passed in 1848. Words were then introduced to apply to the case of open speaking; but the operation was limited to two years. The Act of *Geo.* III. was, however, preserved. This shows how anxiously and jealously Parliament has guarded its deliberations against overawing or intimidation. I firmly believe that the mass of the thinking reasoning artizans of the country, including those of the metropolis, are not in favour of the course taken by the persons who are opposing this measure. They have too much good sense to suppose that the Parliament, which has so largely extended their privileges, would infringe upon their rights. A member of the Reform League told me that he considered the opposition to it to be a great mistake, and another influential man of the same class, though not a member of the Reform League, told me the same thing. After the course which has been taken by those who oppose the Bill, the Members of the House of Commons owe it to themselves as the depositories of the dignity of the House—they owe it to those who are to come after them for, I hope, many generations—to support the Government in carrying the Bill. I trust they will consider the measure with calm deliberation, but, at the same time, with a fixed resolve to carry it. By so acting they will secure the respect of even those who are opposing them.

Mr. NEATE said, that if the opponents of the Bill had petitioned the House in Petitions signed by large numbers of the working classes, he believed the Government having regard to the period of the Session, would have put off the Bill to another year, without admitting that the principle on which they had acted on introducing it was a mistaken one. But after the challenge of those who said they represented, but who really misrepresented, the working men, consistently with their own character and dignity, the Government could not fail to go on with the Bill, and the House of Commons, after the attempts made to intimidate it, consistently with their character and dignity, could not fail to support the Government in so doing. It was an error to suppose that an aggregate of individuals, however brought together, constituted a public meeting in the proper sense of the term. A public meeting of the people of a parish or a borough was one regularly summoned by the parishioners or the burgesses. It was to such assemblies as these the words "right of pnblic meeting" applied. Of course five people or 5,000 might assemble together to talk politics. They did so by just the same right as they might assemble at the British Coffee House. That the Crown, or the Government on behalf of the Crown, had a right to turn the people out of the Park was a position which no one in the

House would be hardy enough to deny, and it was a pity that men should be found to countenance the people in claims which they well knew to be unfounded. There could be no doubt that these meetings must be attended with evil results. He, himself, had been afraid to vote for the Sunday Trade in Liquors Bill, because he feared that if the Bill was passed, such a meeting would have been held in Hyde Park, that the peace of the metropolis would have been seriously endangered, and several lives would have been lost. The present question ought, indeed, to have been settled by the late Government. He wished the Members of the late Government had as good reason for being absent that evening as the present Government had for introducing the measure. To the present Administration the matter came as a *damnosa hereditas*, and they had dealt with the question as fairly as possible. The hon. Member had objected to proceeding with the Bill on account of the lateness of the Session. The argument would have been good enough if the Bill had been freshly introduced; but it had been before the House during the greater part of the Session, although the Government, from the press of public businesss, had been unable to proceed with it. The Bill indeed, might be looked upon as the proper complement to that great measure of Reform, which they had for so long been engaged in passing. After what had been done for the people it would not be unreasonable to expect that the claims now made for meeting in the parks should be desisted from, especially when it was remembered that the inhabitants of the metropolis numbered about 3,000,000, and that out of those 3,000,000 there were 20,000 or 30,000 who would as soon see London in flames as not. The Government were fully justified in the course they had taken with respect to the Bill. Ample notice had been given of it, and they had never said that they would withdraw it. If the Bill were carried out and a collision ensued, it would only be because the multitude had been encouraged to resist the law, and the law must be vindicated. He trusted therefore that hon. Members would cease the opposition they offered to this measure.

Mr. WHALLEY said, it had been argued that public meetings were no meetings at all unless they were called by some constituted authority. He had the honour of being acquainted with that most respectable man Mr. Beales, to whom on one occasion the peace of the Metropolis was intrusted by the late Home Secretary, (Mr. Walpole). The meetings which had taken place under his auspices had brought the feelings of the people into harmony with the House and with Parliament generally. He considered the question before the House of great importance. The Bill was a direct violation of, and encroachment upon, the rights of the people. The Government were bringing the feelings of the people into collision with Her Majesty. The use of the parks was to be restricted to such purposes as Her Majesty's Ranger might prescribe, and parties offending were to be subject to a penalty of £10. The Bill instituted a new kind of trespass —a trespass in pursuit of politics and religion. The Government were attempting to pass a law which would be most arbitrary, unjust and unnecessary—such a law as could not be found in any previous records of Parliament. On right hon. Gentleman opposite would rest the serious responsibility of bringing Her Majesty, in respect of her property in these parks, into collision with the outraged feelings of the people. The restrictions in the case of private parks had been referred to, and it was said that similar restrictions ought to be applied to the London parks. He altogether disapproved of those restrictions. If the hon. baronet the Member for the West Riding (Sir Francis Crossley) had offered to give a park to any town in which he (Mr. Whalley) had resided on condition that it should not be used for the discussion of politics or religion, he would have urged his fellow-townsmen to decline accepting the park on such conditions. They were inconsistent with that freedom of speech which was the right and duty of every Englishman. But the very fact that gentlemen who had presented public parks to various provincial towns had inserted in their deeds of gift clauses providing that no religious or political questions should be discussed within their bounds showed that, without that clause, the people would have a right to hold such discussions. In the case of the London parks the case was much stronger, because they were maintained for the enjoyment of a very small portion of the community at the expense of the people, who were now pleading for justice and protesting against the wrong with which they were threatened. There were no pieces of ground in the kingdom which more essentially belonged to the working classes than the London parks. They contributed fully one-half to the keeping up and improvement of the parks, and desired their use for purposes which were essential to the performance of their duty to themselves and to the country. He should like to know if the discussion of politics or religion had ever practically interfered with the enjoyment of the parks by other classes of the people? The origin of the movement respecting the parks was the introduction of preaching. The police had already power to remove from the parks those who ventured to preach there. Why should this be so? A great preacher like Mr. Spurgeon could not find a building large enough for his audience, and why not allow him to resort to the parks? Was there any objection, according to the principles of Christianity, to the preaching of religion in the open air? Christianity was founded by preaching in the open air, and not in temples, some of which were now anything but satisfactory. He had heard one sermon preached in the Park by the head of a firm of solicitors who had the confidence of Her Majesty's Government and hon. Gentlemen opposite—he meant Mr. Robert Baxter. It was the best sermon he had ever heard. Primrose Hill had been referred to as a more suitable place for holding meetings than the parks. But in 1864, when Garibaldi was in this country, Mr. Beales was ordered not to hold a meeting there, because it was said the concourse of a great mass of the people might lead to a breach of the peace. On the last occasion on which the right hon. Gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) addressed the House upon this subject indeed, he gave up Primrose Hill, and proposed that the meetings of the people of the metropolis—three millions of people—should be held in public buildings? Could anything be more absurd? What difference was there between such principles as were contradictorily enunciated on this subject by the right hon. Gentleman and the practices followed by the despotic Governments of Spain and Naples? All these precautions were said to be necessary for the preservation of order. But were not the police sufficient to keep order? Were not the troops sufficient to keep order? If not, let more be employed. He could not conceive what pretence could be alleged for passing this measure in order to create a new law of trespass. The only reason there could be for it was that which was so anxiously repudiated by the right hon. Gentleman on the Treasury Bench, that it was an attempt to put an end to freedom of discussion. It was so regarded by the people throughout the country. The noble Lord below him (Lord Elcho)—such was the misdirected and unlicensed zeal of the advocates of the measure—had stated that Mr. Beales obtained leave to go to the Park upon the understanding that he and his party should not be admitted, but should merely exercise their right of going there, with a view to try the question subsequently in a Court of Law.

Lord ELCHO said, what he had stated was that Mr. Beales and the Reform League had themselves doubted their right to go to the Park, because they had intended, according to the newspapers, to go to the Park, ask for permission to enter, and, on being refused, to test the question at law.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that was not the nature of the arrangement made, for Mr. Beales did not surrender one iota of his unqualified right to enter the Park. The people throughout the country regarded this Bill as an attempt to put down freedom of discussion, and, the Government by bringing it forward, had admitted that they had been in error in the course they had taken in endeavouring to prevent the people from meeting in Hyde Park for the purpose of discussing the Reform Bill.

Mr. OTWAY said, it should not be thought that the Government were the sole conservators of order. All classes were interested in maintaining order, and none more so than the working classes. The proof of their disposition to maintain it would be found in their conduct during these meetings in Hyde Park. A statement had been uttered regarding the feelings of the working classes by the noble Lord (Lord Elcho). The noble Lord said that, in his opinion, the greater portion and better portion of the working classes were by no means opposed to the passing of this Bill. He had listened to the noble Lord with great attention; but on a subject of this kind it would be impossible to have any authority weaker than that of the noble Lord. They had only to recollect the noble Lord's statement respecting the feelings of the people on the subject of Reform last year to judge of the weight that should be attached to his opinion regarding the feelings of the working people. He would remind the noble Lord that this was only a project of law—to use a French phrase—and it was for those opposed to it to prevent its becoming law. His (Mr. Otway's) objection to the measure was twofold. He objected to anything like an infringement of the right of meeting on the part of the people of the metropolis. He also objected to the measure because it was singularly ill-timed. The people of the metropolis had been for many years in the habit of meeting in Hyde Park for political discussion. If therefore, by this measure, they would prevent them from doing so in future, it was an infringement of a right they had hitherto enjoyed. He would quote on the subject the opinion of a gentleman of great eminence belonging to the Conservative party (Sir Francis Palgrave) published during the passage of the Reform Act in 1832. He said that—

> "A meeting in the open air obtained an importance that it would have lost if confined within the limits of a building. The influence of a body of people is in a great measure derived from the manner and mode of their meeting."

It was absolutely necessary, if the people of the metropolis were to express their opinion at public meetings, that they should have some open place to do so. He could refer in support of his argument to the authority of Lord Derby, who said, if they took away from the people the right of meeting in Hyde Park, it would be necessary to find for them a large open space in which to meet. It was proposed now to take away the right to meet in Hyde Park; but where was the open space provided for the people to meet in? The right hon. Gentleman, or the Earl of Derby, he forgot which, the other evening disclaimed any desire to infringe the right of public meeting, but enlarged upon the propriety of holding such meetings in some large building. The hon. Member near him (Mr. Whalley) had entirely disposed of that point by showing the impossibility of holding a large public meeting in a building however vast. It was said they might meet on Primrose Hill; but if these meetings, as the supporters of the Bill averred, caused inconvenience and disorder in that neighbourhood, injustice would be done to the persons residing there. He went to judge for himself of these meetings in Hyde Park, and he never could have imagined so large a number of people coming together with so little of inconvenience. The children were playing there, and the flowers were untouched. It was said that great disorder would be caused by the passage of the people through the streets; but why should the inhabitants of Camden Town and of the neighbourhood of Regent's Park be subjected to what was considered a great inconvenience to persons living in the neighbourhood of Hyde Park? He did not believe that it was for the sake of the residents in the neighbourhood of Hyde Park that the Government desired to persevere with this measure. Their desire, no doubt, was to preserve the Park as a pleasure-ground, but he believed that that was a mistaken desire. It would be a sad day for this country if the people became indifferent to the great questions which occupied the attention of the Legislature. This, he believed, would be the result of their being deprived of the right which they now possessed. The loss of the right of public meeting would speedily be followed by that of the right of free speech, and they had instances in the history of other countries of the evils which resulted to the community from those rights being abrogated or surrendered. He warned the Government that they would have great difficulty in in carrying the proposed law into effect. It would be easy for the great mass of the people to meet in Hyde Park in defiance of the law. Thus the law would be brought into contempt, and a deplorable collision might take place between the authorities supporting the law and the people who came to exercise a right they had hitherto possessed. They were at the end of a very laborious Session. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, by his unrivalled skill, had succeeded in passing a measure conferring on the people a larger extension of the franchise than had ever been submitted to Parliament; and was it wise to couple so great a concession with such a Bill as this? With one hand the Government conferred a great boon; with the other they unnecessarily created feelings of animosity. It was impossible the Bill could pass without feelings of great rancour on the part of those who considered that this measure was an interference with what they deemed a popular right. Such a course of conduct was not consistent with the policy pursued during the Session by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He should exercise his strong will over his Colleagues, who, having brought in the Bill, adhered to it through fear of being accused of weakness. If his hon. Friend went to a division, he (Mr. Otway) should support the proposal that the Chairman do leave the Chair.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, it would not be respectful to the House nor to the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment, if he allowed this discussion to close without taking part in it. And, in the first place he must refer to the position in which the Bill stood at the present moment, because that had been kept out of sight rather too much. The hon. Member for Chatham (Mr. Otway) had objected to this Bill upon two grounds—first, that it was an infringement of a right, real or assumed; and, secondly, that it was ill-timed. As to the first objection the House of Commons came to a decision respecting it on the second reading of the Bill, and it came to a decision respecting the second objection on the Motion brought forward by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke). On both those points, therefore, the Government was entirely supported by the House of Commons, and that at a period when there was no lack of Members in the House, and when it was manifest that the Bill could not be further proceeded with until the close of the Session, when it was thought the excitement about it would have passed away. And here he must protest in the name of the working classes, whom hon. Gentlemen opposite professed to consider so much, against the supposition during the whole of this discussion, that if Parliament chose to sanction the Bill and to make it a statute of the realm, the working classes of this country would proceed at once to break the law. He did not for one moment believe that the working classes would adopt any such course. There might, indeed, be persons who misrepresented the working classes, and who might propose some such thing to them, but the followers of such leaders could not be reckoned among the orderly and order-loving people of this country. Then as to the assumed right of meeting in the parks, was it, as had been stated, an inheritance from our forefathers? Was it a right which had existed, he would not say for centuries, but even for years or months? Was there a single occasion on which there had been a meeting in any of the parks without a remonstrance and protest in order to show that the right of meeting was not recognized by those who had the custody of the parks? Some hon. Gentleman talked about the right having existed for centuries, but he challenged them to show that any meetings were ever held in the parks before the year 1855. The meetings referred to by the hon. Member for Chatham in his quotation from Sir Francis Palgrave, were convened by the proper legal authorities, and when were such meetings ever held in Hyde Park or any other *quasi*-public park? These meetings then commenced in 1855. It might be urged that the meetings in the parks had been of a peaceable character. In the great majority of instances they were peaceable, but they knew from experience that such meetings had gradually degenerated into turbulence, as in the case of the Sunday Trading meetings, the Garibaldi meetings, and lately in the case of preaching in the parks. It was absolutely necessary that the parks should be protected, and that the authorities should be armed with the power to keep them in a proper manner. But it was said that the present law might be set in motion. No doubt it might now take legal proceedings of a civil nature, but the process would be tedious and expensive. At present persons could only be removed from the parks as for an act of civil trespass, and it was desirable that the authorities should have more power. In regard to those parks in the metropolis, which were not Royal Parks but were placed under the Metropolitan Board of Works, the very powers asked for in the present Bill were conferred by Acts of Parliament in 1857 and 1864. He only asked the House to confer on the custodians of the Royal Parks the power of making by laws and those powers of exclusion, regulation, and protection, which had already been conferred by two statutes on the Metropolitan Board of Works, with respect to the parks under their control. The right to the parks was inherent in the Crown. By what authority, was a portion of Hyde Park now being added to Park Lane? It was simply a gift of the Crown, and Parliament was not consulted in the matter. If hon. Gentlemen went back to earlier periods they would find instances of sales of portions of the Royal Parks by the Crown. That showed that the right of the Crown was absolutely incontestable. That right, indeed, had been uniformly maintained by the Law Officers of the Crown, and had never been disputed in a Court of Law. Although there had been opportunities given for disputing the right week after week, when persons had been removed for acts lawful in themselves, but which had become unlawful because they were committed in the Parks—such right had never been called in question. Persons had frequently been removed for playing organs and for preaching, as well as for gambling and betting; but the right of the Crown to make these removals had never been questioned in the Courts of Law. Not a single person had ever raised the question. He had stated, on a former occasion, that legal opinions had been taken by the Reform League, and had been adverse to them. He had since received a letter on the subject from the President of the League, and as it was not marked "private," there was no reason why he should not read it to the House. It was in the following terms:—

> "Only one opinion was ever taken, and that was taken by me in consequence of my feeling considerable difficulty as to the best mode of trying the question, not only as regards expense, but as to the difficulties of proceeding against either the Crown or the Government, and in consequence of it seeming to me best to leave the initiative to the Crown or the Government. I therefore consulted a pleader on the subject. I wish to be perfectly frank. His opinion suggested more difficulties than I had even contemplated or could concur with as to the enforcing any legal title by means of user or custom on the part of the public to the Parks in a Court of Law or Equity, and suggested that Parliament was the more proper court, a responsible control being vested in the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works for the benefit of the public, and 'the public having a moral right to be protected by Parliament in any reasonable enjoyment from which they might be debarred.'"

These words being in inverted commas, he presumed they were the words of Mr. Beales' legal adviser—

> "Since this opinion was taken, the question has been more fully investigated, and while I feel the same difficulties, technical and otherwise, as to the mode of proceeding, I am very much confirmed in my conviction of the right of access to the Park being completely sustainable."

Thus it appeared that the only result of laying a case before counsel was the production of an adverse opinion. Was it, then, justifiable that the public should be assured by placard and speeches that their right to hold meetings in the Parks was indisputable? But without entering into the question of right, opposition is rested upon the point fairly raised by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke), that this was not the proper time for going on with the Bill. The hon. Member for Leicester said the same, but with this addition, that no time was fitting. The time was, nevertheless, well chosen; for although some might say that meetings and agitations were at an end and general satisfaction prevailed, information which he had received persuaded him that the Parks, and Hyde Park especially, would become a constant meeting-place for those having real or imaginary grievances. Small meetings had always been suppressed; and it was necessary that larger ones also should be prevented. The only reason, as far as he was concerned, that vigorous measures to that end had not been taken, consisted in the desirability of as long as possible preventing collision between the Government and a portion of the people, who he believed were in this instance more misled than wilful misdoers. But as these meetings were illegal, it was essential that the Executive should have powers to enable it promptly to carry the law into effect by putting its hands on the principals in any case that might arise. If, on the contrary, by giving way to clamour and outcry the House declined to take steps for the protection of the Parks, they would soon become scenes of chronic confusion; it would be said that meetings in the Parks were virtually authorized, and immediately every petty grievance-monger, whether at the head of a Sunday Trading, Sunday Liquor, or Sunday Closing Bill, would swarm with his followers in the Parks to the discomfort of those who desired to go there for their health's sake; it was not the people who had carriages or horses at their command for whom he pleaded. It was for the women and little children who might be seen sitting and playing on the grass to their intense gratification. To open the Parks to great meetings was to close them to the working classes in respect of healthy recreation, and in this the opponents of the Bill were the worst enemies of their *protéges*. It would be far better to define authoritatively and clearly the restrictions which were announced on the boards at the entrance to the Parks, so that the peaceful enjoyment of those places should be secured to the people. With respect to that statute for the suppression of seditious meetings, to which so much reference had been made, the Bill contained no clause for preventing meetings of any kind; it merely declared that they should not be held in certain places; but by that Act meetings held within one mile of the Houses of Parliament were declared to be illegal. The Government had no intention whatever of preventing public meetings. Their only desire was to prevent the holding of meetings in improper places; they wished to extend the legislation with regard to Finsbury and Southwark Parks to the Royal Parks. The Finsbury Park Act, passed in 1857, ordered that a penalty of 40*s.* should be imposed upon those who sought to hold meetings in the park; the Southwark Park Act, passed in 1864, imposed the larger penalty of £5, thereby showing the necessity which had been felt for increased protection. He asked the Committee to do no more than to extend similar summary restraining power to those who had the control of the Royal Parks.

MR. M'LAREN said, if this had been a question in which parties out of London took no interest, he should not have troubled the House with any remarks on the subject; but inasmuch as this was a question in which a great amount of interest was felt in distant parts of the kingdom, he felt bound to say a few words. A short time ago he had the honour of presenting a Petition from the working men of Edinburgh against this Bill, and he was asked at the same time to give the Bill his opposition. He had considered the question in various ways, and, notwithstanding the very able and interesting defence of the measure which they had heard from the Home Secretary, he remained of the opinion of which he was before—that this Bill was a very inexpedient, and, at the present time, a very impolitic measure, to press upon Parliament at the end of a Session like the present. Twelve months ago there was a great meeting in the Queen's Park at Edinburgh, which he had the pleasure of witnessing; there was a procession of 22,000 working men through all the principal streets of the city, occupying nearly two hours. This procession ultimately took up its position within a few hundred yards of the Queen's Palace, and he was glad to say that no person ever complained that the slightest injury was done. In reference to that meeting of the working classes, they consulted with him as to how they should proceed, as he remembered the great meeting of 60,000 people which took place in 1831, at the period of the Reform Bill agitation. He was present at that meeting, and could also speak as to its peaceful character. Looking at all the circumstances, he advised them that the proper way to act, as the question had been agitated in London, was not to meet of their own accord merely, but to represent to the Government that they intended to meet, and ascertain whether the Government would attempt to put any veto on the assembly. He accordingly, as their organ, wrote to the Chief Officer of Works in Edinburgh, who replied that he had not in himself sufficient authority, but that he would write to London for instructions. Instructions came from Her Majesty's Government that they would not interfere with the proposed meeting. That was all they asked. They did not ask any formal permission—they only asked that they should not be interfered with. But so careful were the working men that they should not do any injury to the Park, that they appointed a committee of their own number to wait upon the Chief Officer of Works to confer with him as to the most suitable place upon which to erect their hustings. Those hustings, four in number, were erected, and there were at least 50,000 persons present, including the processionists and the spectators. Not a policeman took part in that procession, and there was no magistrate conducting it, as was sometimes the case, and the meeting was quite as orderly as if it had been held in the drawing-room of a private house. Neither persons nor property were injured; and every care was taken that such should be the case. He would venture to say that the result of the non-interference of Government on that occasion produced the most happy effect on the working men of Edinburgh; and he thought that happy effect had been still more increased by the great measure of Reform which the Gentlemen opposite had been instrumental in giving to the country. He therefore thought that it would be a thousand pities, not only as a question of national policy, but for the sake of hon. Gentlemen opposite, for them to disturb that friendly feeling. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said, a few evenings ago, at a convivial meeting at the Mansion House, in a tone partly of argument and partly in that kind of banter of which he was so great a master, that he had broken up the monopoly of the Liberal party to carry measures of Reform. He (Mr. M'Laren) thought the expression was exceedingly happy, and he had every reason to believe that the working men of Scotland were of that opinion. They thought that the monopoly had been broken up, and they were now disposed to consider men by their works in a far greater degree than had been the case with the limited constituency which formerly existed. Having given this great measure of Reform, he would entreat the Government not to inflict this sting. They had obtained the confidence and perhaps the love of the people by what they had done on the question of Reform, and surely it was a piece of bad management to do anything which should counteract that feeling, and again lead the working classes to believe that the Conservative party were really their secret opponents, and that they had only given this measure of Reform because they had been obliged to concede it. He was no political partizan. In some of the critical divisions which had taken place in that House on the Reform Bill he had exercised his own judgment, and had voted with the right hon. Gentleman opposite, knowing well that when he did so he should incur no little obloquy. This he mentioned, not as a matter connected with the debate, but as showing that he had no disposition needlessly to revive prejudices against hon. Gentlemen opposite. Reference had been made by the noble Lord (Lord Elcho) to the private parks established in this country, and it was argued that, because no meetings were permitted in these, no meetings ought to be permitted in Hyde Park. But look at the facts of the case. Why, the private parks to which reference had been made would not contain the people attending some of these meetings even if there was not a tree or a shrub in them. If they had been present at either of the two meetings in Edinburgh which he saw they would have found a dense ring of people immediately around the hustings, composed of those who wished to hear, and who were the most earnest; while on the outskirts of this ring they would find large numbers of people standing widely, without touching each other. A little further off they would be seen widely apart. In this way a very large space was necessarily occupied. It was easy to calculate arithmetically how many persons could stand in a square yard in close military order; but upon a fair analysis of the space occupied by such meeting as they were now discussing it would be found that, on an average, not more than one person stood upon every square yard. Thus 5,000 persons would occupy 5,000 square yards, and a meeting of 50,000 persons would certainly occupy ten acres, while, if there were large numbers going in and out, twenty acres must be allowed. The splendid park which the hon. Member for Halifax (Sir Francis Crossley) had given to his townsmen did not much exceed that limit. Hence it followed that if 50,000 or 100,000 persons were to assemble there every tree and shrub would be destroyed. But such was not the case in Hyde Park. There there were 500 acres, and if some twenty acres were set apart, and if the people were told that they might assemble within those twenty acres; that no meeting should go beyond that space (and the space would be small as compared with the greatness of the Park itself—in fact, it would hardly be noticed), it was in vain to say that it would interfere with the use of the Park. No such thing would take place. Many Gentlemen did not understand how to deal with the working classes. They could not be kept in good order by being cuffed and kicked. That procedure was a mistake. He meant to say if the working classes were treated with kindness and courtesy they were most docile; but whenever they thought they were being badly used, or that any indignity was put upon them, their anger was aroused. They then assembled together, and they were thus encouraged to do things which they would not otherwise do. Circumstances had made him more acquainted with the poorer classes of the community than with the rich and the powerful, and he believed that in every part of the United Kingdom any number of working men might be allowed to assemble without the slightest fear of injury being done, provided they were treated with proper respect and courtesy. He hoped therefore that Her Majesty's Government would not press forward this Bill at the present period of the Session, but would allow it to stand over until next Session; and if Parliament then chose to pass this Bill, the people would at least know that it had been done in a full House, and after mature deliberation, and not at the fag end of the Session, when so many hon. Members were hundreds of miles away from the House.

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, that as the Bill peculiarly affected the metropolis, and the metropolitan Members had not shown any disposition to take an undue share in the debate, but had for several hours left the House to form its own judgment on the subject, he should not be considered presumptuous in offering a few remarks, more particularly upon the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department. If this Bill were really an official way of snubbing the Reform League—if the discussion were one relating solely to the *amour propre* of Mr. Beales, then he could understand the right hon. Gentleman's speech; but he could not understand the manifestations of irritation which had shown themselves about things with which the House, as matters stood, had nothing whatever to do. The House was not inquiring into the sayings and doings of Mr. Beales, or legislating with regard to them; what they were bound to do was to take care that neither the rights of the Crown, or the rights of the people were not injured. It was simply a calumny to represent—as had been done in the course of this debate—that Members for metropolitan constituencies had lent themselves to the stirring up of agitation. The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) had come down armed with extracts from all sorts of papers, and thought it a clever thing, in support of the Government, to attack all those who had felt it to be their duty, about three weeks ago, to receive a deputation within the precincts of the House. But the noble Lord had not the generosity, the justice, or the courtesy to apprise Members sitting beside him of the course he was about to take. Had he done so, he would have saved himself from having his story contradicted as soon as it was told, as one entirely without foundation. There were many hon. Members who knew that the words attributed to Mr. Beales as having been uttered within the precincts of the House were never made use of; and that if such expressions had been indulged in they would at once have been put down. It was utterly untrue to say that the hon. Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill) presided at a meeting within the precincts of the Palace, at which measures of physical force were proposed, till the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) was obliged to interpose. The hon. Member for Birmingham neither rose nor spoke during the whole of that short conference. And, for his own part, he maintained that he had not been wanting either in respect to the Speaker, to the House, or to himself in hearing representations from men who thought themselves aggrieved by a Bill which was pending. Hon. Members were not at liberty to assume that this Bill was already a law. It was a mere farce and affectation to take airs in this debate, and say that because persons were excited, and, perhaps, angry about this Bill, they could be construed into accomplices in threats of violating the law. Logic which they could not palm off on their constituents ought not to be indulged in in the House. He admitted—though it might have been an error—that with several other Gentlemen he had received a deputation within the precincts of this House from persons who were opposed to the Bill. It might have been better, perhaps, if the "Old King's Head" were still standing on the other side of Palace Yard, where they could hear declamations against Bills that were proceeding; but, rightly or wrongly, his hon. Friend the Member for Westminster, the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, the hon. and learned Member for Southwark, and half a dozen others consented to hear in a Committee-room of the House what those persons had to say. [Mr. Locke: No!] It was perfectly immaterial whether his hon. Friend did or did not consent. He was present, and the hon. Member for Marylebone was also a consenting party. [Mr. Locke again dissented.] He with others attended in the Tea-room to hear what was to be said against this Bill. If he did wrong he was sorry for it; but he did not hear any improper language made use of, and it was simply a calumny to endeavour to import such an allegation into this discussion. He might mention, in reply to some observation made by the Home Secretary, that within the last few weeks he had heard Lord Shaftesbury state that if the right of meeting in the Park were to be curtailed or taken away from the people, before that was done he should like to see proper places appointed for them to meet in. What he understood Lord Shaftesbury to mean was, that if the Government had a due sense of what was necessary in the way of proper places for an expression of public opinion, they would not fail to provide other meeting-places if the Parks were closed against public meetings.

Mr. LOCKE wished to state that he had not issued any invitation to the Tea-room meeting. He had received a circular bearing the name of his hon. Friend the Member for Westminster (Mr. Stuart Mill) and signed by other hon. Members, requesting his attendance at a meeting in the Tea-room, "to confer with us upon the subject of the Parks Bill." He went to the meeting to confer with those hon. Gentlemen as to the course which they might think ought to be adopted with respect to the Parks Bill. When he arrived, he found Mr. Beales and several other gentlemen there; but no threat whatever was thrown out in his hearing either by Mr. Beales or by anyone else. Mr. Beales stated his views on the subject, and, if he recollected rightly, that gentleman remarked, "If the Motion about to be moved by Mr. Locke does not succeed, what course should be adopted?" He thought the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Candlish) said, "It is time enough to take that matter into consideration when the result of the Motion shall be known."

Lord ELCHO said, that with regard to the meeting in question, he had only quoted a paragraph from an evening paper, and had not made any statement on his own authority. If he had stated what turned out not to be correct, he could only express his regret that he should have been deceived by a public newspaper. But the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Torrens) was very indignant at the idea of his being present at a meeting where such language was used. He begged, therefore, to refer to another occasion. Mr. Beales was reported to have said, at the Queen's Concert-room, Hanover Square—

> "That if the obnoxious Parks Bill was proceeded with, they (the Reform League) would hold other meetings in Hyde Park, and then it might be found necessary to pursue a course of procedure which would remove all possible misrepresentation, and leave not the slightest doubt as to what was the temper, what were the numbers, and what was the determination of the men of London in resisting this measure."

He wished to ask the hon. Member whether he was Chairman of that meeting?

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, he was Chairman of the meeting, and he felt bound to tell the House to what that observation applied. As he (Mr. Torrens) understood the speaker, he told the meeting that he had been held up to those who believed in him in the foolish position of not representing their opinions—they had heard something of that kind of thing that day—and he said that he should take very good care, in the event of this Bill being proceeded with, that the House of Commons should be left under no delusion as to what the feeling of the people was, and that he would find means by public meeting of showing whether the people agreed with him or not in thinking that the Bill was an encroachment upon their rights. He (Mr. Torrens) did not see that there was anything improper or illegal in the use of that language.

Mr. J. STUART MILL, who spoke amid much confusion and cries for a division, said, he was anxious to state to the House what he and those who agreed with him claimed, and what they thought the working classes of London were entitled to, on this subject. They had heard a great deal about the necessity of legislating for the Parks. Well, he had no objection to any legislation which could properly partake of the nature of police. He did not suppose that any of them would have the least objection to the suppression in the Parks of anything, the toleration of which in any public place was a questionable matter, such as the gaming and betting of which they had heard so much. What they stood up for was that there should be some place open for the purpose of holding great public meetings. He had no objection to preventing meetings being held in such of the Parks as were manifestly unfit for that purpose. No one would think of claiming the right of holding a public meeting in St. James' Park, because, in the first place, there was not room for such a meeting, and, in the second place, it could not be attempted without destroying the ornamental character of the place. The question at issue concerned none of the parks except Hyde Park, and the reason why it concerned Hyde Park was that it was the only great open space in the neighbourhood of London on which it was possible to hold a multitudinous open-air meeting. He could perfectly understand those Gentlemen who said that there ought to be no public meeting of that character at all; but such was not the opinion of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he should be surprised if the right hon. Gentleman continued to give his support to this Bill, because in his speech on the second reading of the Bill—a speech that was most moderate in its tone, although not equally so in substance—he admitted that there were cases in which it might be desirable that a multitudinous meeting, a meeting larger than could be contained in any public building, should be held. But if such a meeting were to be held, he (Mr. Stuart Mill) did not know any place except Hyde Park, in which it could be held with so little disturbance to the convenience of any class. It was true that the right hon. Gentleman did tell the working classes of London that they might meet on Primrose Hill or on Hampstead Heath, and he was sure that this advice must have been accompanied with a twinkle of the right hon. Gentleman's eye, which he (Mr. Stuart Mill) wished he had been near enough to have seen. He thought that nobody who had ever seen Hampstead Heath or Primrose Hill would say that they were places in any way suitable for the holding of public meetings. There was scarcely a spot of level ground on either of them, and no place could possibly be less convenient. Did anybody who had seen these public meetings in Hyde Park think that they had been accompanied with inconvenience to any class? It might, indeed, be said that inconvenience was caused, not by the meeting itself, but by the processions to and from the meeting. That was an argument for those who thought there ought to be no great public meetings at all; but, unfortunately, it was an argument which, if applicable to Hyde Park, was quite as applicable to a meeting held at any of the places where the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that they might be held. It seemed to him that no person who admitted, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had done, that there may be certain cases in which it was desirable and right that great multitudinous meetings should take place, could contend that they ought to be held in a corner or at a great distance. He did not think it was in the interest of either order or liberty to choose this time —at the close of the Session—with only a small number of Members present—for carrying a measure of which no opportunity had been given for discussion at a proper period. [*Cries for a division.*] Assent had been given to a second reading of the Bill, because many hon. Members on that side of the House were not unfavourable to the principle of legislating in some way upon this matter. The Bill had been since much altered, and it appeared to him an unjustifiable exercise of power to proceed at this period of the Session with the Bill, in the absence of so many Members. There were other most important Bills on the Paper, which could not be passed if the Government persisted in going on with this Bill. One of these was the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill, than which there was no measure more creditable to the Government, and it was most important that it should be passed this Session; but if the Government were determined to press on the Parks Bill, the House would not have made one step nearer to the useful legislation involved in the measure of which he spoke. [The hon. Member resumed his seat amid continued interruption and cries for a division. These manifestations of impatience were continued to the end of the debate, which was, consequently, very little heard.]

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he represented a large number of persons living in the vicinity of Hyde Park, and had therefore considered it his duty to inform himself as much as possible what were the opinions of his constituents with respect to this matter; and he found that the shopkeepers in the neighbourhood of Hyde Park were not very strongly in favour of demonstrations. They did not go to demonstrations themselves, and, possibly, if another place could be found as good or better than Hyde Park they would be glad if people would go there. But they were practical men of business, and they knew that there was a large and respectable body of their fellow-citizens who regarded such meetings as a legitimate engine of party warfare. They considered that if the people were prevented from going into the Park at any time of great political agitation — if, at such time, Parliament were to close the gates of Hyde Park against them—that the House would be flying in the face of common sense; for they thought that then the whole of those people would be thrown back into the streets surrounding the Park, and that instead of destroying some few trees and flowers they would prevent the circulation of the traffic of the neighbourhood. A "public meeting" was not a "demonstration." Public meetings, he held, ought to take place in rooms — but demonstrations could not take place in rooms, as none large enough for them could be found; and it appeared to him that the Home Secretary had not made out that there was any place within the metropolis so well suited to demonstrations as Hyde Park. He believed that the people of London had no objection to a Bill which would regulate the way in which the Parks were to be used; but the majority of the people of London were opposed to anything like laying down a rule that there should be no political demonstrations in London. It was suggested that the people might go to Primrose Hill, but even if they did, they must go there through the streets. It seemed to him that it would be well if Ministers ascertained the real state of the law. The right hon. Gentleman had given the House the legal opinion sent to Mr. Beales; but would he give that furnished to the Government?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: It has been for some time in the hands of the House.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, that the right hon. Gentleman referred to the opinion which lays down that nothing but the law of trespass could be put in force; but, putting the mere legal technicalities out of the question, he contended that there were many obsolete rights that should not be too strictly insisted upon. He did not say that any revolutionary proceedings would result from persisting with this measure; but he laid it down as a wise principle not to exaggerate the rights of the Crown. The Bill was now quite different from its original form. Originally it was permissive—now it proposed to prohibit meetings in the Parks altogether. It was very desirable that the Bill, if it was to be passed, should not be passed in a thin House, but passed with the full authority of the Members of the House on both sides; and by referring the Bill to a Committee the House would have the benefit of the Report of that Committee, and they could then, with full information before them, decide whether there was any necessity for altering the law.

Mr. FAWCETT addressed the House at some length; but the interruptions were so continuous that he could not be followed. The hon. Member having referred to the Hours of Labour Regulation Bill, Colonel Knox rose to Order, and the Chairman having ruled that the hon. Member's observations were not in Order, after some further observations the hon. Gentleman sat down.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he would state very briefly why he should vote for the Motion of the hon. Member. He did not wish to be supposed to give an opinion as to the right of meeting in Hyde Park; but he did not think that they had yet gone sufficiently into the question whether or not that right existed. He did not think there was any ground for surprise that strong opinions should have been expressed by those who thought their rights had been invaded, and he would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that the legal point should be further inquired into. He thought the question was one which ought to be decided in accordance with the general feeling entertained by the inhabitants of London, and ought not to be connected with political questions. No one supposed that there was any probability of there being any large number of political meetings between this time and the next meeting of Parliament. Next Session a Select Committee might be moved for, and then the legal rights of the question might be fully discussed. With this opinion he should vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Leicester.

Mr. THOMAS HUGHES hoped the Government would not insist upon proceeding with this Bill at this period of the Session in a very thin House. The Bill was palpably aimed against the League, and, in fact, against the mechanics of London, of whom he would say that they were the hardest men in the world to drive and the easiest to lead. If this Bill was dropped he thought it would be difficult to get together 500 men for a demonstration in favour of the right of meeting in the Parks. All you had to do was to let the people alone. There was a large class of persons in the metropolis who felt very strongly upon this question, and the Home Secretary must be perfectly well aware that the passing of the Bill would immediately create great and unpleasant agitation. No sensible person would wish that there should not be proper police arrangements in the Parks, and if they would introduce a carefully drawn Bill, no objection whatever would be made to it, so far, at least, as he was concerned. A portion of the Park might be staked off, where meetings could be held; and stringent police regulations might be enforced outside of that space. He hoped that, for their credit, Government would desist from proceeding with this Bill, and, having carried a great Reform Bill, would not interfere with the popularity they had acquired from it by attempting to pass the present measure. He did not wish to detract from the popularity of the Government, and therefore, though no follower of theirs, he did not like to see them needlessly getting into hot water and again arousing the passions that had been excited during the agitation of the Reform question. It would be unwise and Quixotic to press forward this measure from a feeling that having put their hand to the plough they would not flinch from it. Nobody would taunt them with irresolution for withdrawing it.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN supposed that the Government, after the long speeches they had listened to, would be anxious to pass on to the other Orders of the Day, and therefore he begged to move that the debate be adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN said, there was already a question before the House—namely, that he do now leave the Chair, and an Amendment moved thereon.

Sir JOHN GRAY, after some observations, urged upon the Government to postpone the Bill to next Session.

Mr. COWEN addressed the House; but it being now ten minutes to seven of the clock—

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

MERCHANT SHIPPING LAWS.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. O'BEIRNE, in calling attention to the unsatisfactory state of the Merchant Shipping Laws, said, that his task would be an easy one, as he gathered from an answer given by the President of the Board of Trade to a Question put to him yesterday, that it was the intention of the Government to consider the subject, if not of the consolidation, at least of the amendment of the Merchant Shipping Laws. At present there were about fourteen Acts and 700 sections bearing on this most intricate subject, so that it was difficult to discover what the law really was. He therefore thought that in itself would go far to prove that consolidation was necessary. The Act of 1854 was very unsatisfactory with respect to many of its provisions, and first as to the rules laid down for the measurement of ships. Certain clauses in that Act empowered the Board of Trade to make rules with respect to such measurement, and the Dublin Steam Packet Company, thinking the rules established by the Board of Trade to be injurious and unauthorized, appealed to a Court of Law in Dublin, and the Court unanimously decided that those rules were beyond the powers given by the Act; this judgment was appealed from, and the Lords Justices, some months since, affirmed the decision of the Irish Judge. The new rules were, in consequence, cancelled, and the old system, which was a clumsy one, was resumed; consequently, it would be admitted that upon this point new legislation was necessary. The Act of 1854 established Local Marine Boards, but it was not explicit as to the duties of those Boards. As far as he could understand, their duties were confined to examining masters and other officers who desired to obtain certificates, and to assisting in inquiries respecting wrecks and other casualties. It was not found, however, that they very usually attended at those inquiries, and, as all the papers of real value connected with those inquiries were, under the Act of Parliament, sent to the Board of Trade, it was a point worthy of consideration whether the machinery of these Local Marine Boards might not be got rid of, and all their duties transacted by the Board of Trade and the Registrar General of Shipping. He came next to the question of seamen, which was one of the greatest importance. There were several considerations which suggested themselves in dealing with that branch of the subject. The Committee which was appointed a short time ago, and examined the matter thoroughly, recommended the discontinuance of advance notes, which were payments on account made to the sailor when he joined his ship, the money being generally squandered and of little advantage to him. They also urged the advantage of giving monthly notes—that was to say, the making of monthly payments by the shipowners while the ship was at sea to the family of the seamen. The establishment of pension funds and of life insurances for the benefit of the sailor was advocated, too, among others, by Captain Toynbee, who took so great an interest in the welfare of this large class. Prompt payment of the men on their arrival in England was also very impressingly recommended by all who took an interest in this question, as waiting for two or three days to be paid off produced a most baneful effect in the case of the sailor. He was thus kept idling about, fell into bad company, and became the victim of the crimps. The same Committee had given it as their opinion that the crimping system was mainly attributable to the delay which arose between the discharge of the crew and their payment. They, therefore, recommended that pay clerks should be attached to the shipping offices, in whose presence the men should receive a portion of the pay legally due to them. The question of pilotage, also, was one which, as it at present stood, was in a most unsatisfactory state. There were six boards, as he was informed, the oldest being the Trinity Board, by which the system of pilotage was regulated, but they were absolutely independent one of the other, and great practical inconvenience was suffered because of the constant collisions between them. On the subject of salvage, which had been taken up by his hon. Friend the Member for Sandwich, he would only say that it, too, was in a most unsatisfactory position. A great amount of property lay in various directions on the coast, especially at the mouth of the Thames, which was admittedly capable of being recovered, but which the boatmen never attempted to recover, inasmuch as they were not certain they would be paid for doing so. The next question on which he should touch—and it was perhaps the most important of all—was that of the safety of the public. There was a general feeling abroad that the remedies proposed by the Act of 1859 and subsequent Acts did not take within their purview the safety of the public sufficiently. Many objections, for instance, were offered to the present system of surveys of vessels, and of inquiry in the case of wrecks. The surveys under the 303rd section of the Act, to which he had just alluded, referred simply to the case of a vessel after she was built. They required that she should be seaworthy, have certain signals, and be in other respects in accordance with the schedules laid down by the Act. But that survey having taken place as soon as the vessel was built, there was no other survey for six months, and, therefore, the ship might go to sea in any state which the master thought proper, provided she did not come within the category of passenger ships. The surveys made of passenger ships were also of a very inefficient character. He did not mean to say that the surveyors were not as active as they ought to be, but many of them were not shipwrights or acquainted with shipbuilding, and he did not think they were as efficient men as they might be. Sometimes they did great mischief by requiring alterations to be made which were needless, and at other times by not requiring alterations to be made which were necessary. Attached to the establishment there was a Surveyor General, but he had never heard that that officer exercised any supervision over the sub-surveyor, or, in fact, that he discharged any duties; and it might, therefore, be well to consider whether, on economical grounds, his office ought not to be abolished. A great improvement would be effected if in all cases it was provided that there should be a final inspection before the ship left port. At present many seamen were brought before the magistrates of Chester and elsewhere for deserting, and the defence of the men often was that their ship was not seaworthy. If the principle of a final survey were enforced, many casualties arising from bad stowage and what was called deck hamper would be prevented. Again, the number of boats which the Act directed should be carried was entirely inadequate to the number of passengers which ships were entitled to take. It might be said that it was impossible to carry sufficient boats for taking all the passengers ashore; but the proportion of boats to passengers which the Act directed to be kept was not at all reasonable, and some larger reform was necessary on this point. A ship authorized to carry some 1,600 persons was not now obliged to take more boats than were capable of saving about 500, exclusive of the crew. The provisions of the American law in relation to lifeboats, life preservers, and other means of saving passengers, well deserve the attention of our own authorities. Another subject, and one in respect to which the public mind was very sensitive, was, with reference to the inquiries instituted into casualties at sea. What had taken place in the instance of that ill-fated vessel the *London* painfully illustrated the inefficiency of the inquiries which the Act permitted or directed to be made in such cases. Those inquiries had no sort of issue which could be satisfactory to the public. The issue raised was not one as between the passenger and the shipowner, or between the shipowner and the authorities, but simply between the Board of Trade and the captain of the ship. The court was constituted of two assessors named by the Board of Trade and a stipendiary magistrate of the locality, and its duty was to investigate the circumstances attending the casualty and to report whether the captain had been guilty of any default, or whether he had shown any negligence or any want of nautical knowledge, but beyond that point it had no power to go. The courts of inquiry into shipwrecks were in many respects unsatisfactory in their constitution, operation, and results; and he hoped that the Government would take this important question into their consideration. Much inconvenience also was occasioned by these inquiries taking place at so great a distance from the scene of the casualty, and the Board of Trade had, he believed, received a memorial from Newcastle-on-Tyne on the subject, earnestly urging a radical change in the entire system of these investigations, and praying for a full, clear, and impartial inquiry before a competent tribunal. This memorial, which was on the table of the House, was well entitled to the attention of hon. Members, and to the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Board of Trade. There were very many more subjects, and some of equal importance to those to which he had referred, which required to be dealt with. He, however, had full reliance upon the disposition of the Government to handle this question largely, and in the hope that the hon. Gentleman opposite would give the House an assurance that his Motion would have his attention during the recess, he would not press his Resolution to a division. The hon. Member concluded by moving his Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that the Laws with reference to Merchant Shipping should be revised and consolidated, and that such Amendments should be made therein as will better protect the interests of the public and the mercantile marine of this Country."—(*Mr. O'Beirne.*)

MR. KNATCHBULL - HUGESSEN said, that he would second the Motion, upon the understanding that it was not brought forward in any spirit hostile to the Government, but solely with a view of urging them to consider the whole question during the recess. There were many points connected with the subject upon which, had the opportunity allowed, he would have been glad to make some observations. But the House would agree with him that the consolidation of our Merchant Shipping Laws was a question of too great a magnitude to be satisfactorily discussed at the fag end of a Session, and that, too, a Session of a character more than ordinarily laborious. He would therefore only call attention to one point, upon which the interest of his own constituents were much affected—namely, the question of salvage. He had been induced to look into this question on account of a circumstance which had given rise to much newspaper correspondence during the last autumn—namely, the wreck of the ship *North* upon the Goodwin Sands. With respect to property lost from that ship, charges of a grossly exaggerated character had been made against a portion of his constituents, which charges, even in a lesser degree, could not be substantially proved when an inquiry took place by order of the Board of Trade. But the circumstance had directed his attention to the question of salvage, with a view to ascertain whether adequate remuneration was given to the boatmen of the coast for the risk, expense, and trouble which they underwent in saving property in such cases, or whether the insufficiency of such remuneration did not throw much temptation in the path of these poor men, and really tend to discourage their efforts. Subsequently, he had had the honour of introducing a deputation upon this subject to his noble Friend at the head of the Board of Trade (the Duke of Richmond). He found that the two principal complaints made by the boatmen were—first, insufficiency of payment; and secondly, the unnecessary delay in obtaining that payment. He had ventured to suggest to the noble Duke an improved scale of payment, varying with the value of the property recovered, and also that the payment should be expedited. He would not enter into details at that moment, but he earnestly pressed the attention of the Government to the matter. That, however, to which he especially begged to call attention at this moment was the question of lost anchors and chains—a large number of these were now in the Downs, and unless removed, could not but prove a serious detriment to the shipping. He had been in correspondence with his constituents, and would read two short extracts from letters which he had received, and which would put the whole matter clearly before the House. The first extract was from one of that valuable class of men, the pilots, whose services to shipping were so great, and whose evidence on the subject was well worth consideration. The second extract was from one of the boatmen themselves, a man of good character, and who expressed the feeling of his class—

"The number of anchors and chains that lay strewed about between the North and South Forelands cannot be much less than 200, a fearful thing to contemplate when one is about to let go an anchor for safety. I do hope, for the safety of the anchorage, that these impediments will soon be removed."

"As regards the anchors and chains now in the Downs, you may safely say there are from 150 to 200, and men would be very glad to get them if they would pay for getting, for there is very little doing now; it is quite clear they must be got some time, for another blustering winter will block the roadstead up, and the longer they lie the worse they will be, for they will soon rust. If they will give us 2*s.* 6*d.* per cwt, good and bad anchors and chains, we will get them, and be very glad to do it—for I am very sure if they do not pay better than they pay at present people will not get them."

He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) would add nothing to the statements, nor delay the House at a moment when time was of so much importance; but he left the matter in the hands of the Government, and earnestly begged them to deal with it before winter comes on, and to deal justly and fairly with those whom he represented. He would second the Motion in the spirit in which he had spoken.

Mr. HENRY SEYMOUR trusted that the Vice President of the Board of Trade would consider whether the Government might not relax the provisions under which merchant seamen could be taken out of their ships in any part of the world and be compelled to serve in the Royal Navy.

Mr. STEPHEN CAVE said, he was too deeply sensible that there was much which required alteration and amendment in the laws relating to merchant shipping to find fault with the first part of the hon. Gentleman's proposition. But when we were reviewing our shortcomings it was only fair to take into account what had been done, in order that the House and the country should form a just estimate of the difficulties which had been surmounted and the evils which had been overcome, as well as of those against which we had still to do battle. He believed that it frequently happened that an outcry against an abuse was a pretty sure indication that much had been already done to remove it. The public mind required to be educated by successive attempts at legislation, or in other ways, before it perceived the hideousness of an evil to which it was accustomed. In reading the narratives of Anson and Cook and other celebrated navigators of a past generation, and seeing the evident pride with which they ascribed their success, and the little loss they experienced in certain voyages, to precautions which were now ranked among the most ordinary duties of the master of a ship, he was impressed not only by their exceptional energy and humanity, but by the reflection how wretched must have been the state of things when these ordinary precautions were of such rare occurrence that they deserved to be chronicled —when even a man-of-war was not unfrequently designated as a "floating Hell." It could not be said that the present Government, or their predecessors for many years past, had been unmindful of this important subject. In 1851, to go no further back, Acts were passed regulating the condition of apprentices to the sea service, and placing on a new footing the Merchant Seamen's Fund. In 1853 were passed Acts relating to pilots and pilotage, and to the merchant shipping law in general; and he might here pause to remark that although the hon. Member had mentioned the different jurisdictions to which pilots were subject, he had not alluded to the most difficult part of the question, that—namely, of compulsory or voluntary pilotage. In 1854 was passed the General Merchant Shipping Act and Merchant Shipping Repeal Act, which might be called Acts of amendment and consolidation (to which the hon. Member had referred) of great length, containing between 500 and 600 sections, besides Schedules under almost every letter in the alphabet. These Acts were amended by another the very next year. Then in 1856 came the Seamen's Savings Bank Act, and in 1862 another general Amendment Act. This year the department which he represented had not been inactive in the matter, though legislation had on this as on many other pressing subjects been prevented by the absorption of the time and attention of the House by one engrossing topic. A Bill was introduced, as the hon. Member was aware, called the Admiralty Jurisdiction Bill, which had been reluctantly dropped for the Session, being impeded by the opposition of some of the legal Members of the House, though it received the cordial support of the mercantile community in every part of the country. The object of that Bill was to establish local courts for the trial of nautical questions, with an appeal to the Court of Admiralty. It was proposed to bring all questions relating to a ship, such as freight, average, demurrage, seamen's wages, salvage, &c., before a court which could try and decide several questions in one suit, instead of their being, perhaps, tried in different courts and settled on different principles. Another Bill, which was introduced into the House of Lords by the noble Duke the President of the Board of Trade, had passed all its stages in both Houses, and would doubtless shortly become law. It was only a fragmentary measure, dealing with pressing matters in anticipation of a more complete measure in a quieter Session. Fragmentary as it was at best, it had been still more curtailed, and some valuable clauses had had to be abandoned in order to secure its passage through this House, one of which was for the survey of ships alleged to be unseaworthy, to which the hon. Member had referred. The hon. Member had said truly that the condition of our merchant seamen was one of the most important subjects which could be considered by the House. This Bill dealt with that subject. It related, as the hon. Member was aware, to scurvy and to the accommodation of merchant seamen. It provided that the space for the crew should be improved, better lighted and ventilated, and free from the incumbrance of ship's stores. It provided also that this space should be exempted from measurement, and subject to inspection, and that the same number of cubic feet of air should be allowed for those sleeping in berths and in hammocks. It gave the crew a personal remedy in case of the space allotted to them being, as was too often the case, blocked up with ship's stores. It provided, likewise, that there should be certain conveniences on board merchant ships to prevent the necessity of the men going out on the chains or head, which had led to so many fatal accidents. It directed the appointment of inspectors of provisions, medicines, and anti-scorbutics. It confined the sale of lime-juice for ships' stores to dealers who would deliver it out of bond mixed with 15 per cent of spirits, and took power to authorize the use of other anti-scorbutics. It also dealt with offences by British subjects on board foreign merchant vessels, and with other matters. So much for the present Session. With regard to the future, the Board had issued a very carefully-prepared memorandum respecting tonnage, dealing with the very difficult questions of measurement, the allowance for engine-room, and other deductions from the computation in respect of which payments were made to harbours and dock companies; also for lights and other payments depending on tonnage. On this question the hon. Member had mentioned the Bill of the late Government, but he had not stated that the question was really one between steamers and sailing ships; that the owners of the latter demurred to an allowance being made such as the steamship owners desired, for those accessories to the propelling power, by which the steamers carried higher freights. This was with a view to future legislation. They had, moreover, been carefully collecting statistics with a view to applying to the merchant service the provisions of the Contagious Diseases Act, which had been so successful in the case of the Royal Navy. Such an extension of the Act was necessary, indeed, for the effectual working of its provisions, because it was found that when the disease had been stamped out in Government ports, like Woolwich and Sheerness, it was constantly reintroduced from merchant ports, like Gravesend. He was quite sure that when the House was aware how powerful for good the present Act had been, both physically and morally, it would agree with the Board that it was our bounden duty to extend those advantages to the merchant service, and to make another effort to stem that tide of iniquity which had so long impeded the improvement of our merchant seamen. They had it also in contemplation to alter the boat scale of steamers to which the hon. Member had alluded, and to provide that they should carry boats more in proportion to their passengers and voyages than simply in relation to their tonnage. They proposed to extend Government inspection to the boilers of steam tugs, the absence of which had possibly been the cause of some recent disastrous accidents, taking care at the same time not to limit unduly the responsibility of owners, which, as he had more than once remarked, formed, perhaps, the best safeguard of the public. The hon. Member had attacked the system of inspection, and said the Government surveyors were not equal to their work. He (Mr. Stephen Cave) admitted that this was sometimes the case, but this was hardly the fault of the Department; it was caused by the rapid transition from sailing vessels to steamers, from wood to iron. They proposed by degrees to appoint surveyors who had served an apprenticeship in the working of iron, and had likewise served at sea, so that the inspection to which he had alluded might be more effectual. The Board had been engaged in many other inquiries with a view to legislation, and the results of those inquiries had been laid before the House this Session in papers relating to scurvy, to merchant seamen's accommodation, to local tribunals, to disasters at sea, to wrecking in the Hebrides, and some bad cases on the English coasts. The question of salvage had been touched upon by the hon. Member for Sandwich. It was full of difficulty. We did not bear a good character in foreign countries in this respect. When he was in Paris last winter a paper of complaint had been placed in his hand by the French Minister of Marine who had spoken in almost an angry tone of the extortion practised on French vessels by English salvors. He had been informed that in France it had passed into a proverb that there was one thing worse than being wrecked altogether, and that was being saved by an Englishman. When, however, they had asked for a list of cases in which these malpractices had prevailed, the list furnished was somewhat less than they had been led to expect from the loudness of the complaints. At the same time there was considerable room for improvement, and he thought it possible, with the hon. Member, that if some more regular system of rapid payment of authorized charges were introduced these irregularities might altogether cease. Their attention had also been given to the alleged scarcity of merchant seamen, and to the establishment of training ships for merchant sailors, which had succeeded so well in the case of convicted boys, that it seemed unjust and unreasonable, to say the least, to withhold similar advantages from honest boys. They had likewise given attention to the reconstruction of courts of inquiry in case of wreck, which he quite agreed were at present insufficient and unsatisfactory, to the case of what were technically called distressed seamen, and to the general condition of British crews in foreign ports. There were several other matters to which the hon. Member had referred, and some of which had been brought before the notice of the Society of Arts in a paper read by Mr. Gray, one of the most efficient officers of the Board of Trade, such as the questions relating to local marine boards, advance, and monthly notes, pensions, life insurance, the speedy payment of crews, or payments on account, and the exclusion of crimps from dock premises. These had for some time engaged the attention of the Board; in all these they had confirmed habits and prejudices to encounter, but he hoped that by degrees a considerable improvement would be effected. It was not inquiry that was wanted, for we had had inquiries enough, but comprehensive dealing with the question, with the assistance of those practical men whom the Board were always glad to consult. This had been impossible in the present Session. He had felt sure the hon. Member did not wish to press the Motion in a hostile manner, but that his chief object had been to obtain information. He had endeavoured to give him all the information in his power, and probably the hon. Member would be satisfied with the statement he had made. He thought the House did well to consider, from time to time, these important subjects. It had discussed a similar matter, on the Motion of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Graves), at the end of last Session at considerable length. He could assure the House that the Board were most desirous to put an end to the acknowledged evils which still existed, and that want of time only had prevented more being done in the present Session of Parliament.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he thought the Board of Trade should have power to adapt their regulations to the experience and information which they might obtain from time to time. This would be much better than a rigid and complex Act of Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman should have regard to the expediency of carrying out these maritime regulations by a board with sufficient authority to adapt them to circumstances that might arise. This would be preferable to incumbering the statute book with statutes of 200 or 300 clauses, which could only tend to embarrass the maritime interest of the country.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARTILLERY—RIFLED CANNON.

RESOLUTION.

Major ANSON said, that the question of the conversion of smooth-bored guns into rifled guns was as important as that of ships or fortifications, because the efficiency of our ships and fortifications depended entirely upon the efficiency of the guns with which they were armed. This question was of greater moment to this country than to any other country in the world, because we had not our fortified places connected by lines of railway as other countries had. We had our fortified places scattered all over the world, and in case of emergency they were thrown on their own resources. What would hon. Members say if, waking up from a long sleep, they were to find our infantry armed now with "Brown Bess?" It was just as important at present that our ships and fortifications should be armed with rifled guns, as that our infantry should be armed with rifled muskets. All our great fortified places — Gibraltar, Malta, Bermuda, Mauritius, Aden—were, so to speak, unarmed. It was quite true that they had a great number of guns mounted on their fortifications, but in case of attack these guns would be at the mercy of any iron-clad ship that might attack them. He believed there were two or three rifled cannon mounted at Malta and Halifax, but with these exceptions all our other fortified places were at the mercy of any iron-clad. We ought to look at this as a question also of justice to our troops. We scattered our army all over the world, and it was a matter of justice to give to our soldiers, who were necessarily comparatively few in number at each point, the means of repelling any attack that might be made upon them. Take the case of our navy, which, after all, was our first line of defence. People in this country generally judged of its efficiency by the number of iron-clads afloat or in commission. But that was a fallacious way of judging. It would be far wiser to judge of its efficiency by the manner in which our ships, both iron-clad and wooden, were armed. Some years ago we took to iron-clad instead of wooden ships, and we did that to prevent our ships being penetrated by the old smooth-bore guns. We devoted almost all our attention to putting iron plates on the sides of the ships, but paid little or no attention to keeping our wooden ships properly armed, so that they might compete with the iron-clads of foreign countries. If we armed our wooden ships with plate guns, that is, with guns which would pierce armour, we should place our wooden ships on a footing with the iron-clad. They would again become perfectly effective for all warlike purposes, and our ancient maritime supremacy would thus at once be restored. Of cast-iron guns, which were entirely useless, we had at present the great number of 15,000 mounted and 20,000 in store. This was a very large question, because the number of guns required both at sea and in forts was enormous. What we wanted was a large number of guns rifled and fit for modern warfare. We were at the present moment in a transition state. A short time ago we set to work upon breech-loading guns. We did away with our field artillery and substituted Armstrong guns. At the present moment we were discarding the latter and were endeavouring at Woolwich to make new guns on an entirely different principle. It should be remembered that in a transition period like this we should not be able in a year or two to manufacture a sufficient number of articles to replace those that would be superseded. It was a matter of time and of great expense. We did not know at present what our ships of the future would be. We were still in uncertainty, as might be seen from the debate which took place the other night about the fortifications of the future. Anybody that went down to Woolwich and talked to artillerists would see that all was uncertain as to the guns of the future. What ought to be done was to avail ourselves of our present stock, whether of ships, guns, or stores. The only way we could utilize our wooden ships was by arming them with guns capable of penetrating the sides of iron-clads, and by taking advantage of the number of guns which the ships would be able to carry. The weight of the guns also must be taken into account, and we should proceed to convert them. It might be asked, was it possible to convert our old stock of guns? A great number of experiments with old cast-iron guns had been tried, and many of these old guns burst. They tried to strengthen them with wrought-iron hoops on the outside, but that was of no use. But of late years a series of experiments had been carried out by Major Palliser, to whom this country was already so much indebted. Years ago Major Palliser invented the system known as that of the compound ordnance. Since then he had been employed in other experiments; he tested everything and took nothing for granted. In 1862 a 68-pounder gun was handed over to him to work into a rifled gun. He put a barrel of wrought-iron into it, and this gun, before it was rifled, went through what was called "the test of destruction." There had, in the first place, been fired a 68 lb. shot, and the weight of the shot had afterwards been increased by 10 lbs. at a time until it at length amounted to 680 lb. The gun had perfectly withstood that test. He then tried another 68-pounder, of the same size as others that were now being made at the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich. The gun they selected had been condemned as unfit for service. It had fired 383 rounds, and had been condemned on account of fissures round the vent. This gun was rifled on Major Palliser's principle, and fired 750 rounds with various charges. At the end of the 750th round the inner tube split, and they then fired fifty more rounds. The Ordnance Committee remarked upon that circumstance that the trial was more favourable to the system than if it had burst the barrel without warning. This gun had afterwards its breech bored out in order to take out the inner tube that had been split, and to examine the remaining tube. After that they put in another tube, and screwed up the breech again, and then fired 105 rounds, making, in all, 1,250 or 1,260 rounds. The gun then failed by blowing its breech out. The tube inside was taken out and put into a 10-inch shell gun, which was now at Shoeburyness passing through other experiments. The testing this gun had gone through was never dreamt of by any artillerists in the world. The Ordnance Committee were satisfied that the gun was as strong a gun as you could wish to introduce into the service, was capable of standing any charge which could be put into it, and of firing as many times as could possibly be required. It might be said that at Woolwich we were already making a great many 64-pounders and 7-inch wrought-iron guns. These guns were first-rate in their way, as everything turned out in the Royal Arsenal was; but, in order to utilize our wooden vessels, they must be supplied with guns of very much the same weight as those with which they were now armed. The new 7-inch wrought-iron guns which were being constructed at Woolwich, and which were to take the place of the old 68-pounder, weighed three tons heavier than the old, and the new 64-pounder increased in proportion; so that they would have to alter the armament of these wooden ships very considerably, and for every two guns they carried now they would only in future carry one; but the Palliser guns only weighed seven or eight cwt. more than the old ones, instead of three tons. Besides the vast stock of cast-iron guns in our dockyards and elsewhere, there was the question of carriage, which was almost as important as the question of guns. For every 7-inch wrought-iron and 64-pounder rifled gun made at Woolwich, they had to make a new iron carriage; whereas, if they utilized the old iron guns, they would be able to utilize the old carriages. It had been doubted whether the old wooden carriages would stand the heavy charges of the new guns; but Major Palliser found by actual trial that the old carriages stood the recoil, and Colonel Clarke, at the head of the Carriage Department at Woolwich, had not the slightest doubt that he could, at a merely nominal cost, strengthen the existing wooden carriages sufficiently to stand the recoil of the converted 68-pounder. With regard to the expense of the guns, a short time ago the new 7-inch wrought-iron guns at Woolwich cost as much as £700 each. What was called a cheap-construction gun was now produced at something like £425; but it had not been proved to be as satisfactory as the more expensive gun; nor could they really say whether it cost only £425, for it was doubted whether the increased wear and tear of machinery and furnaces caused by the cheap-construction gun would not counterbalance the saving in actual labour. Besides the £425, a new carriage, new slide, and new platform would cost £370 or £380, making altogether nearly £800; but the expense of converting the 68-pounder on Major Palliser's principle was under £200 a gun, and the cost of converting the existing carriages and platforms was merely nominal. Very nearly the same proportion applied to the 32-pounder, and the 32-pounder converted gun was capable of penetrating the *Warrior* target at anything like a fair range. They might thus turn all their wooden ships to account, and render them able to compete with almost any iron-clad afloat. Hon. Members might be astonished that if the Palliser system possessed the great advantages, and would result in the considerable saving he had described, it had not been adopted before; but though the experiments had been going on for two or three years, it was only fair to the Ordnance Department to say that these experiments had only just been carried to a satisfactory conclusion. The time had now come, however, to set about this conversion in good earnest. In case of war we must have thousands of rifled guns for forts and ships, and the difficulty must be faced. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would do what he could to convert these guns as rapidly as possible, and he would now move the Resolution which stood in his name.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the experiments that have been made with Cast-iron Guns lined with coiled wrought-iron, justify the belief that these Guns may be thus made available for the purpose of modern warfare; that a great saving of public money would thus be effected, and that this system of conversion is deserving of the serious and immediate attention of the War Department."—(*Major Anson.*)

Lord ELCHO said, that his hon. and gallant Relative had done good service in bringing this subject before the House; because if the facts he had stated were correct, the system would result in a great economy of public money, and useless iron ordnance might be converted into efficient guns at comparatively small cost. While forts were built by means of a loan, guns were manufactured by an annual Vote of the House. The process in the latter case was therefore necessarily slow, and if for about the same money they could get two guns almost as efficient in place of one, such a system, promising as it did to put the country into a proper state of preparation much more rapidly than would otherwise be possible, deserved favourable consideration. He hoped that before the present Government went out of office the country would have better armaments than it had ever had before. He admitted the great improvements which had been made by the late Secretary for War in the supply of breech-loading rifles; but the same progress was not observable in the equally important matter of rifled guns. There had been a large order of breech-loading rifles for the army; the late Secretary for War had ordered a rifle gun to be tried on the Lancaster system; and an experiment had been tried with an American gun recently brought to this country. It might be thought from the reports of this experiment that the gun was of no value against iron-plated ships. But the plate used in the experiment was an 8-inch plate, and the thickest plate on any of our ships was 6-inch. If the 60-pounder charge of powder had been used against a 6-inch plate the ball would have gone through; and in all probability in the case of the 4½-inch *Warrior* plates, it would have penetrated both sides. This was satisfactory as regarded the penetrating power of the shot. A most important point was that the metal of which the shot was composed should be of the best possible kind. He would place in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman specimens of three different shots fired from this American gun at the plate in question. One was a cast-iron shot, which came from America; the second was the Pontypool shot, which was cast in sand; and the third was the Palliser shot. Whoever had any doubt of the importance of the invention of Major Palliser had only to look at these specimens of shot. The American shot was a beautiful specimen of iron; the Pontypool shot iron was comparatively worthless—like pie-crust. Anybody could see that it must break against an iron plate; but the iron of Major Palliser's shot was more dense, and looked in every way superior in the character of the metal to both the other specimens. It was universally admitted that Major Palliser had conferred great benefit on the country by introducing his mode of chilling shot, not only as regarded the penetrating power of the Palliser projectile, but also in the eventual saving of hundreds of thousands of pounds that would have been incurred in expensive steel in order to attain the same result. He was glad, therefore, that the question of Major Palliser's invention had been brought before the House. He did not wish to detract from, but rather to enforce the estimate of its importance, by bringing forward another method of lining guns, and urging the desirability of our turning our attention seriously to the question. He did not wish to go into the question of the priority of patents; but his attention was some years ago drawn to the gun of Mr. Parson's, which was lined with steel tubes, not made like Major Palliser's, but of solid steel, bored out and inserted at the breech of the gun. This he thought equally deserving of the attention of the Admiralty. The two systems were different in this respect, that Major Palliser's was a coil of wrought-iron, and a tube was inserted at the muzzle. The other system was that of a steel tube bored, inserted at the breech, and reinforced at the breech by a sort of shoulder. The question had arisen whether guns bored at the breech and lined from the breech were as strong as guns made on the Palliser principle. Many persons spoke of the former as the best way of securing strength in cast-iron guns. Unable to get a trial in this country, gentlemen interested had obtained one in France. A report of it by the French officer in charge stated that the cannon so made showed greater resisting power than cast-iron guns of the same bore. Mr. Parsons' gun had been tried at Vincennes, and that officer spoke of it in the highest terms, regretting that it could not be adopted from their not being able to get the steel tubes required for it made in France. A Prussian officer who had been sent over to this country to ascertain the best system of iron ordnance, had also recommended its use in the Prussian service. He would not go into details to show that this system of lining guns was as cheap as the other; but it was as strong, and some said stronger. On the part of the inventor, Mr. Parsons, he would make an offer to the Government, the terms of which he himself proposed to Mr. Parsons, who accepted them. It was that, at the Arsenal, under the direction of Mr. Palliser, a 68-pounder should be converted on his principle, and a 150 lb. shot fired from it with 30 lb. of powder, 1,000 rounds to be fired; if the experiment were a success the Government should bear the expense; if it failed, the expense should be borne by Mr. Parsons. An undertaking to that effect, signed by Mr. Parsons, he held in his hand. His object was not to detract from the value of Major Palliser's invention, but it had been tried, and that of Mr. Parsons had not. He hoped that the Government while not delaying conversion on the Palliser system, would accept the proposal of Mr. Parsons in the interests of the service.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he begged, in the first place, completely to acknowledge the great importance of the subject which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had brought forward. This question of trying the effect of lining old guns with other metals had been in course of trial and experiment for a considerable length of time. He understood the hon. and gallant Gentleman to claim for Major Palliser the origination of this idea, but it was by no means new. The first proposal made to our Government for lining guns with a different description of metal was so long ago as 1808, and the guns we had taken from the Chinese in our late wars were found to be lined. The question now raised by his hon. and gallant Friend was mainly a question of expenses. It was—Are we able to obtain rifled guns cheaper by this method of lining old smooth-bore guns with wrought-iron than we can by constructing new guns with rifled barrels? The question was divided into two portions—that which related to large heavy guns, and that which related to guns of a lighter calibre and construction. The experiments were not yet completed; but, so far as they had gone, he was justified in expressing great doubts whether it would be profitable and successful to convert the larger class of guns. He alluded particularly to our well-known old gun which, up to a recent period, was the most formidable gun we possessed—namely, our 68-pounder, known as the 95-cwt. gun. It was an 8-inch gun. The proposal made by Major Palliser and also by Mr. Parsons was that this 8-inch gun should be converted into a 7-inch gun, contracting the calibre by one inch through inserting a rifled wrought-iron lining. The result of this change was that a gun weighing 95 cwt. was converted into one weighing 105 cwt, or 5¼ tons, whereas the weight of the new 7-inch gun made at the Woolwich factory, and rifled from the beginning, was 6½ tons, or 1¼ more than the other. Either he misunderstood his hon. and gallant Friend, or his hon. and gallant Friend made a mistake, for the difference in weight was stated by him at three tons.

Major ANSON said, that included the carriage as well as the gun.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, there was another thing to be taken into consideration in that view of the matter. He was not prepared to say whether, including carriage as well as gun, his hon. and gallant Friend was not correct in stating that there was a difference of 3 tons, but as between the two guns the difference was 1¼ tons, or the difference between 105 cwt. and 6½ tons. It would be necessary, however, to have new carriages, and therefore the question was in that respect one of expense. As respected the guns only, the actual difference in cost was the difference between £263 and £405. His hon. and gallant Friend was mistaken in saying that the old carriages could be used with the converted guns. He was informed that the old carriage would not do for these guns, and that it would be important in any case with heavy guns, whether weighing 5¼ or 6½ tons, to use the new carriages. A converted gun and carriage would cost £590, an entirely new gun and carriage would cost £734. The difference, therefore, was from £140 to £150. The result of the experiments, so far, had gone to show that the converted guns, in consequence of their lighter weight, would not bear the battering charges so well as the heavier guns. They were what professional men termed "too lively." Looking, therefore, at the difference in cost, he could not see that the country would gain so very much by the conversion of the 68-pounders into 7-inch guns. Our arsenal at Woolwich was capable of turning out twice the number of guns provided for in the annual Estimate, so that, looking at the small saving which would be effected, he very much doubted whether it would be either prudent or economical to engage very largely in the conversion of these guns. A paper war had been going on between Major Palliser and Mr. Parsons, but the real difference of construction between the plans of the two gentlemen was very slight. He had already stated that the plan of lining the guns with a different metal was by no means a new one, though the first experiments of late years were probably made by Mr. Parsons. The plan first suggested by that gentleman, by which the barrel of the old 68-pounder was heated so that an inner tube could be introduced, did not answer. Then Major Palliser proposed to bore the old barrels so as to increase the diameter, and to introduce a new tube, which was fixed by a mechanical process. He would not refuse to accept the offer made by his noble Friend (Lord Elcho) on behalf of Mr. Parsons. Although no expense would be spared if there were any prospect of success, yet so much had already been spent that it was but fit some precaution should be taken before even promising to enter into a new competition. Nothing, however, that he (Sir John Pakington had said upon this point referred to the smaller guns. His hon. and gallant Friend was perfectly justified in all he had said upon that point. We possessed, in all, some 30,000 guns of this character. But our available supply of the smaller rifled guns was by no means so large as it ought to be. The doubts which he had expressed, therefore, with regard to the advisability of converting our 68-pounders, in no way applied to our 32-pounders and 24-pounders. The 32-pounders converted on Major Palliser's plan became most valuable guns. The carriage for the old 32-pounder would be equally good for the new one. He believed that the 32-pounders converted on Major Palliser's plan would become most valuable batteries, equal in every respect in power to the new 64-pounder rifle gun. The cost of converting the 32-pounder would be £120, whilst that of the 64-pounder would be £190. The country would, therefore, derive from the conversion of our existing 32-pounders the whole advantage of the saving which would be effected by conversion as against the manufacture of an entirely new gun of that calibre. He trusted that his hon. and gallant Friend would be content with this admission as to the value of converting the smaller guns. Until the experiments were finally completed he would not, of course, undertake to say that it was inexpedient to engage in the conversion of our old 68-pounders, but he confessed that, as far as we had yet gone, he believed it to be very doubtful. He had been reminded that within the last week the Admiralty had ordered a fresh supply of the smaller converted guns, and with the conversion of those guns, so far as the financial arrangements of the country permitted it, it was intended to proceed, a statement which he hoped would be regarded as satisfactry by his hon. and gallant Friend (Major Anson).

Mr. SAMUDA said, he quite agreed with his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War that the question of the saving of expense was not worthy of much consideration unless the result attained by the conversion was satisfactory. Taking the figures of the right hon. Gentleman himself, there were at least 10,000 of the smaller guns which might be converted.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had stated that we possessed 30,000 guns, but he had not stated that even 10,000 of them could be converted.

Mr. SAMUDA said, that with regard to what had been said about wooden ships being able to stand against good artillery, the latest instance in which wooden ships were engaged was at the battle of Sinope, and a Turkish officer had informed him that at the first broadside all the Turkish ships but three went to the bottom. Of those three, two succumbed to the second broadside, and there remained but one survivor from the third. From what had been said that evening he believed no hon. Member who had spoken was satisfied with the success which we had obtained with our artillery up to the present moment. It would be better if the House would not look at this matter in the light of a mere rivalry between two competitors. A sufficient inducement ought to be held out for a trial and proof of both plans. Comparing the French and English systems of conversion, he thought the system of tubing infinitely superior to that of hooping. He believed that these old guns might be utilized, and he was glad that the Secretary for War had so liberally met the views of the hon. and gallant Gentleman.

Major ANSON said, that as there seemed to be some doubt as to the capability of the 68-pounder to stand the recoil, he wished to know whether the Secretary for War would furnish Major Palliser with a serviceable platform and slide, so that that gentleman might be able satisfactorily to try whether the carriage would stand the recoil. If it did he could not understand what objection there could be to convert the guns. He should like to ask whether any private firm had been asked whether they could make the new 7-inch wrought-iron gun at anything like the price which it was supposed it would cost in the arsenal. He should be satisfied with the result of the debate if a fair trial were given of the 68-pounder carriage with the gun in question.

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he was not aware of the offer of any private firm that ever varied more than a few pounds from the price of the guns made in the arsenal. In reply to the other question, he begged to remind the hon. and gallant Gentleman that he had already told him that the experiments were not concluded. He had no objection to anything that would make those experiments as useful as possible.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

CASE OF JAMES SCOTT.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he rose to call attention to a case of a painful nature, which had excited the deepest interest in Birmingham and the adjoining districts in the Midland counties. It was a case of murder of the most aggravated character. He made that statement on the best authority, for a Petition he had presented to that House on the subject was signed by the magistrate who committed the prisoner, ten other justices acting with that magistrate at Quarter Sessions, and by 3,000 of the most respectable inhabitants of Birmingham. He did not wish to say a word that might prejudice the unhappy man who had been reprieved; but he had communicated to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary that he must call attention to the case, and he thought he was justified in bringing the matter forward. The coroner's jury had returned a verdict of wilful murder, the magistrates at Birmingham committed the prisoner on that charge, and the jury at the Warwick Assizes last month returned a verdict of wilful murder after a quarter of an hour's deliberation. It was therefore not surprising that, since the jury had not made the slightest recommendation to mercy, and since the Judge, Mr. Baron Pigott, had not held out the slightest hope to the prisoner, there should be in the Midland counties a strong feeling of astonishment that this prisoner had been reprieved. The prisoner, James Scott, had been cashier in the service of a firm, and was accused by John Pryse, a brother of one of the partners, of defalcation. The prisoner acknowledged the defalcation and begged for forgiveness, but was told that the example he had set rendered that impossible. He then went out of the office and asked a fellow workman in the business to let him have a revolver, and having obtained it, he loaded all the seven barrels. Returning to the office where John Pryse was, he deliberately shot that person while standing about eight paces from him. John Pryse then rushed at him, and was again shot by the prisoner through the breast. The partners rushed in and wrested the pistol from the prisoner, and the wounded man died in about ten minutes. When the prisoner was taken, he declared openly that he had committed the crime, and he added that John Pryse had been an enemy to him for some time. The reprieve of the prisoner had produced a deep feeling in Birmingham, because, taken in connection with the sentences in two cases of homicide and manslaughter at Walsall and Lichfield, it had produced the impression that such crimes as wilful homicide and murder would not meet with adequate punishment. There was no country in which the term of penal servitude was so uncertain as in England. Some criminals who were condemned to penal servitude for life obtained their liberty at the end of a period of seven years, while some condemned for a period shorter than life obtained their release in four years. The consequence was that the stipendiary as well as the other magistrates, and upwards of 3,000 of the inhabitants of Birmingham, had petitioned the House praying that it would assent to an Address to Her Majesty for a copy of the Memorial and Correspondence relating to the case and conviction of James Scott. The terms of the Motion he had to submit to the House were, as far as possible, those of that Petition. It appeared that the result of the inquiries and the Report of the Commission on Capital Punishment had tended, or was supposed to tend, in some degree, to the lamentable uncertainty as to the administration of the law which now prevailed. In the concluding paragraph of their Report, the Commissioners said—

> "There are other questions of great importance upon which we have taken evidence, namely—1. The propriety of allowing an appeal on matters of fact to a Court of Law in criminal cases. 2. The mode in which the Crown is advised to exercise the prerogative of mercy by the Home Secretary. 3. The present state of the law as to the nature and degree of insanity which is held to relieve the accused from penal responsibility in criminal cases. It is obvious that these difficult questions are not confined to capital crimes only, but pervade the whole administration of the criminal law. They, therefore, require a more general and comprehensive treatment than the terms of the Commission under which we act will admit. We think, therefore, that while we should not be justified in making any recommendation to your Majesty on any of these points, we should fail in our duty did we not humbly solicit your Majesty's attention to them as requiring further investigation."

It was evident that the Commissioners, by concluding their Report in this manner, had travelled far beyond the duty to which, by the terms of their Commission, they were confined. The unfortunate effect produced, at all events, was to unsettle the minds of the Judges and of the public, not only on the question of capital punishment, not merely as to matters of law, but of practice and administration. He was fully convinced that the present Secretary for the Home Department was perfectly incapable of anything like a wilful dereliction of duty either from fear or favour; but it might happen that the right hon. Gentleman had found himself in a position in which he could not exercise the sound judgment for which he was distinguished. Be that as it might, he felt, with the petitioners, that the House would act rightly in asking for an explanation of the case to which he had called attention. He begged to assure the Secretary for the Home Department that if he was of opinion that to press the Motion would be inconsistent with the practice of the House, or with that of the department over which he presided, he would at once withdraw it. He hoped, at the same time, that the right hon. Gentleman would give some explanation of circumstances which had produced deep discontent.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a Copy of the Correspondence and Memorial relating to the case and conviction of James Scott of Birmingham, who was convicted of the wilful murder of John Pryse at the Assizes holden at Warwick on the sixteenth day of July last, and was sentenced by Mr. Baron Pigott."—(*Mr. Newdegate.*)

Mr. AYRTON said, he had been requested by his hon. Friend who had been lately elected a representative for Birmingham (Mr. Dixon) to second the Motion, and to express his regret that owing to his unavoidable absence he was unable to state to the House the views held by his constituents on the subject. He (Mr. Dixon) looked upon the case as one of the deepest importance to the administration of justice. Its position left upon the minds of the people of Birmingham a very painful impression, and they desired that, whatever conclusion the Secretary of State might have arrived at with regard to it, he would take some means to inform the public of the exact grounds on which he proceeded.

Mr. GILPIN said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not feel it to be his duty to give an answer to the appeal of the hon. Member for North Warwickshire in the present position of matters concerning the unhappy man whose case was under consideration. He adhered to the opinion he had on many previous occasions expressed in that House and elsewhere, that capital punishment must be done away with if we wished to make punishment certain. It could not be certain so long as the Home Office was besieged with petitions in favour of a policy of mercy on grounds more or less tenable. He did not regret that it was thus besieged, because he believed that the line was very narrow indeed which was drawn by juries between aggravated manslaughter and murder. But there should be a strong case to justify the trying over again in that House that which had already been tried before a coroner, before a jury at the assizes, and afterwards considered by the Secretary for the Home Department. Appeals had on more than one occasion been made in favour of a reprieve, but the present was the first in which a fair appeal had been made against one. It was all very well to say that many of the respectable inhabitants of Birmingham were excited because of the decision of the Home Office; but he knew that a large proportion of them were in favour of the immediate abolition of the punishment of death, a view which he found was shared in by public meetings he had attended in several towns throughout England.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he entirely agreed with the opinions expressed by the hon. Gentleman who had last spoken. The repugnance of juries to find a verdict of murder, which was certain to be followed by death, frequently led them to find verdicts contrary to the evidence. Public opinion was ahead of legislation in reference to capital punishment. This was the reason why it was so difficult to obtain convictions, and to carry out the sentence after conviction.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: The discussion has gone rather beyond the necessity of the occasion. Certainly, in this instance, the jury did not neglect their duty, but found a verdict of "wilful murder," in a case which was undoubtedly one of wilful murder according to the law of this country. As far as I am concerned in this transaction, I have no hesitation in explaining all that has taken place in regard to it. At the same time I must decline to produce the Papers for which the hon. Gentleman has asked, it being quite inconsistent with the established practice to produce such papers, including, as they do, the letter of the Judge. The fact is that the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright)—not the junior Member, whom the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets has represented here tonight—called at the Home Office, bringing with him a memorial which he stated was signed by a large number of the inhabitants of Birmingham, and also by ten of the jurymen who had tried the prisoner, in favour of the commutation of the sentence. I immediately, without reading the memorial, the effect of which was stated to me, or taking any other step with respect to it, directed that it should be sent to the Judge for his notes of evidence, which I had not seen, and opinion. It was very material that it should be so sent, because the time for the execution of the prisoner was drawing nigh. The memorial was sent down to the Judge, and by return of post I received an answer, in which the Judge recommended that the sentence of death should be commuted to penal servitude. Under these circumstances, I had to consider what had been the uniform course followed by the Home Office in all such cases. I found that where the Judge had recommended the commutation of the sentence there was no precedent for the Home Secretary standing in the way, and that if I did so I should then myself become passer of a sentence or executioner rather than an adviser as to when the prerogative of mercy should be exercised. I therefore felt that I was bound to act upon that recommendation.

Mr. NEATE said, that the right hon. Gentleman had said nothing about another case. Supposing, as sometimes happened, a Judge were to fail in his duty by exercising an excessive lenity towards a criminal, was it ever a part of the duty of the person holding the high office of Home Secretary to remonstrate with the Judge in such a case?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: I would rather deal with a concrete case when it arises than with an abstract one.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, that he was perfectly satisfied that the right hon. Gentleman had acted in strict accordance with recent precedents and with the recent practice of the Home Office, and that so far his explanation was satisfactory; as such was the case, he would withdraw the Motion then before the House.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

POLITICAL PRISONERS.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

Mr. REARDEN said, that he would refer to the amnesty recently granted by the Austrian Government to the Hungarians; M. Kossuth having not only been allowed to return, if he chose, to his native country, but having been elected a Member of its Legislature. He urged that the present auspicious moment, when all England was rejoicing at the passing of another great Reform Act, was particularly opportune for such an exercise of the Royal clemency as his Motion suggested. In reply to a deputation from Conservative working men, the Chancellor of the Exchequer told them that if they would support Ministers they would save not only the country but the Crown. He had acted in the spirit of the advice dictated by the right hon. Gentleman, and he hoped that would induce the right hon. Gentleman to lend a favourable ear to this proposal.

Mr. WHALLEY said, he seconded the Motion, and that he was acting with perfect consistency in doing so. He had signed a Petition for the mitigation of the sentence on the Fenian prisoner Burke. Whether the Fenian prisoners had been influenced by political or by religious motives, he did not think that disaffection in Ireland was to be removed by pursuing these men to extremities, or by treating them with greater severity than the circumstances of their individual cases rendered imperatively necessary. One simple remedy, in his opinion, for the evils of Ireland was to make known to the Irish people what were the facts of the case with regard to the position which this country had taken up in reference to civil and religious liberty.

Motion made, and Question,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be pleased to extend Her most gracious pardon to all persons now in prison in the United Kingdom and the Colonies for political offences."—(*Mr. Rearden.*)

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: With respect to the political prisoners in the Colonies the House is not acquainted with the facts. With respect to those in the United Kingdom, it would be contrary to all reason and common sense, while you are trying a great number of persons for these offences, and while the Habeas Corpus Act is suspended in order to enable you to apprehend them, to let out a number of prisoners, many of whom, having been let out before, have returned again to trouble this country. I need not say a word more.

Motion put, and *negatived.*

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, August 14, 1867.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued—*For* Stroud, *v.* George Poulett Scrope, esquire, Manor of Northstead.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Royal Military Canal* (313).

Second Reading—Traffic Regulation (Metropolis) [97]; London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance [43], debate *adjourned;* Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement (Loans)* [56].

Committee—Contagious Diseases (Animals) (*re-comm.*) [228]; Agricultural Gangs* [310]; Consecration of Churches and Churchyards* [276].

Report—Contagious Diseases (Animals) (*re-comm.*) [228]; Agricultural Gangs* [310]; Consecration of Churches and Churchyards* [276].

Considered as amended—Contagious Diseases (Animals) (*re-comm.*) [228]; Hours of Labour Regulation* [258]; County Courts Acts Amendment* [212]; Railway Companies (Scotland)* [306].

Third Reading—Contagious Diseases (Animals)* (*re-comm.*) [228]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Courts of Referees* [311]; Hours of Labour Regulation* [258]; Railway Companies (Scotland)* [306].

Withdrawn—Metropolitan Improvements [55]; Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings [14].

NAVY—TENDERS FOR ENGINES.

QUESTION.

Mr. GRAVES said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, If the tenders for the engines for the two iron-clads building at Glasgow have been decided; and, if so, to state the price named in the accepted tender, with the names of the parties who were invited to tender?

Mr. CORRY, in reply, said, the tenders in question had only been received on the 7th instant, so that they had not yet been taken into consideration. He could not, therefore, give his hon. Friend any information as to the price; but he could give him the names of the parties who had been invited to tender, if that was desired.

Mr. GRAVES: No, no!

NAVY—MARINE ENGINES ORDERED AND RESOLD.—QUESTION.

Mr. GRAVES said, he would also beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, If a pair of marine engines, of about 700-horse power, ordered of Messrs. Napier and Co., were re-sold by the Admiralty to the contractors before they left their factory; and, if so, to state what ship they were ordered for, the price paid for the engines, the amount that the Admiralty sold them back for, and the reason for the re-sale?

Mr. CORRY said, he had to state to his hon. Friend that no marine engines had been sold by the Admiralty to Messrs. Napier and Co.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) (*re-committed*) BILL (*Lords.*)—[Bill 228.]

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 45 (Regulations respecting landing, &c., of Foreign Animals).

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: I wish to make a short statement with regard to the debate and division on this clause which occurred on Monday night. The expression of opinion on that occasion was so decided, and the minority was so large that the Government have felt that they could not pass the circumstance by without consideration. That minority contained the names of persons to whose judgment the Government has been accustomed in a great degree to defer. The whole minority, indeed, consisted of Members whose wishes the Government are always anxious to consult. It must be confessed that considerable difficulties prevented the acceptance of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Suffolk (Mr. Corrance). If it had been admitted into the Bill the Privy Council would have been placed under "a hard and fast" rule to slaughter all foreign animals at all times, whatever might be the circumstances of the country. If an emergency and distress for food were to arise, then the rule could not be relaxed. Yet Parliament in 1848, placed the power and consequent responsibility in the hands of the Privy Council, and refrained from determining it by an Act of the Legislature expressly in order to meet such a case, so that restrictions might be imposed whenever there was danger of disease, and relaxed whenever an emergency with regard to food should arise. The Government felt, therefore, that they would not be justified in freeing themselves from the responsibility and in agreeing to bind themselves hand and foot for the future; yet they entertain a strong desire to meet the wishes of the minority, and, having considered the arguments which were used on Monday night, and perceived that the object which was conscientiously aimed at was the slaughter of all foreign animals at the ports of landing, they have determined to revoke the Order with reference to Harwich and Southampton, so that all cattle should be slaughtered at the ports of landing, and none allowed to leave those ports alive. The Bill, if carried, would only be in operation for a year, before which time Parliament would have to deal with the whole question. He, therefore, asked the Committee to allow the Bill to pass with all despatch, in order that it might become law this Session. The Consolidated Order was in type, but could not be issued before this Bill was passed. Unless the Bill was sent to the House of Lords to-morrow, it would be impossible that the Bill could be passed on Saturday.

COLONEL SYKES said, he was glad to hear the determination that had been come to by the Government. The course taken was precisely that which he had been pressing on the Government, and which had been adopted by France, with the best results.

MR. CORRANCE: After the statement of the noble Lord, perhaps I may be permitted to say a few words upon the present views of Her Majesty's Government upon this clause. It seems to me, if I have perfectly comprehended their scope, that the present Orders which the Privy Council are about to issue under the authority of the Bill, are in exact accordance with the point embodied in the amended clause I submitted the other night—that they do make slaughter imperative; that they will define the ports; the time of doing so being simply limited by the limited duration of this Bill, say for one year. I can take no exception to this; indeed it seems to me that it is perhaps the wisest course. The provisions of this Bill are entirely provisional, and are not such as would be desirable to make permanent; and to meet the present case by the time specified, it will no doubt be in the power of the Government to deal in a more comprehensive manner with the question, and from the effect of the measure they now propose to adopt, they will gain some valuable experience of the operation of such law upon markets, prices, and their relation to produce of every class, for which the data are undoubtedly insufficient as yet. Had I been met by such a proposition as the one now moved I should not have pressed to a division the other night; nor, indeed, had I been aware that I should find myself directly opposed to the whole Government strength, would it have been the case. There has been some misapprehension as to this. By the statement now made by the right hon. Gentlemen these are removed; and, accepting the proposition, I can only express my satisfaction at the results. I therefore beg leave to withdraw the remainder of the Amendments proposed, from line 9, to the end of the clause; but, as the noble Lord said nothing concerning the sub-section with reference to quarantine, I shall therefore beg more particularly to call his attention to that point. The rest I am happy to leave in Government hands.

COLONEL NORTH said, that the transit of foreign cattle had occasioned the greatest alarm in Oxfordshire, and he was much gratified at the announcement of the noble Lord. He had presented a number of Petitions from his own county on the subject, and all they asked for had now been granted. He only regretted that this step had not been taken before.

Mr. M'LAREN said, he was not at all surprised that the hon. and gallant Member for Aberdeen (Colonel Sykes) whose county was one for the growth of cattle, and almost nothing else, should have been pleased with the idea of slaughtering all cattle at the port of landing, but it did not follow that because such a regulation would be good for Aberdeenshire, it would be good for every other part of the country, and he would suggest that words should be introduced into this clause, declaring that for the purposes of this Act, the City of Edinburgh and the port of Leith should be held to be one and the same place. In the Bill of last Session, of which the hon. Gentleman who was now the Secretary to the Treasury had charge, a clause to that effect was inserted.

Mr. HENLEY was sure the House and the country would hear with great satisfaction the statement made by his noble Friend on the part of the Government. There could be no doubt that so long as the risk existed, which seemed to be perpetually recurring by the introduction of animals from abroad not slaughtered at the ports of entry, it would be necessary to keep up the restrictions on the home trade of the country, and he believed those restrictions had a very great effect in keeping up the price of meat to consumers, and enormous inconvenience to all persons concerned in the trade, and the sooner they were relaxed the better. He could quite understand that the Government would not be willing to have their hands tied by an Act of Parliament; but in his own county everyone was most anxious that everything in reason should be done to prevent the recurrence of this disease. He heartily accepted the promise of the Government because it showed that the discussion which had taken place on this Bill had satisfied the Government that these measures should be taken. The present vexatious restrictions, as the noble Lord said, were about to be much lessened, and he hoped they would be entirely relaxed, for they applied not only to cattle, but to sheep.

Mr. LIDDELL, as one who had voted in the minority, cordially hailed the anoucement just made by the noble Lord. He entirely agreed with the views expressed by his right hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire. He lived in a part of the country which had suffered much loss and inconvenience from the restrictive measures adopted in regard to the home trade, farmers having to travel miles and miles to obtain passes for their cattle. He had voted for the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Suffolk, because he felt convinced that they could not safely or wisely relax the restrictions on the home trade till they adopted measures to prevent the spread of infection from the ports of entry. He hoped and believed the wise step now taken by the Government would be followed by another equally necessary—he meant the consolidation and simplification of all the Orders in Council relating to the cattle plague. He also thought the powers and duties of the Privy Council should be better defined. It was a very anomalous body. He had himself sat on a Committee to inquire into the constitution of that Board, but no one could define its limits or responsibility. The country generally, did not understand upon whom the responsibility for the acts of the Privy Council lay. The question was one of great importance, and he trusted that the Government would seriously consider the subject of the re-organization of this department of the public service.

Colonel KINGSCOTE expressed his thanks to the Government for meeting the views of the Western counties upon this subject. The question was of importance not only to the agriculturists but to the interests of the community generally. Two cases of cattle disease that had occurred recently near Bristol had been traced distinctly to foreign cattle which had come from London to Bristol. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley) had so clearly expressed the views he himself entertained that he would not further trespass upon the attention of the Committee.

Mr. READ also wished to draw the attention of the noble Lord to the question so ably put by the hon. Member (Mr. Liddell). The whole system upon which the Privy Council worked was imperfect and incomplete. The Privy Council had no more right to deal with the cattle plague than the Board of Trade had to attempt the collection of agricultural statistics. We require to have some department of the Privy Council exclusively devoted to agriculture, so as to understand agricultural wants and interests, and to command the confidence of the farmers. He was glad to hear that this Bill was only intended to continue for a year, and he hoped that during the recess the noble Lord would take into consideration not only the proper method of dealing with the cattle plague, but also the mode in which the transit of cattle, both by land and sea, was conducted. He was glad to hear that the Privy Council intended to issue a Consolidated Order, which, he understood from the noble Lord, was to be published on Saturday, and which he sincerely hoped would remove from the home cattle trade the bulk of the present most vexatious restrictions.

Mr. AYRTON suggested the insertion of words into the clause which should meet the views of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren). If no words were inserted in the clause extending the limits of the port of Leith to Edinburgh, the Act would not apply to the city. As the Bill now stood, the local authorities would have no power to enforce the provisions of the Act; and therefore he should be glad to hear from the noble Lord that it was his intention to bring up a clause which should give the local authorities power to secure places for the slaughter of cattle.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he would take care that the views of the hon. Member for Edinburgh were met by the provisions of the Consolidated Order. As he had before stated, the Consolidated Order was already printed, and directly this Bill was agreed to by both Houses it would be promulgated. In general, the ports were too large. The port of London, for instance, was seventy miles long; That of Plymouth twenty-six. What was wanted was to diminish, rather than extend, the limits of the ports. The Privy Council was an ancient institution, formed for the purpose of assisting the Sovereign with advice; but Committees of the Privy Council devoted themselves to specific objects. In the present case, the Committee of Privy Council was not empowered to make arbitrary Orders, but only such as they were distinctly authorized to make under the Act of last Session.

Mr. HUNT said, that previous to the passing of the Act of last Session, the question of permitting cattle to pass from Leith to Edinburgh had been minutely gone into, when it was found that, owing to the road between those places running through market-gardens, there could not be the slightest danger in permitting cattle to be driven along it. From the peculiarity of Edinburgh there was no danger whatever of infection from the transit of cattle from the harbour into Edinburgh.

Mr. CANDLISH thought that if the port of Leith were to be made to include Edinburgh some difficulties might arise with the Customs authorities.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, he would propose the insertion of the following words in line 13, after the word "land:"—"and may define the limits of such port or ports for the purposes of this Act." He thought this Amendment would meet the case of Edinburgh and Leith.

Mr. M'LAREN thought the Amendment satisfactory.

Mr. AYRTON thought it would be still necessary to insert another clause, giving the local authorities power to carry into effect the provisions of the Act.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU proposed to add words to the clause in order to meet the views of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, giving power to the local authorities to fit up places for the slaughter of cattle, and to charge for the use thereof such rates as should meet with the approval of the Privy Council, and providing that all expenses so incurred should be deemed expenses incurred for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. AYRTON pointed out that the words proposed by the noble Lord gave the local authorities no power to acquire lands for the purposes of the Act.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, perhaps it would be better for him to withdraw his Amendment, and to bring up a clause at the end of the Bill, to meet the hon. and learned Member's views.

Amendment *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 46 to 57, inclusive, *agreed to.*

New clauses *moved,* and *added* to the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Chatterton) brought up a new clause, embodying the suggestions of the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets, giving the local authorities power to erect buildings for the slaughter of cattle and sale of cattle, and to acquire land for that purpose.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE protested

against this clause as interfering with the privileges of the City of London in the management of local markets.

Mr. AYRTON said, that the clause seemed sufficiently general and comprehensive to meet the various circumstances of the case. The cattle disease was introduced into this country chiefly through the negligence of the Corporation of London, and he thought they were putting themselves into a very invidious position by standing in the way of any proposal for putting an end to the calamity under which the country had suffered during the last two years. Unless the Corporation of London were prepared to pay the whole expenses to which the country had been put in consequence of the introduction of the cattle plague, they should not obstruct the passing of this clause.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that at this period of the Session it would be impossible to enter into the large question as to the creation of local markets, which must be considered upon its own merits. The establishment of separate markets would entail great expense, and must necessarily interfere with the vested rights of the City of London. He did not think that such interference would be justifiable without a full discussion of the subject. The clause had better be agreed to as it stood, and he would then move an addition to it which would protect the interests of the City of London.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU moved the addition of the following words:—"Provided that nothing in this Bill contained shall interfere with the rights of the City of London."

Mr. HENLEY said, that no one was more friendly to the rights of the City of London than he was; but he thought that the authorities were placing themselves in an invidious position by standing on their extreme rights in this matter. The Corporation had done nothing to check the disease during the last two years; and they now wished, in order to preserve to themselves a small pecuniary benefit, to continue a practice which was fraught with great danger to the agricultural interest of the country. He never knew a more striking illustration of the fable of "the dog in the manger." It had been stated by the noble Lord who had official information on the subject that it was impossible to guard against foreign cattle being infected. These cattle came 500 or 600 miles by land and sea, and then crossed the whole of England, and if they were to be admitted into the metropolitan markets, those markets would become the centres of infection; yet it was now proposed that they should be permitted to enter these markets in order that the Corporation might preserve their miserable tolls. If the City of London were to come forward and offer to provide places for the slaughter of these foreign cattle, he should be the last to wish to interfere with its privileges. He, however, did not see that while other persons and corporations had given up all their rights those of the City of London should alone be preserved intact.

Mr. NEVILLE-GRENVILLE said, he agreed that the Corporation would be acting very invidiously if they set up their rights in this instance. He hoped that the noble Lord would withdraw his Amendment, which was calculated to interfere with the interest of the general community.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE defended the City of London from the charge that had been brought against it of desiring to obstruct the passing of a measure which would tend to extirpate the cattle disease. All that they desired was that in the event of these new markets being established the control of them would be left in their hands. If the word "sale" were struck out of the clause, their objection would be removed.

Mr. AYRTON denied that the markets in the metropolis, with the exception of the one at Islington, were under the control of the Corporation, and pointed out that the markets at Whitechapel, Portland Place, Covent Garden, and elsewhere were under no such authority. The Islington market, no doubt, was within the rule of the Corporation; but every one knew that the Corporation constructed that market merely out of spite, and that the Corporation went to an enormous expense over it rather than take advantage of the market already established in a place convenient for the agricultural interest.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU thought that, after the clear expression of the opinion of the House, it would not be worth while to press the proviso.

Mr. RUSSELL GURNEY said, that nothing could be farther from the truth than the statement of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton) with regard to the conduct of the Corporation in building the market at Islington. There really was not the slightest foundation for asserting that it was built from motives of spite: it was constructed at the special request of the Government, and at a great loss to the Corporation. As regarded the present clause, no obstacle would be put by the Corporation in the way of anything being done that was necessary for the prevention of the disease. But the hon. and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets knew very well what private interests, on the other side, were at work in this matter, and he was therefore not justified in coming down and attributing to the Corporation unworthy motives that had no foundation.

Mr. AYRTON admitted that this clause had been drawn up and placed in his hands by some of his constituents—wharfingers on the Thames—who were very much interested in it. With respect to the suggestion that the word "sale" should be omitted, it was only necessary to point out that if foreign cattle could not be slaughtered until they had been sold the object of the clause would be defeated by the proposed Amendment.

Proviso *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Mr. READ moved the following new clause:—

> "When any animal is slaughtered by the order of the Inspector of the Privy Council, or the Inspector of any Local Authority, for the purpose of ascertaining the nature of any disease under which such animal may be labouring, the owner of such animal shall be compensated in the manner provided by the Cattle Diseases Prevention Act, 1866."

It had often been discovered that the disease from which the animal slaughtered was suffering was not the cattle plague. In the absence of such a provision great injustice was often inflicted on the owners of cattle.

Sir J. CLARKE JERVOISE said, he felt inclined to propose that an inspector who made such a mistake should be sent to the treadmill.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU said, that at present the inspectors had no authority to order the slaughter of any animals except those which were suffering from the cattle plague. He had, however, no objection to the clause, but it would be necessary to add to it words authorizing the inspectors to order the slaughter of any animal for the purpose of ascertaining the nature of any disease suspected to be cattle plague from which such animal may be suffering.

Clause *withdrawn,* and new clause, as proposed by Lord R. Montagu, *agreed to,* and inserted in the Bill.

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, *considered;* Amendments made:—Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he wished to rectify some statements which he had made in the early part of the Session. As, however, the hon. Member for Poole, who had given notice of a Motion respecting the state of Candia, was not present, and as the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Under Secretary were both absent from the House, it was not his intention to say anything which would lead to controversy. He did not wish to retract anything which he had said in the early part of the Session with regard to the state of affairs in Turkey itself. The consular reports differed very much as to the condition of the Christians in the East, but that was no doubt owing in a great degree to the individual conduct of the pashas who ruled the different districts. But when his hon. Friend the Member for Galway brought forward his Motion, in the early part of the Session, he defended, to the best of his ability, the conduct of the Greek authorities, and he took this opportunity of stating that information which he had since received had led him to the conclusion that the present conduct of the Greek Government with respect to Candia was, to say the least, very injudicious. At the same time, he thought there was plenty of room for the amelioration of the condition of the people in Candia, and that the Turkish Government could not do better than turn their attention to the subject. Still, he was of opinion that no country ought to encourage hostilities against another country with which it was nominally at peace. If the hon. Member for Poole had been present, he should have gone into the matter at greater length, but having always been a friend to the Greek nation and the Greek

Government, he had thought it only fair to the House and to the country to state that his opinion of the conduct of the Greek Government was different from that which he had entertained, and that he thought their present policy was prejudicial to the interest of civilization, and could not be too highly deprecated.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

TRAFFIC REGULATION (METROPOLIS) BILL—(*Lords*)—[BILL 97.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, it had been very carefully considered in the House of Lords. He believed there was no opposition to the Bill except on the part of his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Alderman Lawrence), who wished to protect, as he supposed, the interests of the City. But he trusted that his hon. Friend would defer his comments on the Bill until it reached the next stage, and allow it to be read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy.*)

MR. ALDERMAN LAWRENCE said, this Bill was of vast importance to the trade and commerce of the metropolis, but not a word of explanation had yet been given of it in this House. He objected to the Government attempting to carry such a measure at that advanced period of the Session. It had been taken for granted by the great interests of the metropolis that the Bill would not be pressed forward on the 14th of August. The Bill would interfere, to an extraordinary extent, with the trade and commerce of the metropolis. It was read a second time in the House of Lords on the 12th of February, and came to the House of Commons on the 26th of March last; it had been hung up ever since, and those interested in it believed it had been abandoned. He did not say that the Government were responsible for the delay. The Bill should have been introduced to the House of Commons first, or it should at least have been sent to a Select Committee of the House of Commons, that its details might be sifted; for, although it had been before a Select Committee of the Upper House, the proceedings there were conducted in private, and none of those interested in it knew what was going on; many even did not know that Evidence was being taken. He opposed the Bill on the ground that it would increase the price of all articles of necessity to the inhabitants of the metropolis. It had been said that the Bill was similar to one introduced by the Corporation of London; this was not the case. The Corporation's Bill would have regulated the traffic; this would simply suppress it; instead of directing the routes the traffic should take, it would expel traffic from the metropolis. The measure had been framed on evidence given by Sir Richard Mayne, who evidently felt that the traffic had got beyond him, and that there was no means of controlling it except by suppression. Sir Richard Mayne desired to prevent coals and heavy goods from being delivered either in the City or suburbs as far as Clapham, Hampstead, Notting Hill, and other places four miles distant from Charing Cross, except between one and ten in the morning; he also suggested that people should sit up to receive the coals, or leave the coal plates of their cellars unfastened; but the consequence would be that the consumers would have to pay an additional 2*s.* 6*d.* per ton for their coals. The wine and spirit trade ought to be entirely excluded from the operation of the Bill, as the docks and bonded warehouses which were under the supervision of the Officers of Customs were only open for the delivery of goods from nine o'clock to four o'clock in the winter, and from eight o'clock to four o'clock in the summer, consequently it would be quite impossible to remove wines and spirits in casks from the docks and bonded warehouses and deliver them in the City of London either before ten o'clock in the morning or after six o'clock in the evening as was provided by clauses in this Bill. The parties affected by the measure should be afforded an opportunity of stating their grievances and explaining how its provisions would injuriously affect them. The provisions for insuring the speedy removal of snow were the most absurd and impracticable that could have been desired, and would cause considerable annoyance to the street authorities of the metropolis, and therefore ought to be expunged from the Bill. And that part of Clause 12 should also be struck out which authorizes any police constable to take into custody without warrant any person who within view of such constable should disregard the regulations in any street within the special limits of the Bill. If the Government would adopt measures by which Waterloo Bridge would be made free, the metropolis would be greatly relieved from the pressure of traffic. Great advantages had been derived from throwing open Southwark Bridge, and similar advantages would result to the Western and North Western parts of the metropolis from making Vauxhall Bridge free. It was a new idea that a Bill for the Regulation of Traffic should commence by suppressing traffic, and that it should presume to say what vehicles should alone pass through the streets. On the whole, he felt convinced that it would be most objectionable to press the measure forward this Session when it was known that it would inflict great evils on the trading community. It was supposed that in Paris after certain hours no heavy traffic was to be seen in the streets; but this was a mistake, for he himself had seen great waggons conveying stone to buildings in course of erection within the prohibited hours. But the real reason why the heavy traffic of Paris was capable of being controlled, was that, comparatively speaking, it was of very moderate dimensions. In Paris, there was no great river with freight equalling that of the Thames, or manufactories of large articles. It was a city of pleasure, and elegant trifles formed the staple of its products. The effect of compressing the limit of time within which heavy traffic could be carried on would be to necessitate the employment of many more vehicles and horses to do the same work quicker. Loss of life was spoken of; but loss of life was owing in the City not so much to the slow as to the quick traffic, which it was now sought to accelerate. The House was familiar with a very common form of complaint. A gentleman wanting to get from the West End to Bishopsgate Street Station rapidly, having a dinner party at home perhaps, and not having allowed himself sufficient time to drive there, missed his train, spoiled his dinner party, and then wrote next day to *The Times*, complaining of the crowded state of the streets. The effect of increasing the present rate of driving must be to add to the annual number of deaths. The Metropolitan Board of Works had, under their seal, petitioned the House of Lords, praying to be heard by counsel against this Bill, but their Lordships refused to accede to their prayer. It should be remembered that Petitions from all the principal railways running into London had been presented to Parliament against the passing of the Bill. The vestries of the most important parishes in the metropolis, from St. Luke's, Old Street, to Kensington, inhabited by very different classes of population, all disapproved of the Bill as interfering materially with social arrangements, likely to produce great inconvenience, and to require a great increase of police and parochial officers. Boards of Works, Commissioners of Sewers, and other public bodies, also petitioned against the Bill, pointing out the ill effects that would be produced by the clauses relating to the delivery of goods, as well as by other regulations affecting houses and property. These all asked to be heard against it, and to have an opportunity of appearing before a Committee. He knew it was hopeless for him to contest the Bill against the weight and authority of the Government, which was all-powerful in the month of August; but he appealed to the Secretary of State for the Home Department to listen to their opinions, and to postpone the measure for that purpose. They might carry the measure, but putting in force its provisions was a very different matter, and Sir Richard Mayne, with all his men, and even a large accession to the police force, could not attempt it without leading to the greatest confusion. What would be said if it were proposed to take the heavy barges out of the Thames, and leave it clear for the fast steamboats? It was equally ridiculous to propose to take the heavy traffic out of London streets and leave them to cabs and carriages. He begged to move that the Bill be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day three months." — (*Mr. Alderman Lawrence.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. CRAWFORD said, he had been anxious to take some part in this debate, but the subject had been treated in such an exhaustive manner by his hon. Colleague, that it was impossible to approach it at any point that had not been thoroughly discussed. He could only say that he agreed with his hon. Colleague. He did not object to Parliament dealing with the traffic of the metropolis, but at this period of the Session it was impossible the subject could be properly considered.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, the Bill contained many clauses which he thought it was desirable to pass. He suggested that the House should consider these clauses, but that the Home Secretary should withdraw that portion of the Bill relating to the delivery of coal and the removal of snow and dust.

Colonel SYKES said, the radius of three miles within which this Bill was to operate should begin not at Charing Cross, as was proposed, but at Guildhall. In the former case, Belgravia and Tyburnia would be brought under the operation of this Bill. That would be an unreasonable interference with the comfort of the inhabitants of these districts, because there was no crowded traffic there. He insisted that before any measure was passed on this subject, the people whose property and comforts would be affected by it, ought to have an opportunity of being heard before a Select Committee of the House.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON said, he would not attempt to follow the hon. Member for London (Mr. Alderman Lawrence) who had gone into so many subjects beyond the scope of the Bill. Those embraced within the measure were not very numerous, but they were very important as regarded the comfort and well-being of the metropolis. Some of the regulations provided in this Bill had been called for year after year, and there could be no doubt that the question of regulating the traffic of the metropolis must be dealt with before long, whatever party might be in office. Even at that advanced period of the Session he thought it was incumbent on the House to attempt to remove some of the evils with which the Bill dealt. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment complained that there was not time for a consideration of the Bill; but it had been before Parliament during the whole of the present Session, and, no doubt, every Member of that House had given it his consideration, and made up his mind on it. Again, though he would not venture to say that an inquiry before a Select Committee of the Lords superseded inquiry in the House of Commons, still hon. Members ought not to refuse to recognize inquiries made by the other House. The Bill, as now before the House of Commons, did not go nearly to the extent which had originally been intended. All the various interests concerned had been heard attentively by the Select Committee of the House of Lords, and very considerable modifications had been made in the measure at the suggestion of those interests. It had been at first intended that extensive power should be given to the Commissioner of Police as to the streets in which there should be restrictions on the traffic; but, instead of that large discretion being given to him, the streets in which the restrictions were to have effect were all duly scheduled. It would be seen that the streets so scheduled were principally those in which great carrying companies had found it to be for their own interest to have self-imposed restrictions as to the delivery of goods. The want of proper regulations for heavy traffic was a disgrace to the metropolis; and better regulations with regard to hackney carriages and to dogs were also urgently required. There had been some distressing occurrences in consequence of rabid dogs being allowed to run about the streets in warm weather. Various useful regulations, too with regard to shoeblacks, commissionaires, and other *employés* were not to be despised. The hon. Member (Mr. Labouchere) had asked the Government to consent to take out the clauses relating to the removal of snow, dust, and coals. He should not like to pledge the Government to give that consent, but he was authorized to say that they would accept any reasonable modifications which might be proposed, and that when they got into Committee they would consider the question of the withdrawal of such clauses as might be objected to. He trusted that that promise would satisfy the House, and that the hon. Member would withdraw the Amendment he had proposed.

Mr. LOCKE was glad to hear the statement which the hon. Baronet had made, the more particularly since the persons connected with some of the trades with reference to which it was proposed to legislate had had no opportunity of appearing before the Select Committee and stating their objections to the clauses and where the shoe pinched them. He understood that the whole of the City of London and the liberties thereof were scheduled in the Bill with respect to the delivery of goods, and considering the immense trade of the City, regulations forbidding the delivery of bulky goods within certain hours of the day would create an enormous tax upon traders, which tax the public at large would ultimately have to bear. It was likewise a most preposterous proposition to say that beer should not be delivered to public-houses between ten o'clock in the morning and seven o'clock at night. He suggested that they should strike out all those clauses which had not been considered by a Select Committee of that House. With regard to the removal of snow, the vestries, while disclaiming the contemplated interference with their powers, were unanimous in expressing the opinion that it would be impossible to carry out the provision of the Bill which related to this subject, and that provision ought also to be struck out, and any regulation necessary on the subject postponed till next Session, when it would be able to receive proper consideration. There were several valuable provisions in the Bill, such as that relating to dogs straying about the street, and he should be sorry to see those parts of the Bill lost because there were other clauses to which great objection was entertained.

Mr. Alderman LUSK thought that some of the clauses—such as those relating to gambling, advertising vans, and dogs—could be made useful, and the other clauses could be subsequently taken into consideration.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE said, that after the declaration made on the part of the Government he should withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow* at Two of the clock.

METROPOLITAN IMPROVEMENTS BILL.

(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Tite.*)

[BILL 55.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. AYRTON said, the Bill was introduced early in the Session, but owing to the great consideration which the subject required, the second reading had been postponed from time to time, and it was now too late to proceed with the measure in the present Session. He might, however, say, inasmuch as no explanation had as yet been given of its objects, and as it had been made the subject of much misrepresentation, that the Bill had been framed in accordance with the Report of the Committee which had deliberated upon the subject, and that it proposed not to increase the taxation of the metropolis, but to restrict, regulate, and make its incidence fall more regularly upon the community. To do this, of course some people would be subjected to more taxation than they had hitherto paid, and hence the misrepresentation that had been made. He thought it was impossible to conceive anything more just than that works undertaken for the permanent improvement of the metropolis, and enhancing as they must do the freehold interest of the metropolis, should be in some measure paid for by those who possessed freehold interests. He trusted that the Government would in the recess give some attention to the subject, and bring in next Session a comprehensive measure, dealing not only with the taxation, but the general organization of the metropolis. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by moving the discharge of the Order.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged:* Bill *withdrawn.*

LONDON COAL AND WINE DUTIES CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*Mr. Dodson, Lord John Manners, Mr. Hunt.*)

[BILL 43.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be read a second time *To-morrow.*"—(*Sir James Fergusson.*)

Mr. AYRTON moved that the Order be discharged, he having arranged with the noble Lord having charge of the measure that the Order for this and the following Bills should be discharged.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the words "That the" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "said Order be discharged,"—(*Mr. Ayrton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON said, that it was unusual to press a Motion for the discharge of a measure in the absence of the Member who had charge of it.

Mr. TITE and Colonel SYKES had both understood that the Order was to be discharged.

Mr. M'KENNA said that, at all events, it was only a question whether the Order should be discharged on that or the following day.

Mr. AYRTON said, he thought that an arrangement once made should be carried out. He should persist in his Motion, but had no objection to the debate on that Motion being adjourned until the following day.

Mr. LABOUCHERE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow*, at Two of the clock.

ARTIZANS' AND LABOURERS' DWELLINGS BILL—[Bill 14.]

(*Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Locke.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. M'CULLAGH TORRENS said, it was with great regret that he found himself obliged for the second time, to move the discharge of the Order relating to this Bill. It was due to those who had supported the measure this year and last, to state why its promoters had reached so late a period of the Session without having made more progress than they had. He acquitted the Government of any share of what might seem to be blame in the matter. He believed the Leader of the Government was perfectly sincere in the opinion which he had more then once expressed favourable to the principle of the Bill, but there were great difficulties in working it out. He ought not to shrink from saying that the reason why, for the second time, the destitute portion of the population would be left without any remedy or attempt at remedy against disease, demoralization, and death was the implacable hostility shown to the principle and provisions of the Bill by a small section of the House, not defined by party so much as by locality, and by the possession of advantages which none would envy, but which constituted in his mind a peculiar claim to a more just and generous consideration by them of the merits of the question. ["Oh, oh!"] Pledging himself to bring forward the Bill again next Session, in earnest faith that the Government would consider how they could promote it, he moved that the Order be discharged.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged:* Bill *withdrawn.*

Mr. M'Kenna

PARKS REGULATION (*re-committed*) BILL.

(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Mr. Attorney General.*)

[BILL 273.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY: In fixing this Bill for Two o'clock to-morrow I would venture to say that the language used by many Members yesterday leaves me not without hope that, by some alterations in the Bill, it may be rendered acceptable to the House. I am most anxious not to press this Bill so as to drive even a minority of the House to take a very strong course against it. I would therefore make the proposal that the first clause—prohibition of public meetings in the Parks—should be withdrawn; that it should become a Regulation Bill; and that, instead of the penalty being 40*s.*, it should be £5, as in other Park Bills.

Committee *deferred* till To-morrow, at Two of the clock.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, August 15, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Courts of Referees* (340); Hours of Labour Regulation* (341).

Second Reading—Companies Act (1862) Amendment (333); Investment of Trust Funds (246).

Report—Master and Servant* (334 & 342).

Third Reading—Local Government Supplemental (No. 6)* (289); Army Reserve* (320); Militia Reserve* (314); Public Works (Ireland)* (315), and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Representation of the People [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 102]; Naval Knights of Windsor [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 100]; Public Health (Scotland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 101]; Masters and Workmen [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 105]; Factory Acts Extension [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 103]; Railways (Ireland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 104].

THE LONDON, CHATHAM, AND DOVER RAILWAY (ARRANGEMENT) BILL.

THIRD READING.

Lord REDESDALE, in moving the third reading of this Bill, said he did so under protest, objecting to every part of it. He believed it to be the very worst measure he ever saw framed.

Lord WESTBURY expressed his regret that the noble Lord (the Chairman of Committees) should entertain such an opinion of the Bill, which must be regarded as one which proceeded on compromise and arrangement between the parties. Although much censure might be cast on the measure, much also would be cast on the law which rendered such legislation necessary, in order to supply a remedy which ought to be supplied in some more efficient manner. He admitted that he regarded the machinery of the measure as very defective; and there were two Amendments which, before the Bill passed, he should like to submit to the notice of the House. Clause 25 proposed that the consents to future proceedings of the mortgagees or debenture-holders should be necessary, but no machinery was provided for the purpose of ascertaining that those consents were duly given. He should move, therefore an addition to the clause by way of Amendment, to the effect that the certificate of a Justice of the Peace of the number of consents from time to time obtained by the company to their proceedings, and of the amount of the mortgages represented by such consents, should be sufficient evidence that those assents had been given.

Bill read 3^a.

Then Lord Westbury's Amendment *moved.*

Lord REDESDALE thought the provision suggested by the noble and learned Lord was open to very great objection. The Bill would, he contended, be much better without it. The provisions of the Companies Act required that one-half the capital of the company should be paid up, but their Lordships all knew how that requirement had been complied with in the case of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway. Sir Morton Peto gave a bit of paper on one side and got a receipt on the other, and the money was said to have been obtained when not a single shilling had been paid. Such was the manner in which the proceedings of the London, Chatham, and Dover Company were managed; and if the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord were agreed to, it would afford no protection to the rights of the parties concerned. He hoped, therefore, the Bill would be allowed to pass as it stood, and that the proof of the consents having been given would be left to be taken in some other way.

Lord HYLTON, as Chairman of the Committee which sat on the Bill, entirely agreed with the noble Lord, as to the great laxity which seemed to have prevailed in regard to all those matters which it was required should be brought before a Justice in dealing with the affairs of the Company. The facts had been fully proved by the evidence before the Committee. Under those circumstances he could not help thinking that it would be better to reject the Amendment.

Lord WESTBURY said, that if a Justice of the Peace were to grant a certificate in the absence of all evidence he would perform his duty in a most reprehensible manner. The Bill provided no machinery in its present shape to effect the object which he had in view, and if there were no person appointed who would interfere judicially for the purpose of ascertaining the facts, the Company would be left simply to the assertion of the Board of Management for the proof that the consents had been obtained.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Lord WESTBURY briefly adverted to some other provisions of the Bill, observing that when it came up to that House it contained a provision relieving the Imperial Mercantile Association from the operation of the suspending clauses. He proposed an Amendment for the purpose of protecting the interests of the Imperial Mercantile Association, and which he said had been agreed to by all the parties concerned.

After a few words from Lord Hylton,

Lord REDESDALE said, he gave an unwilling assent to the introduction of the clause. It was true that one of the most disgraceful transactions that could occur had taken place. The authorities of this Railway Company had on the same day and in the same room mortgaged the same property to two different parties without the persons who were interested in advancing the several monies being aware of what had taken place. The whole of the provisions of that Bill proceeded on the extraordinary principle that all legal proceedings against the Company should be hung up for ten years, and the Imperial Mercantile Association had no more right to be excepted from the operation of that principle than any of the other creditors of the Railway Company. He agreed that these parties had been hardly dealt with. The transaction which made that clause necessary was one of the most disgraceful transactions which had ever taken place in the affairs of any company.

Motion *agreed to;* Clause *added* to the Bill.

Bill *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE BILL. (No. 331.)

(*The Lord Lyttelton.*)

COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order.)

LORD LYTTELTON moved that the Commons' Amendments be agreed to. The first consisted of the introduction of words into the first clause, providing that no scheme for the erection of a new see should take effect till the endowment was subscribed and paid. To that he did not object. The next were words in the fifth clause, proposed by a strong Liberal, who had so tender a regard for the dignity of the Church that he was shocked at the idea of a Bishop without a Chapter; he had therefore proposed that there should be a capitular body, but he had not required any endowment to be provided for them, or he allowed it to be of a merely nominal character. The House of Commons had varied the seventh clause, on the subject of the *congé d'élire*; but he had received a letter from Sir Roundell Palmer, to the effect that the use of the word "election" twice in the Bill, coupled with the general terms of the Act of Henry VIII., preserved the right so far as regarded future Bishops of the new sees. As to the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, he had the opinion of Sir Roundell Palmer that no part of them could be applied to the purpose of founding new bishoprics; the original Episcopal Fund being applicable only to the purposes of the episcopate as it then existed. The omission of the Rotation clause, coupled with the provision that there should be no increase in the number of Bishops sitting in the House of Lords under the provision of the Bill, would prevent the new prelates from ever becoming Lords of Parliament. For his own part he assented to that arrangement; for he thought that the permanence of the connection between the right rev. Bench and the House of Lords would not be weakened by it. He attached so much importance to the recognition of the principle of an increase of the episcopacy that he trusted their Lordships would not offer any opposition to Amendments which were not fatal to the principle. The appointment of Suffragan or Assistant Bishops would not, he hoped, be lost sight of, and he trusted that a proposition of that kind would be again brought forward.

Moved, to agree to the Amendments made by the Commons in the said Bill.—(*The Lord Lyttelton.*)

THE EARL OF DERBY said, he had given his willing and cordial assent to the principle of the Bill as originally introduced by the noble Lord, because he felt, and still felt, that a moderate increase of the episcopacy was to be urgently desired for the advantage of the Established Church. He would not, however, treat so lightly as the noble Lord the Amendments made by the other House, because they appeared to him to change the whole character of the Bill, and to make it so utterly impracticable, that it would be almost impossible to assent to a measure so much altered, not only in its details, but also in its fundamental principles. At this time of the Session he knew that there would be little hope of passing the Bill if the Amendments of the other House were disagreed to, and that in such an event there would be little hope of obtaining the assent of the House of Commons or of passing the Bill. He did not support the proposition made in their Lordships' House that the minimum salary of these Bishops should be £4,200, because he thought that in fixing so high a minimum an additional difficulty would be placed in the way of obtaining the necessary subscriptions, more especially as their Lordships had decided that no portion of the Common Fund of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should be applied to the increase of the episcopacy. By the Bill as it now stood the whole question was left in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. [Lord LYTTELTON: With the consent of Parliament.] Yes, but see how it worked. They desired by private subscriptions to raise funds for providing a new bishopric. But what funds did they require? That point was left entirely in the dark. It was for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to fix what income should be provided, and also whether and what income should be given to the capitular body. A landowner in Cornwall might be very anxious to raise funds for a Bishop for that county; but when he found that the whole question as to the amount of that fund was in the breast of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners he might take a different view of the question. If the Ecclesiastical Commissioners chose to say that the people of Cornwall should not have a Bishop unless they paid him £4,200 a year, and unless they provided him with a Dean and Chapter, he would feel great difficulty even in beginning to collect subscriptions. He could not consent to leave the matter exclusively in the irresponsible hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, subject only to a power in Parliament to object to their scheme; for while Parliament could object to a scheme it could not sanction a new scheme without the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. It seemed to him that these provisions raised insuperable difficulties in the way of working the principle of the measure. There was another serious objection and that was—that they were about to constitute an entirely new class of Bishops, and to draw a distinction which had never hitherto been made. He knew there was a general feeling that it would be inconvenient to increase the number of Bishops sitting in that House, and if there were any large number of new Bishops, and the principle of rotation were adopted, they might be kept waiting for seats until the right rev. Bench was filled with Prelates the most advanced in years, and, therefore, the least likely to attend to their laborious duties in Parliament. At present, as there was on the average a vacancy every year, no single Bishop appointed under the Bill would have to wait for more than about four years on an average. That was no extraordinary time to wait, and there would be no great inconvenience from the number kept waiting. Again, it would be very inconvenient that certain dioceses should be singled out for the purpose of never being episcopally represented in that House while there were certain dioceses that never ceased to be represented in the House. The Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester always had seats in that House; but the other Bishops had not a seat until a vacancy occurred. A noble Lord had objected to the income of the new Bishops being reduced and left to the option of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, because he said he was afraid of what he considered the danger of translation. But if anything would encourage translation more than another, it was the creation of a class of Bishops with less incomes than the other members of the Episcopal Bench, and without the possibility of seats in the House of Lords. That was an objection not merely to the detail, but to the whole principle of the measure. With regard to the appropriation of the Common Fund, he must, of course, bow to the opinion of so learned a person as Sir Roundell Palmer; but he had always understood that, when there was a sufficient surplus from the original Episcopal Fund, it was in the power of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, if they thought fit, and with the consent of Parliament, to apply those funds to any ecclesiastical purpose. Much as he should regret the Bill being lost, he would rather see it lost than consent to Amendments which completely altered its character. He believed that the scheme, as the Bill at present stood, would be impracticable, and he did not believe that a single see would be erected under it. As the noble Lord (Lord Lyttelton) had obtained the sanction of Parliament to the principle of an increase in the episcopate, he hoped he would be content and not press the measure further in the present Session.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, it was with deep regret that he should oppose the passing of the Bill, but he could not assent to the Amendments introduced by the House of Commons. The noble Earl had clearly pointed out their objectionable character, and for his own part he could not sanction the creation of an inferior order of Bishops, which would be setting a precedent for the exclusion of Bishops from the House altogether. He trusted, therefore, that the noble Lord would proceed no further.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD said, that so far from thinking that the Bill, as amended, would facilitate an increase of the Episcopate, he thought that nothing would so much stand in the way of such an increase hereafter as the present measure. He advised his noble Friend to be content with having obtained the sanction of Parliament to the principle of the extension of the episcopate, he should stop there, and not attempt to force what would prove a most unworkable Bill through Parliament this Session.

LORD LYTTELTON hoped their Lordships would not disagree to the Amendments *in toto*, several of them being perfectly free from objection.

THE EARL OF DERBY suggested that the Amendments should be considered *seriatim*.

LORD LYTTELTON agreed to the course.

Moved, to agree to the Amendment made by the Commons in Clause 1.

THE EARL OF DERBY objected to this Amendment, on the ground that, recognizing only voluntary subscriptions and bequests, it virtually excluded contributions from the Episcopal or any other fund.

On Question? *Resolved* in the *Negaive.*

Moved, to agree to the Amendments made by the Commons omitting Clause 2.

On Question? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 24; Not-Contents 12: Majority 12.

CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Amherst, E.
Cadogan, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Leven and Melville, E.

Malmesbury, E.
Romney, E.

De Vesci, V.
Hawarden, V.

Bagot, L.
Clinton, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Ebury, L.
Lyttelton, L. [*Teller.*]
Redesdale, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Templemore, L. [*Teller.*]

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archp.

Beauchamp, E. [*Teller.*]
Lichfield, E.
Shaftesbury, E. [*Teller.*]

Sydney, V.

Chester, Bp.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
London, Bp.
Oxford, Bp.

Foley, L.
Mostyn, L.
Vernon, L.

Resolved in the *Affirmative.*

Some Amendments *agreed to*; others *disagreed to.*

Moved to agree to the Amendment made by the Commons in Clause 12.—(*The Lord Lyttelton.*)

On Question? their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 7; Not-Contents 29: Majority 22.

CONTENTS.

Graham, E. (*D. Montrose.*)
Harrowby, E.
Shaftesbury, E. [*Teller.*]

Chester, Bp.
London, Bp.

Ebury, L.
Lyttelton, L. [*Teller.*]

The Earl of Derby

NOT-CONTENTS.

Canterbury, Archp.
Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Buckingham and Chandos, D.
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.

Amherst, E.
Beauchamp, E. [*Teller.*]
Cadogan, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Leven and Melville, E.
Lichfield, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Romney, E. [*Teller.*]

De Vesci, V.
Hawarden, V.
Sidmouth, V.

Gloucester and Bristol, Bp.
Oxford, Bp.

Bagot, L.
Clinton, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Denman, L.
Redesdale, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.
Templemore, L.
Vernon, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

A Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords disagreeing to some of the said Amendments.

COMPANIES ACT (1862) AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 333.)

(*The Duke of Richmond.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said, that it had been brought into the other House of Parliament in consequence of the Resolutions to which a Select Committee appointed to inquire into the working of the Act of 1862 had come. His right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Board of Trade had the conduct of the Bill in the other House. On its first appearance there certain objections were taken to some of the provisions, and as he believed with great justice, by Sir Roundell Palmer. That hon. and learned Gentleman proposed the insertion of some clauses, the omission of others, and certain other Amendments to be made; and the result was the Bill in its present shape. One object of the Bill was to allow companies to reduce the amount of their capital and subdivide their shares, due provision being made for the protection of creditors. Again, companies formed for purposes of charity might be registered under the Act without adopting the word "limited." It was said that if companies wished to alter the amount of their nominal capital they ought to wind up their affairs and begin again *de novo.* But such a course in the case of banks would be productive of great inconvenience. They might lose their connection; and a certain amount of discredit attached to such a proceeding. By giving to companies the facilities proposed by the Bill, no persons need be injured; the rights of creditors were most strictly protected; and the measure altogether was one which greatly interested the banking and commercial world, and which they were very desirous should pass in the course of the present Session.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Duke of Richmond.*)

Lord REDESDALE said, all would admit that this was a Bill of the greatest importance, yet their Lordships were asked to pass it without knowing its contents—so that it was not really to be the legislation of both Houses of Parliament—it was to be the legislation of one. He had asked for the Bill in the House this morning, and it was not then delivered, and he had not been able to obtain a copy until the afternoon. How, then, could their Lordships be asked now to read it a second time? It was proposed to allow a company which had been established without any provision for the reduction of its capital to make such a reduction upon a resolution passed to that effect. Such a proposal demanded grave consideration, and also, he thought, more safeguards than were provided in the Bill. As far as he could judge, such a power given to companies would subject their creditors to the same inconvenience and trouble as if they became bankrupt. For example, a creditor was obliged to object before the Court, or, if he could show that he had had no notice, he had a remedy against the shareholders, according to the extent to which each would have been liable for that particular debt if the capital had not been reduced. With regard to associations which were not established for purposes of profit, he did not see why they should object to the use of the word "limited." It must be remembered that such associations entered into engagements and had creditors. The Bill appeared to him to be framed in order to enable companies to do anything, and he believed that if passed it would throw joint-stock companies into great confusion and uncertainty. Their Lordships ought not to be called upon to pass a measure which hardly any Member of the House could have had an opportunity of considering. He had barely had time to look into the Bill himself; but it was one that demanded serious consideration, and it would be highly imprudent to proceed with it at that period of the Session.

The Earl of HARROWBY said, that his attention had been called to the Bill by a letter he had received from Liverpool, which represented the urgency of the case. The Bill had passed the ordeal of a very intelligent Committee of the House of Commons; that pains had been taken to secure the rights of all parties concerned; and urged the very great importance of giving something like stability to joint-stock companies. Great discredit had been thrown on these undertakings, and public confidence in them had been shaken by the disparity which had been found to exist between real and nominal capital; and it was highly desirable, if possible, by removing that disparity, to give solidity to property of this nature. Due attention had been paid to the interests of creditors, whose position would be as little altered as possible. He did not pretend to be master of all the details of the Bill, and possibly it might be amended in Committee; but at the same time, considering the extreme urgency of the case and its public importance, he hoped their Lordships would consent to the second reading.

Lord REDESDALE asked what time there would be, if Amendments were proposed, for their discussion, the Report, and the third reading? He asserted that the passing of a Bill of this sort, when their Lordships had not time to do anything with it, would be a most dangerous proceeding.

On Question? *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

INVESTMENT OF TRUST FUNDS BILL

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

(NO. 246.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, its object was to remove doubts as to the liberty of trustees and executors to invest trust funds in certain securities. Many years ago, when trustees were empowered by deed or will to invest trust money in Government securities, they could only place it in the Three per Cents, no matter how secure other funds might be.

However desirable it might be that the money should be so invested as to increase the amount of the income, the trustees had no power whatever, except at their own risk and peril, to invest in any other security than the Three per Cents. After a time the Legislature intervened, and said that trustees might invest in Bank Stock and also in East India Stock. Since then the Government of India had been transferred to the Crown, and there had been created a new East India Stock chargeable on the revenues of India. Doubts had arisen as to whether this new Stock came within the provisions of the Act, and the object of the Bill was to remove these doubts by empowering trustees to invest in this Stock. There was also a clause enabling them to invest in any security guaranteed by Parliament. Of course it was desirable that trustees should have a large sphere of action; and he apprehended their Lordships would have no objection to the second reading of the Bill which he now moved.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

INSURRECTION IN CANDIA.

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE, in rising to move that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for such further Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments in alliance with Her Majesty as may have occurred since the date of the 5th of February in this year respecting the insurrection of Candia, the means employed for its pacification, and the assistance afforded to the insurgents either by the Greeks, the Greek Government, or the natives or Governments of any other countries, said: My Lords, I feel, on this occasion, even more than ordinary embarrassment, proceeding in part from the late period of this anxious and protracted Session, and partly from the denuded state of the benches, a natural consequence of the very advanced stage of the public business. I explained on a former evening the accidental circumstances which had compelled me to postpone the Motion of which I had given Notice, and if I now persevere in bringing forward the subject to which it relates, I may fairly affirm that I am less influenced by motives of personal consistency than by a sense of public duty and also of respect for your Lordships' House. I claim no merit for meaning to perform my task with as much conciseness as the nature of its object and the principal considerations belonging to it will permit.

You are aware, my Lords, that the formidable insurrection which broke out in the island of Candia about twelve months ago has never been entirely extinguished. It rages no longer with the violence which characterized it at first; but it continues, nevertheless, to smoulder beneath its ashes, and to prolong a state of disturbance and suffering, when it has probably ceased in real effect to be a source of hope on the one side and a cause of serious apprehension on the other. Although the actual scene of contention between the Sultan and his Christian subjects in Candia is limited to that island, it stands in such close connection with more extensive countries, and brings into play so many eventful interests, that, even at this distance we cannot be indifferent to the incidents which occur there. The island itself, though comparatively of small extent, is by no means destitute of natural advantages, and whether under the name of Candia, or under that of Crete, has acquired no trifling renown; and from its situation with respect to Greece, to Egypt, and to Turkey, has on several occasions excited the ambition of rival Powers. The desire of independence has operated strongly on that part of its population, which is Greek, and has led to a display of energy on their side which is worthy of better fortune and of better times. The Turks also have employed powerful means in support of their authority, and have shown by their exertions what deep importance they attach to the retention of Candia under their rule. The loss of that island, placed as it is near the entrance to the Archipelago, would not only diminish their revenue, but compromise in no small degree their political power, and greatly tend to hasten the catastrophe which ever hangs over them in the shape of the Eastern Question. It does not appear that the insurrection had its origin in any oppressive acts committed by the local authorities. The habitual state of antagonism subsisting between the two separate races, and rival creeds is enough to account for a mutual disposition to quarrel, and it may readily be imagined how intensely the war of last year in Germany worked among the ardent minds of the Greek population, and inspired the hope of a general convulsion favourable to their deliverance. Committees were not wanting to fan the nascent enthusiasm, to organize the means of insurrection, and to create sympathies capable of assuming in due time the form of material succour. The Hellenic Government could hardly expect to avoid the suspicion of encouraging, and perhaps even of aiding, the Cretans in their rash but patriotic efforts to throw off the Mussulman yoke; and greater Powers were not likely to neglect so good an opportunity of promoting that process of decay and exposure to dismemberment in Turkey, for which their policy is supposed to have been long prepared. The natural vicissitudes of war, resulting from superior forces on one side, and from remarkable advantages of position on the other, its cruel necessities and brilliant exploits, have rendered the situation still more complicated in its bearings and dangerous in its contingent results.

My Lords, it is not my intention to open a discussion as to the manner, discreet or otherwise, in which Her Majesty's Government have dealt with this important matter; and with respect to the noble Secretary for Foreign Affairs, I readily acknowledge the commanding ability he has displayed in the performance of his public duties. But I must at the same time assert it to be the duty of Parliament to take an active part in watching over the proceedings of that department with respect to an event of such political magnitude as the insurrection in Crete. It cannot be denied, my Lords, that such transactions are of the greatest importance not only to the interests but to the honour of our country. England, whether we look to her political relations, or to her commercial interests, has a deep stake in the movements and destinies of the Eastern World; she is bound thereto by obligations of the most solemn character. She has given her guarantee to the Turkish Empire, and also to the kingdom of Greece. She has made herself virtually responsible for the conduct of both those Governments. Engagements of such importance, whether wisely contracted or not, must be held to carry with them no common charge of duties as well as of rights. If Turkey is supported by the guarantee of England and her allies, the guaranteeing powers are fully entitled to insist that the Porte shall lose no time in carrying into real effect those measures of administrative reform which it has solemnly adopted and proclaimed as necessary to the existence of its empire. If Greece and its independence are sheltered from danger by the protection of Christian Powers, the protecting Governments are morally bound to restrain the Greeks from every act of unprovoked hostility against the Sultan. These obligations evidently press with the greater force upon England, because, of all the powers concerned, this country is the most fitted to command the confidence of Turkey as well as of Greece, and the most exposed to injury and loss by a revival of the Eastern Question. It is but too clear, from occurrences reported in the public journals, that not only sympathy but material aid in men and munitions of war has been largely afforded to the Cretan insurgents, if not by the Government, at least by the inhabitants, of Greece. I do not wonder at, indeed, I can hardly blame the feelings which have found utterance in this manner. But they are not the less indulged to a degree which compels the Turkish authorities to employ severer means for putting down the revolt, which prolongs the horrors of a hopeless contest, and exposes the protecting Powers to reproach, to trouble, and eventually to the most disastrous contingencies. The Hellenic vessel, which has earned the largest share of admiration by the courage and dexterity of its crew in running the blockade, would also seem to have shown the most daring contempt for the law of nations, the most utter disregard of the duties prescribed to every vessel bearing the colours of Greece, and not prepared to incur the extreme penalties of piracy. Can it be doubted that in such a state of things your Lordships must desire to know what language has been held, what steps have been taken by Her Majesty's Government with respect to the transactions in question. Has anything been said or done in the name of England to restrain such perilous excesses, and at the same time to dissuade the Turkish Government from pushing its rights to an extreme? The best friends of Turkey are those who, while they respect its independence, and withhold as far as possible every kind of coercive intervention, employ their friendly influence with effective energy to settle its administration on a broader basis, and to provide impartially for the welfare and protection of all classes of its dependents. The best friends of Greece are those who would engage its people to seek a gradual extension of power by improving its natural resources in every branch, and by regaining the confidence of other nations. The sea is open to its activity, the neighbouring continent to its intelligence, and its example in cultivating the arts of peace would do more for the Greeks in Turkey than any ebullition of a lawless and aggrandizing spirit. I have no hesitation in expressing my deep conviction that Europe, and more particularly England, will find its true interest, no less than Greece and Turkey will find theirs, in pursuing this two-fold policy, which is at once conservative and progressive in the best sense of those words. Whatever feeling may be entertained in favour of the Greek populations, or to their disparagement, I, for one, have never ceased to give them my cordial sympathy, originating in the remembrance of their condition under the oppressive sway of Turkey before the existing reforms were introduced. There is a further consideration which cannot with justice or safety be left out of the account—I mean the moral duty of maintaining the law of nations, and not lending the countenance of this great country to any violation of that law. With respect to Turkey itself, your Lordships cannot have forgotten with what generosity the blood and treasure of England, and of England's allies, were expended on behalf of that Empire only a few years ago. In coming forward with assistance involving so many sacrifices we surely acquired a right to take care that the rulers of Turkey perform whatever depends upon them to prevent the necessity of our undergoing the same tribulations again. If we have pledged ourselves by a treaty of guarantee to them, they also have pledged themselves to us by proclaiming a system of internal reforms confessed by them to be necessary, and recorded with their concurrence in the same treaty. The idea of nationality is become so powerful a dissolvent of political relations, and, by consequence, so abundant a source of disturbance and confusion that it is the more incumbent upon us to hold the Porte to a steady performance of its obligations, and thereby to protect ourselves and our allies from those evils which the continued and, therefore, increasing weakness of its Empire would not fail to reproduce. This sounds like intervention, and such in truth it is; but friendly intervention in the matter of Greece and Turkey is no longer a question open to our choice. It is the natural fruit of anterior circumstances, the necessary consequence of engagements now in force; a rightful duty, to be exercised with due discretion and under its appropriate limitations.

I trust, my Lords, that in the course of these remarks I have suggested reasons enough to justify a call for that additional Correspondence to which my Notice refers. The Papers already communicated to Parliament on the subject in question go but very little beyond the month of January. More than six months have elapsed since that time, and the long interval has been productive of occurrences no less significant than those which appeared in the first series of documents, and no less capable of giving occasion for important communications between the several Governments concerned. Now, my Lords, when interests so momentous, as I have shewn them to be, are at stake, when the honour and prospects of the country are involved with the conduct and language of the Foreign Secretary, I am greatly mistaken if your Lordships would approve of being kept indefinitely in the dark. It is true that we are now on the verge of prorogation, and cannot hope to exercise any effective or immediate control over the transactions in Downing Street. But it is not the less desirable that Parliament should stimulate the sense of responsibility in official quarters, and convince the nation that a vigilant attention is paid by both Houses to its interests abroad as well as to those which lie more directly under our observation at home. Such being the case, I rely with full confidence upon that support which useful and constitutional suggestions are sure to receive at your Lordships' hands. I appeal to you, my Lords, with the greater earnestness, because to my apprehension the time is not far distant when an impartial estimate of the functions assigned to this House of Parliament may avail much towards maintaining a wholesome equipoise in the popular institutions of this deep-rooted but not unshaken monarchy. We have just returned, as it were, from launching the Vessel of the State, with all its time-honoured freight of liberties, glories, and prosperities, upon a new sea of illimitable expanse. We have seen it quit the well-known, long-tried shore of our ancestors, and whether, as all must hope, it shall find a brighter course and a safer haven in regions favoured by all the elements, or meet, as many fear, a disastrous doom in the dominions of the iceberg or the hurricane, your Lordships must wish to have the satisfaction of looking back with honest pride on services rendered by this House to the country in many successive ages. Under these impressions and in this spirit I humbly solicit your Lordships' assent to my present Motion.

Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for such further Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments in alliance with Her Majesty, as may have occurred since the date of the 5th February in this year, respecting the Insurrection of Candia, the Means employed for its Pacification, and the Assistance afforded to the Insurgents, either by the Greeks, the Greek Government, or the Natives or Governments of any other Countries.—(*The Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe.*)

The Earl of DERBY: My Lords, nothing can be more natural than that my noble Friend, who has been so closely connected with the affairs of Greece, should desire to receive all the information which it is possible for the Government to give with respect to a subject in which he, in common with many other Members of your Lordships' House, takes the deepest interest. I can, on the part of the Government, assure my noble Friend that we have not the slighest wish to withold any information bearing upon that subject which we think we can lay before Parliament consistently with the public interests I can, however, I have no doubt, satisfy him and the House that it would be inexpedient to produce at the present moment the Papers for which he asks. No very great or material change in the aspect of affairs in Crete has, I regret to say, taken place since the last Correspondence relating to them was laid upon the table. The insurrection still continues with unabated activity, although Omar Pasha has, I believe, lately met with some signal successes; and I have very little doubt that the insurrection would long since have been suppressed had it not been for the encouragement and assistance in volunteers, provisions, and warlike stores, which the insurgents have received from the Greeks. There exists, no doubt, on the part of the Christian populations in the East a very great desire to be emancipated from the rule of the Turkish Government; but I am not at all disposed to think that the unity between them and their Greek allies as to the ultimate objects they have in view is very great. I do not believe that it is the desire of the great body of the Christian population to be annexed to Greece, although they may be very anxious to get rid of the domination of Turkey. I entirely concur, I may add, in the view which has been expressed by my noble Friend (Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe) as to the policy which ought to be pursued by Greece at the present moment. I think with him that her true policy consists not in attempting to extend her territory by means of foreign conquests; but in the more rational and modest ambition of establishing peace, good order, and tranquillity in her own dominions; by that means she will be more likely to promote her happiness and that of the populations around her than by indulging in wild schemes which will interfere with her tranquility and progress. And if my noble Friend entertains the least suspicion that Her Majesty's Government have been indifferent to the occurrences in Crete, or have in the slightest degree encouraged the Greek Government to take any part in assisting the insurgents in Crete, I assure him he is very much mistaken as to the course which we have deemed it to be our duty to adopt. The fact is, whatever appearances may be, that the Greek Government has always steadily denied any complicity in the expeditions which have been organized for that purpose. It is said that those who leave Greece and convey assistance to the insurgents do so in the character of blockade-runners, and that they do not leave it under the sanction of the Government, which has no means of preventing them from doing so. But we have expressly stated our opinion that blockade-runners are subject to the penalties of illegal commerce, and are not the less subject although they should sail with the sanction of the Greek Government. Unfortunately the Turkish navy is utterly insufficient to prevent this illegal traffic, so that some vessels, few in number and comparatively insignificant, are able to carry over with them stores and volunteers with perfect impunity. One vessel is said to have made twenty-two voyages with perfect immunity, landing ammunition and stores on each occasion, and carrying back with her on her return to Greece, numbers of wounded volunteers, women, and children. Only in one case did a collision take place, when a Turkish vessel pursuing a Greek vessel into Greek waters was fired upon by a fort. With regard to the position of the Turkish forces at the present moment, I apprehend the case to be this—that they constantly obtain very considerable successes, but that the continual reinforcements arriving week by week, and day by day, among the insurgents, keep alive the spirit of revolt; and although, no doubt, both on the one side and on the other, there have been some cruelties and atrocities perpetrated by the Mussulmans on the Christians, and by the Christians on the Mussulmans, yet any excesses on the part of the Turks have been chiefly committed by irregular troops. I believe that the regular Turkish troops have, on the whole, behaved with singular moderation, that Omar Pasha has earnestly endeavoured to avoid any unnecessary effusion of blood and especially to spare the lives of women and children, has forborne to take sanguinary measures, and has protracted negotiations with a special view to spare human life. I believe that the slowness of his movements may be in some degree attributed to this motive. There is no doubt that where the Christian population have made their submission, men, women, and children have been furnished by the Turkish authorities with provisions and supplies, and have been treated with great humanity, and I believe there is no case in which those who have so submitted have had reason to complain of the conduct of the regular Turkish troops towards them. With regard to the interference of foreign Powers, the matter stands thus — Her Majesty's Government, in common with the Great Powers of Europe, have sought to impress, as they have a perfect right to do, upon the Turkish Government the expediency of carrying out internal reforms and improvements for the benefit of its Christian subjects; and I must do the Turkish Government the justice of saying that they have never shown any indisposition to enter upon a course of such reforms and improvements. They have not even made any objection to the mission of the persons appointed by the different Governments to associate themselves with the Turkish Government for the purpose of inquiring into the causes of complaint which the Christian population of Crete had against them. They have, however, said this—"As long as this insurrection goes on we must use our best means for putting it down. We are ready to follow your advice as far as possible, provided you will give us a security that the object is not to despoil Turkey of that which is an integral portion of her dominions, and provided, also, that encouragement is not afforded to foreigners—more especially to the Greeks—to throw in reinforcements from various parts, and thus to keep alive the spirit of insurrection among her subjects." Her Majesty's Government took early opportunity of joining in the recommendation to the Turkish Government to issue a Commission to act with persons deputed by foreign Powers for the purpose of making inquiry; but they have done so separately from, and not in conjunction with, those other Powers. We are in harmony with their wishes; but we have not felt ourselves bound to press on the Turkish Government that which other Governments have thought it reasonable to urge on them—namely, that this Commission should be issued irrespective of any such condition as that imposed by Turkey, or that during the progress of the insurrection any security should be given by the different Powers that they would discourage it. That is how the matter stands at the present moment. All the Powers of Europe are agreed in urging that Turkey should do justice to her Christian subjects; but they are not all agreed as to the extent and the manner in which they would press their recommendations upon Turkey. This subject has engaged the anxious consideration of the Foreign Office, and the Correspondence with reference to it which has taken place with other Powers has been very voluminous. There is one particular thing in which we have refused to join with other Powers, and which may, at first sight, appear to be an act of humanity—namely, the sending of vessels of war to remove any portion of the Christian population from Crete. Russia and France have felt it to be consistent with their duty to send out their vessels of war for that purpose; although the Turkish Government protested against that proceeding they acquiesced in it, and those vessels have carried away considerable numbers from the island. The case therefore stands in this way—united, as all the Powers are, in the object which they desire to effect—namely, the improvement of the condition of the Christian population subject to Turkey—an object, let me say, which I believe the Sultan and many of his subordinate agents are sincerely desirous of promoting—we have not come to an agreement as to the mode in which, if at all, we should enforce our views upon the Turkish Government. Her Majesty's Government have steadily refused to take any step for forcing their advice upon Turkey. They have given her their advice as a friendly Power. That course we have thought was consistent, not only with our own obligations, but with the best interests of the Ottoman Empire. But if Turkey should not be disposed, under present circumstances, to listen to our arguments and recommendations, we do not feel ourselves in a position to force them upon her. There being, therefore, at present a certain amount of divergence between the views of Her Majesty's Government and those of the other Powers, I think my noble Friend (Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe), with his long experience, will acknowledge that the production of the Correspondence which has taken place with the several Powers—with whom we have not yet come to an agreement as to our course of action, although we may hope that we shall be able to do so in future—would not be likely to serve any useful end, but might prove very mischievous. I can assure my noble Friend that nothing would give me greater pleasure than to have it in my power to produce any information on this subject to your Lordships; and I believe I may express a confident hope that before Parliament re-assembles next Session we shall be able to place before it a full account of the proceedings connected with this Question, and that, too, at a time when Parliament will have an ample opportunity of giving it their best consideration; for your Lordships may rest perfectly satisfied that we have not the slightest desire to conceal any portion of our conduct on this important matter.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE said a few words in reply. He acknowledged the courteous manner in which his noble Friend at the head of Her Majesty's Government had treated his Motion; and he could not but admit the general validity of the reasons alleged by the noble Lord for postponing awhile the communication of any further Correspondence respecting Crete. He relied upon the assurances given by his noble Friend that the Papers in question would be laid upon their Lordships' table before the next Session; and he had heard, with satisfaction, the principal part of what the noble Earl had thought proper to disclose of the opinions entertained and the course of policy pursued by himself and his Colleagues. He (Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe) trusted that the contest in Crete would speedily terminate in some arrangement calculated to secure the tranquillity and equitable administration of that island; and he expressed once more his conviction that, in pressing that object on the Sultan's consideration, Her Majesty's Government might be sure that their advice would carry with it all the weight which the friendly and disinterested policy of England towards Turkey so justly deserved. On these grounds, and only on these grounds, he could see no objection to withdrawing his Motion.

Motion (by Leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

NOTICE WITHDRAWN.

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, who had given notice to call the attention of the House to the state of the Ecclesiastical Courts, said, that his Notice related to the whole subject of these Courts; but the advanced period of the Session rendered it indispensable that he should postpone bringing forward the entire question till next year. He wished, however, to be permitted to quote two or three extracts in order to show that he had not rashly or unadvisedly taken up the subject. He found that Lord Cranworth, when Lord Chancellor, in 1856, described the existing system of the Ecclesiastical Courts as cumbrous, dilatory, and expensive, and cited, as an instance, the case of "Furnell *v.* Craig," which lasted four years, and cost an immense sum. In November, 1866, Dr. Lushington said, "The framer or framers of the Church Discipline Act had not the advantage of knowing the Ecclesiastical Law," and he added, "the confusions introduced by it have no limit." Again, Lord Chancellor Cranworth, in 1856, said of the Chancellors of the Dioceses, "In five cases out of ten the Chancellor or Vicar General is not a properly qualified person for the administration of justice." Many of these opinions were shared by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1853, and were strongly expressed. There were ample funds obtainable from ecclesiastical sources for carrying out any improvement which might be required in the present system. For example, there were the fees derived from marriage licenses, which from the twenty-eight ecclesiastical registries amounted to about £42,000 a year. The average fee of a marriage licence being about £2, and the number being estimated at 21,000 annually, gave a sum of £42,000 a year. This was an amount from which the salaries of a sufficient staff of Judges might be derived to administer the affairs of these Courts to the satisfaction of everyone. He mentioned these facts to show that he had not taken up the matter rashly. He now gave notice that he would next Session call the attention of the House to the state of the Ecclesiastical Courts.

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD said, he should be very glad to have the whole subject to which the noble Earl had referred thoroughly investigated; but reminded him that many of the abuses complained of had already been reformed, one of the principal reforms being the substitution by the new Judge of the Admiralty Court of oral for documentary evidence in certain cases.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, August 15, 1867.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Royal Military Canal * [313].

Committee—Parks Regulation (*re-comm.*) [273] [no *Report*]; Traffic Regulation (Metropolis) * [97]; Royal Military Canal * [313].

Report—Traffic Regulation (Metropolis) * [97]; Royal Military Canal * [313].

Considered as amended—Agricultural Gangs * [310]; Consecration of Churches and Churchyards [276].

Third Reading—Agricultural Gangs * [310]; County Courts Acts Amendment * [212]; Consecration of Churches and Churchyards [276].

Withdrawn—London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance * [43]; Thames Embankment and Metropolis (Loans) * [56]; Representation of the People (Scotland) * [302].

The House met at Two of the Clock.

NAVY—CHIEF ADMIRALTY CHEMIST AT PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD.

QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he could inform the House whether Mr. Hay, the Chief Admiralty Chemist at Portsmouth Dockyard, is the Mr. Hay who is advertised as a Director of the Maritime and General Improvement Company (Limited), 9, Bush Lane, City, E.C., and the proprietor of "Hay's Protecting Varnish, Antifouling Composition, Rodian Paint, &c.," and whose compositions for coating ships have "met with the approval of the Lords of the Admiralty," and are "in general use for iron ships in the Royal Navy;" and, further, are "the standards of comparison for all other compositions;" and, if so, who is the judge of the qualities of the compositions used for coating Her Majesty's Ships?

MR. CORRY, in reply, said, he had given directions that a letter should be written to Mr. Hay inquiring whether he was a director of the company referred to, and informing him that, if so, he would be called upon to choose between the position which he held as Admiralty chemist at Portsmouth and director of the company, as the two were incompatible.

IMPRISONMENT FOR CHURCH RATES.

QUESTION.

MR. ALDERMAN LUSK asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If his attention has been drawn to the case of Mr. Phocion Foster, farmer, of North Currey, a prisoner in Taunton Gaol for non-payment of 15*s.* 7$\frac{3}{4}$*d.* Church Rate, £147 6*s.* 1$\frac{1}{2}$*d.* costs, and £1 15*s.* for a monition—total, £149 16*s.* 9$\frac{1}{4}$*d.*; and to the case of Mr. James Brighton Grant, a prisoner since 15th of March last in White Cross Street Prison for £1 13*s.* Church Rate, and £257 costs, as stated in his Petition to this House on 6th June last; and, whether the Government will adopt measures for the early release of these prisoners?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The attention of Her Majesty's Government has not been drawn to the circumstances of these two cases except by the inquiry of the hon. Gentleman. They have not been brought under the notice either of the Treasury or of the Secretary of State, and therefore I can only say that it appears to me the persons who complain of their grievances have been very ill-advised by their professional assistants.

YELLOW FEVER AT BERMUDA.

QUESTION.

ADMIRAL ERSKINE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether any steps have been taken, in consequence of the Report of a Commission made to the Governor of Bermuda on the subject of the outbreak of yellow fever in that colony in 1864 (and which was laid upon the table of this House in June 1866), to mark the sense of the Government of the neglect therein referred to on the part of some of the authorities, or if any measures have been adopted with a view of mitigating the effects of such a visitation should it unhappily recur?

Mr. ADDERLEY, in reply, said, the Secretary for War had requested him to answer this Question. Two local Reports had been referred to the Army Sanitary Committee, who forwarded their comments on them to the War Office in June last. That Committee stated that the local Government appeared to be taking very active steps for the improvement of the sanitary condition of St. George. Nevertheless, it was evident that a much larger and more systematic plan for the supply of water and the drainage of the town was necessary, and the Army Sanitary Committee accordingly recommended that the first step to accomplish these objects should be a survey of the town. These recommendations of the Committee had been sent to the Governor of Bermuda, with a request that he would take immediate steps to carry them into effect.

EAST INDIA, CHINA, AND AUSTRALIAN MAILS.—QUESTION.

Mr. LAIRD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, before coming to any decision as to accepting Tenders for the conveyance of the East India, China, and Australian Mails, Her Majesty's Government will afford the House an opportunity next Session of giving an opinion on the subject; and, if in consequence of postponing the decision, any temporary arrangement may be requisite for the conveyance of the Mails, whether Her Majesty's Government have made or are prepared to make such arrangement; also, whether the hon. Gentleman knows what is the nature of the arrangement contemplated by the Government with the Messageries Impériales with regard to the conveyance of the China Mails?

Mr. HUNT: With regard to the first Question, I have to state that there is no difficulty at present with regard to the Australian mails, because no notice has been given to terminate that contract. With regard to the East India and China mails, the position of affairs is this—that the present contract, according to notice, will terminate on the 2nd of February next, and the House of Commons will not have, therefore, an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the new contract till after the contract has been made. This result was not foreseen at the time the notice was given; but had it been foreseen, I am not aware that it could have been avoided—for this reason, that before we gave the notice we received a communication from the Peninsular and Oriental Company, that if we did not give them notice they would give us notice. Therefore a new contract was necessary. But in consequence of the expression of opinion on the part of Members of the House that it was very undesirable that the contract should be executed till the House of Commons had expressed an opinion upon it, Her Majesty's Government have been anxious to see whether some temporary arrangement could not be made in order to give the House that opportunity. Accordingly, immediately after the debate in the House, communications were opened with the Peninsular and Oriental Company, inquiring whether they were willing to continue the service for another six months. Only yesterday we received an answer from that Company, in which they expressed their willingness to continue the service for six months, but on such terms as I think the House will consider totally out of the question. They say that if they are to continue the service for six months, they will expect a subsidy of 10*s.* a mile, which would be at the rate of £280,000 a year, in addition to the present subsidy. Her Majesty's Government think the terms are so exorbitant that they are unable to accede to this proposition; but they will continue their efforts to make a temporary arrangement so as to give the House an oportunity for such an expression of opinion as they desire. With regard to the last Question—what was the nature of the arrangement contemplated with regard to the China mails—all that the Government has done in the matter, is to endeavour to carry out the recommendation of the Committee who sat last Session. The Report of that Committee was taken as the text book. With regard to the making use of the French company, they were led to believe that such an arrangement was the wish of the Committee. The terms of the Report and the questions asked of the witnesses all tended to show that it was the wish of the Committee that we should avail ourselves of the

French service to China and Japan. An impression got abroad that it was the desire to hand over the whole of the services to India and China if the French tender was lower than the English. But the Government never contemplated anything of the kind. What they did was this—Having regard to the recommendation of the Committee, the Post Office Department sent the terms to the French Company to allow them to make an offer; and secondly, there had been semi-official communications opened with the French Government on the subject. These communications have not been of a formal or departmental character. We were feeling our way as to whether we could make terms with the French Government on terms of mutual advantage. The fact is, the Messageries Impériales can make no tender without the consent of the French Government, because we require a service to China once in two weeks whereas the French run only once a calendar month. But supposing the French Government permitted the Company to alter the time of departure, it would be possible for them to tender. At present there is a ruinous competition between the English and the French Companies with regard to the China service; and, if both are to be continued for the honour and glory of the respective flags, each country will have to pay for this competition by means of a large subsidy. Her Majesty's Government thought that an amicable arrangement might be made on terms of reciprocity, by which the vessels of each country should convey the mails in alternate fortnights. I believe this would be an arrangement of mutual advantage, and would relieve both nations from the necessity of paying a high subsidy. I still think that such an arrangement may be carried out if the House do not object. I think the arrangement would be far more economical than the present; and I do not think there would be anything unfair to the English Company.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE asked whether the Government had considered the important question which would arise if the contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Company were to cease before other arrangements were entered into.

Mr. AYRTON asked whether the Government had contemplated a failure in their negotiations, and the chance that the Peninsular and Oriental Company would take advantage of the circumstances by asking an exorbitant price; and whether

the Government had thought of availing itself of the transport vessels plying between India and Suez, for the purpose of carrying the mails? His impression was that the arrangement he had suggested would prove the most economical that could possibly be made.

Mr. HUNT said, he would prefer answering that question at another time.

Mr. LAIRD asked, whether the Government would lay before the House the arrangement they proposed to make with a foreign company before it was finally concluded?

Mr. HUNT said, that depended on whether the Government was able to make a temporary arrangement. It would do so if possible, and then Parliament would have an opportunity of considering the basis of the future contract.

Mr. CHILDERS asked whether the Government anticipated making any arrangement with the French company?

Mr. HUNT repeated that the Government wished to have all the different schemes before it, and to consider them on their merits; in asking for tenders the Government had distinctly stated that it could not be bound at present.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION FUNDS.

QUESTION.

Mr. HOWES said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been directed to the state of the Police Superannuation Funds in counties and boroughs; and, whether he intends to bring in a Bill upon the subject next Session?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, in reply, said, he had received Reports from the inspectors on the subject, but thought much more inquiry was necessary, and could not say what course it would be thought necessary to adopt.

SCOTCH JUDICIAL ANNUAL RETURNS.

QUESTION.

Colonel SYKES said, he would beg to ask the hon. Member for Peeblesshire, What progress has been made in adapting the form of the Scotch Judicial Annual Returns to those of England, as promised some Sessions back by the Lord Advocate?

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY, in reply, stated, that no progress had been made in the direction indicated, and was not aware that any promise had been made; but, from a Report of the Crown Agent of Scotland, dated the 24th of July, 1863, he found that two volumes of statistics were in the Home Office, one relating to police and the other to common law and equity. Consideration would be given to the question as to what steps should be taken to secure a compilation of the statistics.

Colonel SYKES said, that at present the Scotch statistics were absolutely useless, from the form in which they were set out.

Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY promised that the matter should be dealt with next Session.

ARMY—LATE INSPECTION OF CHATHAM GARRISON.—QUESTION.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to a published account of an inspection of the Chatham Garrison on the 10th August, by which it appears that the men having been on the ground from eleven o'clock a.m. till after two o'clock in the afternoon, carrying their knapsacks in full marching order, a number of men were compelled to fall out during the inspection in consequence of the intense heat, and were attended by the members of the Medical Staff Corps; and, whether he does not think that means might be found to avoid the exposure of men to the sun, during the hottest part of the day, for the purpose only of a general inspection?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON said, he had some difficulty in answering this Question, because he doubted whether the hon. Member was serious in putting it. From all he had heard of the inspection of the 10th, those engaged in it congratulated themselves on having had a fine day. It was a little warmer than usual, and some of the men were perhaps oppressed by the heat to some extent; but he had heard nothing to lead him to believe that the men had in any way suffered, and it should be remembered that the Commander-in-Chief and the Staff were exposed at least as much, and perhaps to a greater extent, than the men. No doubt there were means of "avoiding the exposure of men to the sun;" but he could hardly imagine that the hon. Gentleman would seriously recommend an umbrella to be included in the equipment of the British soldier, or that soldiers should not be called under arms if it happened to be a little warmer than usual. The only serious Answer he could give to the Question was, that he felt the most perfect confidence that neither the Commander-in-Chief nor any officer would unnecessarily expose his men.

ARMY—VOLUNTEERS' CAPITATION GRANT.—QUESTION.

Mr. SCHREIBER said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether any portion of the Capitation Grant is at present paid to Volunteers on account for the current year; and, if not, whether, in his opinion, it will be practicable for the future to make payable yearly upon the 1st of June a portion of the said Grant, not exceeding one-half of the amount earned by each Corps of Volunteers for the year ending the 30th of November last preceding?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: In answer to the first part of the Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that no part of the capitation grant is now paid during the current year. With reference to the latter part of the Question, I am in hopes that the course he has suggested may be rendered unnecessary by the altered mode of payment which I stated a few evenings ago that I had determined to adopt. There can be no doubt that there has been great and, in some cases, vexatious delay as regards these payments. I heard it suggested in this House that payments have been delayed two years and even longer. By the new mode of payment the efficients who are reported in December will be paid for as soon as the Estimates for the following spring are voted. The utmost delay, therefore, which can take place will be a period of six months.

NAVY—NAVAL ARSENALS AND DOCKYARDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether the experiments to be made as agreed to by him in the recent discussion upon the defences of our Naval Arsenals and Dockyards will be against targets of stone and iron accurately representing the forts now being erected, or which have been contracted for at Portsmouth, Plymouth, Portland, and Pembroke; and, whether he will suspend the further prosecution of the works upon the forts until the result of the proposed experiments shall be ascertained?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: I have already given directions regarding the experiments to which the hon. Member refers. These will be made against forts accurately representing both the iron walls of the fort at Plymouth, and also the shields proposed for the forts in course of erection. The experiments will be made by firing from the heaviest guns now carried by any of our ships of war, and within as short a range as it is probable or possible that ships of war could approach these forts. Under these circumstances, the hon. Gentleman, I think, will admit that the experiments will be fairly made. With respect to the second part of the Question, I have no intention of suspending the works. It would be undesirable to do this, partly because the experiments will be made without any delay, and also because great inconvenience would result from the suspension of the works; while, on the other hand, if the result of the experiments should show that the shields and iron walls are not so strong as they ought to be, there will be no difficulty in so arranging the contracts as to provide for increasing their strength.

Lord ELCHO: If the experiments are to test the iron shields, I should like to ask whether they will be confined to iron shields alone, or whether experiments will be made as if against the section of the fort, in accordance with the suggestion I threw out during the recent debate, otherwise the test would only speak as to the strength of the shield, and would afford no evidence of the capacity of the resistance of the breast-work, girders, pillars, &c., supporting the structure. I should also like to know, whether when the right hon. Gentleman said the trials would be made with the heaviest guns now carried, he mean the heaviest guns in our service only, or intended to include those carried by vessels of other Powers?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: There is no reason to suppose that the vessels of any foreign Power carry guns heavier than our own naval gun of 12½ tons, with which I propose that the experiments should be conducted. The noble Lord is desirous that those experiments should be carried further. He cannot be more anxious than I am to carry them to the full extent, in order that the tests may be as full and fair as possible, and if my noble Friend can offer any suggestions upon this object, I shall be glad to confer with the noble Lord in private.

Colonel SYKES: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman that the granite walls are not to have shields at all?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON: There is no intention of placing iron shields on the surface of granite walls. The shields of which I am speaking, of which so much has been heard during the recent discussions in this House, are shields that fill up the embrasures of the fortifications.

Mr. O'BEIRNE: Will the experiments include a section of the forts built of granite, into which the shields are to be let? Because they would be very unsatisfactory unless some proof was ascertained of the strength of the granite fronts of the fort under fire.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE OF THE ADMIRALTY COURT.—QUESTION.

Mr. GRAVES said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the appointment of Judge of the Admiralty Court will be completed, as much inconvenience is being experienced by the delay?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that in consequence of the Question put by his hon. Friend he had endeavoured to gain information as to how the matter stood. No appointment had yet been made, but he believed the patent was already made out.

NAVY — ADMIRALTY CONTRACTS—MARINE ENGINES.—QUESTION.

Mr. GRAVES said, his right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty had somewhat misconceived the nature of the Question which he put to him on the previous day. He therefore begged to ask, If a pair of engines of about 700-horse power, ordered from Messrs. Napier and Co., about six years since, are still lying in their factory; and, if so, to state what ship they were intended for and why they have not been used; and, whether these engines were not recently offered for resale to Messrs. Napier and Co.; and, if so, to state the price offered by that firm?

Mr. CORRY explained that he had understood the second part of the hon. Member's former Question to hinge on the first portion, to which he had given a negative reply. The engines referred to were ordered in 1860, and were still lying in the factory of the Messrs. Napier; they had been intended for a frigate which, after standing for four years, was taken down in 1864, in consequence of the introduction of armour-plated ships. The reason these engines were not used on board another ship was that they were of old construction, without the modern improvements; and, in the opinion of the Controller of the Navy, it would be impossible to put them into any ship now building, while it would be most unadvisable to build a ship for them. In the course of the present year Messrs. Napier offered £10,000 for the engines; but in the opinion of the Controller of the Navy that sum was insufficient.

Mr. GRAVES asked what price had been paid for these engines?

Mr. CORRY said, the contract price for the engines themselves was £28,880, exclusive of £2,321 for completing and fitting them on board. The former sum was paid, but the latter expense of course had not been incurred.

NAVY—MARINE DEPOT AT DEAL.

QUESTION.

Mr. BRADY said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is in contemplation to augment the force at the Marine Depôt at Deal; and, if so, what amount of cubic space will the Barracks admit of being allotted to each man; whether it is true that the Staff Surgeon of the Royal Navy doing duty with the Marines at Deal has been deprived of the quarters occupied by his predecessors, and is thereby compelled to reside at a considerable distance fom his duties; and, how the gardens belonging to the Royal Marine Buildings are apportioned, and by whom occupied?

Mr. CORRY said, it was not in contemplation to augment the force at the Marine Depôt at Deal. At present the barrack space was 600 cubic feet for each man, which is more than is considered necessary; but, in consequence of the insufficient size of the mess room it had been proposed to enlarge it. It is true that the quarters formerly occupied by a staff surgeon have been assigned to two captains and two subalterns, the reason being that it was considered more conducive to discipline that they should reside within the barracks, and it was not thought necessary that more than one medical officer should do so.

Mr. BRADY said, he was given to understand that the captain in command occupied two houses, and had also portions of two gardens.

Mr. CORRY said, he was not prepared to speak with certainty as to the gardens, but thought there must be some mistake in the allegation.

THE NEW LAW COURTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. CANDLISH said, he would beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether, seeing that the designs selected for recommendation are at variance with the Resolutions of the Royal Commission, and have not met with the approval bestowed upon others by the Judges and Officers of the several Departments, seeing also that the element of cost has been ignored in the selection, the Report of the Judges of Designs having been made before the several estimates had been tested by the Surveyor appointed by the Treasury, whose Report is in favour of the design approved by the Commission, Her Majesty's Government will re-consider the Question, and again consult the Royal Commission before any further step is taken; and, whether the Surveyor's Report of the cost of such plan will be printed, and distributed to Members? He apologized to the House for the somewhat obscure framing of that Question, which had been put into the hands of the Clerk at the Table without the necessary revision. He begged now to put to the noble Lord the First Commissioner of Works the various points involved in that Question in a more direct and intelligible form.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, he hoped the hon. Gentleman would excuse him for not entering into what he might call the controversial part of his Question, which ought, indeed, properly to have been addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, as the Treasury and not the Office of Works was now in communication with the Judges of Designs. He understood the facts to be these—The Judges of Designs had sent in a Report to the Treasury which was not regarded as carrying out fully the duties imposed upon those Judges. That view had been made known by the Treasury to the Judges of Designs, but there had been no time yet for any reply to be returned. Under those circumstances, it was impossible for the Government at present to comply with the suggestions of the hon. Member.

Mr. CANDLISH asked, whether there would be any objection to produce the Surveyor's Report as to the cost of the various designs submitted to him?

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, he thought it would be better not to submit those plans, designs, or reports piecemeal to the House, but that they should be produced, when the proper time came, altogether.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN asked, whether it was true that they were to have plans made up partly out of one design and partly out of another?

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, that was exactly the point touched by the hon. Member's Question.

METROPOLITAN COMMON FUND.
QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to introduce a measure in the next Session of Parliament to compel those metropolitan parishes not included in the Union Assessment Act to re-assess the property in their areas in order that the rates payable to the Common Fund may be levied throughout the Metropolis on a fair and equal basis?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that inquiries were now being made by the Poor Law Board for the purpose of ascertaining on what basis contributions to the Common Fund could be most fairly levied. It was probable that the Government would find it necessary to produce a measure on the subject in the course of the next Session.

PARKS REGULATION (*re-committed*) BILL
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Mr. Attorney General.*)
[BILL 273.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Bill again *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DENMAN: Sir, it is with the greatest reluctance that I rise to repeat the Motion which was made yesterday, that you do now leave the Chair. If there were any other mode in which I could, according to Parliamentary usage, express my conviction that the Bill ought not to be proceeded with at this period of the Session, I would have adopted it; but I am assured that I cannot now move the Previous Question, and that this is the only course open to me. I must express my disappointment that the Government have not withdrawn this Bill in deference to what I believe is the general feeling. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] At all events, it is the feeling of a considerable section of the House, and of multitudes out-of-doors. I will endeavour so to deal with the two questions involved as to convince even my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary that this is a question which ought not to be pressed on at the fag-end of the Session against the opinion even of the minority of the House. First, with regard to the question itself, there are some points about which we are all agreed, or, at least, about which there can be very little controversy among persons of candid minds. It is undoubtedly a question of the utmost delicacy and importance. After giving the Government credit, as I do, for having made every effort to conciliate their opponents by removing some of the most unpalatable portions of the Bill, the fact remains that the widest differences of opinion still exist as to the first principles by which we should be guided on a very nice and difficult question. I cannot at all assent to the opinion of those who maintain that the right of public meeting is not, to a great extent, involved in the course we may take upon this Bill. It is all very well to say that there is a legal right to meet, which this Bill does not touch; but, if the Bill restricts that right in every place in which the right can practically be exercised, it would be unfair to deny that it does, so far as London is concerned, affect the right of public meeting. My right hon. Friend spoke of the practice of meeting in Hyde Park as one of modern origin, placing it as late as the year 1855. But Hyde Park was, more than a century ago, and until a comparatively recent period, used by the public for many purposes for which of late it has not been used. I have myself seen in old newspapers many advertisements showing that fairs, cricket-matches, boxing-matches, and other amusements used to be freely carried on there. If it is only since 1855 that Hyde Park has been much resorted to for public meetings, that fact may be partly accounted for by the inclosure of many other spaces for gardens, such as Kennington Common, and other like spaces, and the extension of building in all directions, which has left no other convenient open place for holding a large meeting. It is nothing to the purpose to say that Primrose Hill is a convenient place; because I believe there is the same power in the authorities who have the management of Primrose Hill to exclude the public as exists in the case of the Parks enumerated in this Bill. Therefore, I do consider—and I do not believe that it can be denied—that, so far as the metropolis is concerned, the right of public meeting may be seriously affected by this Bill. Now, I am one of those who hold that right to be one of almost sacred importance, and that for three main reasons—firstly, because we cannot always be secure against the renewal of attempts, such as once were common, to force unjust and tyrannical measures upon the people, and in such cases large public meetings are the best modes of expressing public indignation, and thus preventing arbitrary and oppressive legislation; secondly, because there are occasions on which the feelings of some large class of the community are entirely misunderstood and misrepresented; and it is then of the utmost importance that that class should have the opportunity of assembling in such numbers as to disabuse the mind of the richer and more influential classes of the erroneous notion as to their feelings which has been in circulation. A notable instance of this took place last year. No one of the Gentlemen I see opposite, if he will deal candidly with me, will deny that one of the main arguments used against Reform last year was that the unenfranchised classes were almost entirely indifferent about the extension of the franchise. None will deny that the meetings which have since taken place have gone a long way to convince many of them to the contrary. But beyond all this, comes a third and a very powerful reason. These meetings of large masses of people act powerfully as safety-valves, and give an opportunity of "blowing off the steam" which, if pent up in rooms and dwellings, would be far more liable to dangerous explosion. On a late occasion, when some 23,000 people marched to a place not half so convenient as Hyde Park, to show their interest in Reform, I noticed that many of their banners were inscribed with jokes of an amusing kind. One of them, the banner of the Cabinet-makers, ran—"The people are resolved to be their own Cabinet-makers." How much better that such a sentiment should appear as a joke upon a banner than that there should be no public opportunity of giving it vent. It was surely wiser to let the matter pass off in such a way, than if that whole multitude had been confined to warehouses and workshops, and told that they would be violating the law if they held a meeting in the open air. If the people had not been shut out of Hyde Park last year, I am convinced that no need would have arisen to be now seriously considering this difficult question. But when the gates were so ill-advisedly closed, and the irruption followed, the question was at once unfortunately and unnecessarily raised as to the right of the public to be there at all. Now, Sir, I have appealed to the candour of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and in discussing the question of right, I will myself speak with equal candour. Any lawyer, I will admit, would be departing gravely from his duty if he expressed any doubt that, so far as strict law is concerned, Hyde Park is vested in Her Majesty, and that persons duly authorized by Her Majesty may close that Park when they please. But, on the other hand, no one can fairly deny that there are some equitable, or, at least, moral rights, on the part of the people which practically render it wholly impossible to deal with Hyde Park precisely in the same way as though it were the private garden of Buckingham Palace, or any other portion of the private property of Her Majesty. Suppose it were not the property of the Sovereign but of some private person, it has been so dealt with, in many respects, that a dedication to the public would be presumed. Roads and paths have been opened and used in all directions, and repaired at the public expense. Enormous sums of the public money have been laid out on improving Hyde Park. Hence Parliament is bound to look at this question as one in which the public has an interest, even independent of the right of public meeting. Such being the nature of the questions involved in this Bill, I will now state my reasons for urgently appealing to Her Majesty's Government not to press on this Bill during the short residue of the present Session. I have already shown that the questions involved are of a difficult, delicate, and complicated nature. On the one hand, the practical right of holding public meetings in the metropolis; on the other hand, the relative rights, legal, equitable, and moral, of the Crown and the people. I cannot conceive matters more fit for a calm and deliberate inquiry before an impartial Committee, or more unfit for a hasty and hurried decision in a thin House by a party vote. It is notorious that at this period of the Session the Government can carry any measure on which they may set their heart; swamping all opposition by a majority composed mainly of themselves. Only two nights ago they carried the rejection of a Lords' Amendment, approved of by everybody who knew anything of the subject, and supported by their own Chancellor in the Lords, at the instance of the Attorney General for Ireland. Their majority consisted of 33, the minority of 25; but when I counted the division list, I found that twenty votes out of those thirty-three were the votes of actual members of the Government. Who, then, would be satisfied with this Bill if it were to be forced down our throats by the Government at this period of the Session, merely by means of the majority at their back? But it is said, "The Bill is much less stringent than it was," and "We are prepared to concede one thing and another." Sir, I recognize in the Government a spirit of conciliation as regards the matter of the Bill; but the questions are too important and too delicate to be settled by a compromise of the Government on the one part and a mere handful of Members on the other. If this Bill had been brought forward quite early in the Session, with no Reform Bill in the way, would anyone have ever thought of proceeding with it after twelve o'clock at night? Certainly not; and why? Because at that hour the number of Members present would not have been sufficient for the discussion of a subject of such importance. Why, then, should we be forced to go on with the Bill now, when at no time is there an attendance equal to that which at an earlier period of the Session is deemed wholly insufficient? Besides all this, the Bill in its present shape, even without the Amendments now — as I understand—to be proposed, is a totally different Bill from that originally laid before the House. Had the House proceeded with this Bill earlier in the Session, can any human being doubt that, as a matter of course, it would have been referred to a Select Committ e But what time is there for a Select Committee now to consider this Bill? Again, suppose that we should, in the course of the next day or two, send the Bill to the House of Lords, what possible opportunity will the House of Lords have to consider the various questions arising for their consideration? It would be a simple mockery to ask them to do so in the time allotted for the task. Then, as to the Bill itself, I have before me the first and the second edition, but as to the third, of which I hear, it is even yet not in print. From what I hear of the proposed alterations in the clauses, they would by no means remove my main objection to the Bill. The Bill gives powers, the extent and nature of which are entirely unlimited and undefined. By passing this Bill, Parliament would not have the slightest notion what it would be doing. It contains, in effect, a power to the ranger of the Park, with the assent of the Home Secretary, to make by-laws, the nature and extent of which it is impossible to guess. One ranger and one Home Secretary might be easily influenced by panic, and make by-laws so stringent, that under them no meeting, however unobjectionable, could take place; while another ranger and Home Secretary might so legislate as to leave matters precisely as they are. Parliament ought not to give powers so vague and general as not to know the effect of what it is enacting. It ought not rashly and recklessly to pass an Act which may either have a very violent effect or no effect at all. Many of the persons best qualified to advise Parliament on such a subject are now absent. It is said that this Bill ought to be passed as a proof that the House is determined to maintain its own honour and dignity; and that we are bound to support the Government on this occasion because, forsooth, certain persons out-of-doors wish us to reject it, and talk of holding certain meetings and making violent speeches against it. This I understand to be the argument of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire; but such an argument appears to me to be simply babyish. Are we hastily to legislate in a rash and reckless way on a matter of great difficulty, merely because some persons out-of-doors wish us to do something different? I cannot understand arguments such as these, which, so far from maintaining, seem to me to be playing and paltering with the honour and dignity of this House. Not that we are, any of us, insensible to an individual feeling of indignation, when persons out of the House take upon themselves to attempt to exert a personal pressure upon Members in regard to any measure. Only yesterday, when a gentleman connected with the Reform League met me in the Lobby, and began to talk about this Bill, and the duty of Liberal Members to oppose it, I said to him, "Sir, if you want me to hold my tongue from speaking against this Bill, you can't do better than by canvassing me in the Lobby." But though this is a natural feeling, I hold it to be merely childish by way of an argument to tell hon. Members that they can maintain the honour and dignity of the House by voting on any such principle, however natural the feeling may be, for no feeling of the kind can absolve us from our solemn duty to judge of all matters before us, according to their merits. Another argument used in support of the Bill is that in other Parks, at Liverpool, Derby, and elsewhere, rules have been made entirely preventing public meetings; but in those places there is no difficulty in finding open spaces in or near the town in which public meetings can be held, so that the main question does not arise. Lastly, we have been told that we ought to support the Government in their determination to pass this Bill, because the subject with which it deals is a *damnosa hæreditas* left to them by their predecessors. Sir, I did not altogether approve of the mode in which the late Government dealt with this question of the Parks, and I admit that it has increased the difficulties of the question; but surely that can be no reason for assisting the present Government to hurry on a crude and imperfect measure in a comparatively empty House. For these and other reasons, having a very strong conviction that it is inexpedient now to proceed with this measure, and having no other mode of expressing that conviction, I move, Mr. Dodson, that you do now leave the Chair.

Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Denman.*)

MR. GILPIN said, he did not take any part in the discussion upon the Bill the other day, as he disapproved of the tactics of Friends near him in attempting to "talk out" the question — although he felt as strongly as any of them that it was undesirable to press the Bill at so late a period of the Session. He now earnestly appealed to the Government to postpone the Bill until another Session, by which time it would have been fully considered by their Legal Advisers, and be adopted probably by a large majority of the entire House. If a division took place now, the Government would doubtless have a majority, but it would be no test of the opinion of the British House of Commons. Such would not be the light in which the people out of doors would view the decision. If the Bill were carried in its present shape this Session, there could be little doubt that next Session, or the first new Parliament, would be called upon to alter or repeal it. If the Government liked, let them take a division, and doubtless they had a majority at their back. But when they had taken their division, he appealed to them not to proceed further with the Bill. Let them act graciously and withdraw it. If passed it would have the appearance of being a censure upon the important subject which had called the great masses of the people together in Hyde Park — namely, Parliamentary Reform. Admitting that it was absolutely necessary to meet within doors for the purposes of discussion, large out-door meetings had their uses. In his opinion, hon. Gentlemen opposite were greatly assisted by the meetings which were held in Hyde Park — and it would be ingratitude on their part to attempt to put them down. He had heard of "operative Conservatives"—from whom the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had received deputations — though he scarcely knew to what class of animals they belonged. It was said that the people were not anxious for Reform, and that they did not care about it. The answer to that allegation came trumpet-tongued from Hyde Park, and then hon. Gentlemen opposite were converted, but not before. They were asked to legislate in a hasty manner. When hon. Members were nearly worn out by the fatigues of the Session, sitting morning and evening, a Bill involving a great constitutional principle was pressed upon them. Out of doors the people regarded this question as one affecting the Constitution, and it ought not to be forced on at this late period of the Session. If the Government would listen to his appeal, and postpone the Bill, they would probably come to the conclusion next Session that the best thing to do would be to set apart several acres in Hyde Park for the purposes of public meeting, so as not to interfere with the other portions of the Park. Then they might make such gatherings in all other portions of the Park as illegal as they pleased, with the certainty of carrying their Bill with the hearty consent of both sides of the House; and that Bench (the front Opposition Bench) would then be represented as well as the Treasury Bench.

Their Bill would then be carried with the approbation of the country; and the people, recognizing the justice of their intentions, would yield willing obedience.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just addressed the House, that that was a constitutional question. For that reason, he was anxious that the House should, for the purpose of assuring the freedom of the deliberations of Parliament, take the same security which the Congress of the United States had long since taken for insuring the independence of its Capitol. It was unbecoming in a Member of that House to boast that the House, in dealing with a great constitutional question, had acted under the influence of intimidation from without. [MR. GILPIN said he had not used any such language.] He was glad to find the hon. Gentleman disclaimed the intentional employment of such language. He had certainly heard more than once statements made in the House, which seemed to him fairly to bear that interpretation. He earnestly desired to save Parliament from the indignity of even appearing to be dictated to by local mobs. As the representative of a Midland constituency, and in their name, he respectfully stated that the House ought to guard their deliberations from all chance or apprehension of violent external interruption. The House of Commons ought to guard itself against the imputation of being intimidated by local mobs, by extending the limit of one mile from the Houses of Parliament and the present Courts of Law, within which, by the existing Act of Parliament, it was illegal to hold any public meeting during the Session. They had secured to the people of this country a full representation in that House, and they were bound to provide for the perfect exercise of the new system they had established by not allowing themselves to be subjected even to the imputation of acting under local dictatation. He understood it was the intention of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department so to limit the operation of the Bill that it would merely provide for the Royal Parks the same power of regulation which existed in the case of every other park. He considered this only an instalment of that which the occasion required. It would certainly be unreasonable to refuse to the Crown the same rights which were granted to the holders of every other property of the same description.

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, he should vote against the Motion that the Chairman leave the Chair if it was pressed, because he believed that such a Motion was a most improper mode of dealing with a question which should be disposed of by the Aye or No of the House. He did not approve the Bill, however. He desired to see a measure passed for regulating the Parks, but did not think this fitted for the purpose. A late Home Secretary had declared it to be indispensable before a capital sentence was carried into effect, not only for the law to have been strictly carried out, but that the public should believe that such was the case. He felt that some regulations ought to be adopted with regard to the Parks, and he had come up from the country that morning for the purpose of supporting the Government. But it appeared that the regulations proposed were not considered satisfactory, and the question was one that ought not to be dealt with in a thin and one-sided Parliament. He admitted that the right to use the Parks did not give a right to abuse the Parks, and public meetings ought not to take place in them to the injury and annoyance of the rest of London. Nevertheless, the right of public meeting, which was believed to be bound up in this question, ought to be preserved. The Government had acted conscientiously. They had modified the Bill with a view of rendering it acceptable to the House, but, as it was not satisfactory, they would act wisely in carrying the measure no further this Session. If it were then carried it would be carried by a majority consisting almost exclusively of Members sitting upon one side of the House; and such a decision would not meet with the respect and approval of the country.

MR. LIDDELL said, he should take the rather unusual course of abstaining from voting upon the Bill. He regretted that the regular and constitutional course was not adopted of moving the Previous Question, thus declaring that the time of bringing forward the question was inopportune, but it was now too late so to dispose of the Bill. He would act in the way he had mentioned from no fear of exciting agitation out of doors, but because he thought it would be wiser and more politic to allow the question to rest for another Session. He had differed from the Government in their policy on the Parks, thinking that it was at one time pusillanimous, and at another ill-considered. The whole question was so intricate that the precise legal position of it was ill-understood by those who ought to understand it well. That fact alone was enough to settle the Bill. Some regulation for the Parks was absolutely required, but it would be wiser to put off any measure on the subject until agitation out of doors had calmed down, and until the whole question had been inquired into by a Select Committee.

SIR COLMAN O'LOGHLEN said, that believing some legislation was necessary, he had heretofore taken no part in the discussions. But believing also the present time inopportune, he should now support the Amendment. As regarded the complaints made that hon. Members on the Liberal side had prolonged the discussions, though on ordinary occasions such a course should not be pursued, the conduct of the Government on the present occasion had afforded a justification of the course of the Liberal party. The Home Secretary had announced that he was prepared to make in Committee a serious alteration in the Bill. But even in its modified form it was most objectionable to press it forward, and it was much to be regretted that the result of the deliberations of the Cabinet had not been to withdraw the Bill for the present Session. A Bill might be a good Bill, and yet be brought forward at a most inopportune time, as was seen in the case of the Conspiracy Bill, which caused the overthrow of Lord Palmerston's Government, and yet two years afterwards was passed unanimously. The present moment was inopportune for bringing forward the Parks Regulation Bill. Out of doors it was considered that the Bill was an interference with the right of public meeting, no matter what the Government in this House might say to the contrary. Demonstrations were necessary to indicate what was the popular opinion on any subject affecting the interests of the people, and if these were to be prohibited in Hyde Park, there was no other place in the Metropolis where such out-door gatherings could take place. Pressing forward this Bill at so late a period of the Session was regarded by many as an act of vengeance on the part of the Government, who were seeking to recover the honour which they had lost in connection with the Hyde Park meetings. It was said that the Reform Bill was brought forward for the purpose of "dishing" the Whigs, and in like manner it was affirmed by not a few that this Bill had been introduced for the purpose of "dishing" Beales. He would support the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Tiverton.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the speeches which had been made that day were made in a different tone and, apparently, with a different object from those delivered on Tuesday, and he trusted he should treat them with all due respect; but he could not help saying that the Bill had not received the treatment to which it was entitled. He was told that this was a totally different measure from the Parks Regulation Bill originally introduced by the Government. In the first part it was different, but in the other parts it was the same. The new portion was the part relating to misdemeanour. But the regulations part was the same as that in the Bill introduced by his right hon. Friend. The Bill now under discussion was read a second time when the House was comparatively full, and when the Leader of the Opposition was present. Subsequently when his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke) moved that it was inexpedient to proceed with the Bill, that Motion was rejected by a large majority. The House had decided, therefore, first, that the Bill was a desirable one; and, secondly, that the present was an expedient time for going on with it. In Committee a Motion was made that Mr. Dodson leave the Chair. That was withdrawn on the first occasion. Afterwards when the Bill was in progress, the Motion for reporting Progress was renewed, and the Bill was opposed, without any of its opponents saying what he would suggest. From the beginning of the discussion he had not heard any Member who opposed the Bill say what he would agree to. Not a single hint was thrown out by any speaker as to what kind of regulations he would agree to have incorporated in the Bill. They merely said that they objected to what was in the measure; but no one condescended to specify what portions of the regulations he would agree to. The only Amendment placed on the Paper was one to prevent Her Majesty from exercising her Prerogative of having her soldiers reviewed in one of the Royal demesnes. The Law Officers were of opinion that undoubtedly that was a Prerogative of the Crown. With respect to the observation of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Denman) and other hon. Gentlemen, that Primrose Hill was in just the same category with Hyde Park, this was a mistake. Primrose Hill had been purchased with the public money, on the proposal of Mr. Joseph Hume.

Mr. DENMAN said, that he had not stated what the right hon. Gentleman supposed. He had said that the Crown, or some other authority, must have an equal right to exclude the public in respect of Primrose Hill, to the right claimed for the Crown in respect of Hyde Park.

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he had been most anxious to conciliate hon. Gentlemen opposite, and get rid of what to some persons might appear to be a ground of objection to the Bill. His hon. and learned Friend said this was a Bill to give to the ranger the power to make by-laws. He (Mr. G. Hardy) entirely repudiated such a construction being placed upon the measure. The ranger already had power to make such laws, but he had not the power of enforcing them by penalties. What the Bill proposed was to give the ranger power to enforce the regulations in the same way as was done in connection with the metropolitan parks. It had been contended that in bringing forward this measure the Government were seeking to enforce exceptional legislation. This was not the case. The town of Liverpool possessed three parks, and another was in course of construction. The corporation of that town had unanimously resolved that no preaching or lecturing should be permitted within them, or that any political or religious demonstrations should be allowed within the inclosure. He could not, therefore, see what was exceptional in the present Bill. If hon. Members determined to defeat the measure by delay and talking it out, he could not conceal from himself that at this late period of the Session they had the power of doing so. But he called upon the House to tell him what mode of procedure they intend to adopt in resisting the Bill before he would state how he would proceed with it. He trusted that the Committee would reject the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he wished to call the attention of the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) to the fact that on the 22nd of July, when the House divided on the second reading, there were 181 for and 64 against the Bill. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Morpeth (Sir George Grey) voted in the majority, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Lancashire (Mr. Gladstone) declined to vote. The moral effect of that division was overpowering.

Mr. CRAWFORD said, he intended to vote for the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Tiverton because he entirely objected to the principle of the Bill. He did not believe that it was the duty of those who were averse, as he was, to the principle of the measure, to propose any Amendments. It was for the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department to state the modifications he was prepared to propose.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, he should be glad to know if hon. Members opposite intended to try and talk this Bill out, a mode of dealing with it which might be easy enough at this period of the Session. If that were so, it was not a fair, straightforward, or proper way of dealing with a measure like the present.

Mr. Denman and Lord Elcho explained.

Mr. WHALLEY said, that so far as he, personally, was concerned he should, whilst his strength lasted, do all he could to talk out the Bill, relieved occasionally by others, so as to obtain time for the renewal of his strength. If the Bill, as modified, were accepted, the odium of excluding the people from the Park would not be thrown upon the House of Commons or the Government, but upon Her Majesty, or her nominee the ranger. He contended that the Bill now before the House never practically passed the second reading.

Mr. WATKIN said, he should vote against the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Tiverton (Mr. Denman), but he still hoped that among moderate men some compromise might be arrived at on the question. The Government in their first Bill said that no meeting of a political character should be held in the Parks without the consent of Her Majesty. That Bill was read a second time, and it recognized the principle of public meeting in the Parks by leave of Her Majesty. The metropolitan Members, no doubt, were under some pressure as regarded this Bill, but he and others who were not under any pressure of that kind, did not want the Parks to be turned into great meeting places. They were especially desirous that no meetings whatever should take place there on Sundays. But inasmuch as the Parks were the only places in which great open-air gatherings on important subjects could be held, they thought that some portion of Hyde Park should be set aside for that purpose. To prevent this privilege being abused they were willing that the Home Secretary should have power to prohibit such gatherings as were likely to disturb public order. The question was, whether the Government, after having consented to leave out the first clause, and to give to the Home Secretary, instead of to the ranger, the power of preparing and carrying out the necessary regulation, would agree to the further concession that some portion of Hyde Park should be set aside for public meetings. He did not think the course taken by the hon. and learned Member for Tiverton was a fair way of dealing with the question; but any measure which they might pass upon this subject should be of such a character as to meet the views of Members of moderate opinions on both sides of the House, and to provoke no hostility out of doors.

Mr. O'BEIRNE said, he had no desire to see the peace of the West End of London interfered with in any way. He should, however, vote with the hon. and learned Member for Tiverton if he went to a division, because he felt that it was very inconvenient, and he might say dangerous, to attempt to legislate upon a question which in any way interfered with the rights of any class at this period. It was highly inexpedient to interfere with or touch those rights within four or five days of the end of the Session. He had heard with great disappointment the observations of the Home Secretary in reply to the remarks of the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Whalley) and the hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr Liddell). He did hope that the remarks of those hon. Gentlemen, couched as they were in such moderate and earnest terms, would have met with a much better reception at the hands of the right hon. Gentleman, and that he would have yielded to the views so strongly impressed upon him by both sides of the House. If Her Majesty's Government would bring this matter forward next Session, they would find a ready desire to support any measure for the preservation of public order, without interfering with the rights of the labouring classes of the metropolis. There was no analogy whatever between Hyde Park and the Liverpool Park. The right of meeting in Hyde Park for social and political purposes had existed for 300 years with modifications. Even races had taken place there. The origin of this Bill, was that at the end of last Session a disorderly meeting was held in the Park. He believed that the meetings which were held during the present Session would not have induced the Government to propose any such measure. Any meetings which took place within the boundaries of London was certain to be followed by a large Bohemian class, such as was not to be found in any other city. It was the duty of the authorities to take earnest and determined means to preserve the peace; but legislation of this kind was not the proper course. There was no attempt to interfere with the people, and in consequence no breach of the peace occurred, as the people themselves were determined to resist the Bohemian class—the "roughs." He had heard of no inconvenience arising from those meetings, nor did he see any complaints in the press as to the consequences of them. He was not aware that a single Petition from the West End of London in favour of this Bill had been laid on the table. [Mr. Gathorne Hardy: I presented two very numerously signed myself.] Two Petitions from London scarcely offered very strong evidence in favour of the Bill. If the question were postponed it would obtain a fuller and more satisfactory solution. Endowed parks were subject to such rules as the donors desired to fix; but in the case of Hyde Park, time and usage had conferred rights which this Bill sought to take away. He would earnestly ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department to re-consider this question, and at the end of the Session not to persist with a measure which would produce a feeling out of doors which he was satisfied would be a matter of deep regret hereafter.

Mr. Alderman LUSK said, he gave the Government credit for the best motives in pressing the Bill forward; but one party must give way, and it would be more dignified for the majority to yield.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR said, he had no intention to delay the House with any lengthened observations; but he wished to say a word with respect to a letter, signed "A Man in the Streets," which the noble Lord the Member for Haddington (Lord Elcho) had read in the *Morning*

Star. It would appear from the observations of the noble Lord that he supposed he (Mr. Taylor) was the author of that letter, but he begged to assure him that he had not written, nor had he even read, the letter. There was another matter with respect to the noble Lord which he wished to allude to. He had said, merely on the strength of a rumour, that the noble Lord wished for, or spoke of, the employment of the Volunteers to keep the people out of Hyde Park. To that statement the noble Lord gave a very emphatic denial, stating that his opinions were quite the reverse of what they had been represented to be. For the statement he had made, therefore, he (Mr. Taylor) begged to apologize to the noble Lord. He could not exactly regret that he did mention the matter because, being an earnest friend of the Volunteer corps, he was glad, for the sake of the corps, with which the noble Lord was so honourably associated, that the public denial had been given. He had endeavoured to maintain the argument that there was an ancient, constitutional, and century-hallowed principle of the right of the people to meet. To that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary said that it was perfectly impossible to prove that there was any such right of the public to meet in Hyde Park, and he defied him (Mr. Taylor) to show that up to fifteen years ago there had been any attempt at all to meet in the Park. That was no answer to his argument. What he said was, that there existed a constitutional right of the people to meet in any convenient and public place. He did not say there was any particular right to meet in Hyde Park or any other place. Sixty years ago Hyde Park was outside London, and as much out of place as Battersea Park now was. The hon. Member for Honiton (Mr. Baillie Cochrane) had said that the course taken in opposition to the Bill was unjustifiable. He took issue with the hon. Member on that. The course taken was not unjustifiable. If the Government brought the Bill through the House they would do it by the most unfair coercion to that side of the House on which he sat. If the Government had a majority on the Bill it would be a majority of mere officials. Is was a justification for using all the forms of the House to defeat the measure, that although he and his friends were a minority in the House, they really represented the great community out of doors. He had had the curiosity to take the fourteen Members who spoke against the Bill on Tuesday, and he placed opposite their names the population in 1861 of the places they represented. [*Laughter.*] He was quite aware that hon. Gentlemen opposite paid no attention to large constituencies. The fourteen Members represented a total population of about 2,000,000, of which the registered electors were 130,000. That was to say, they each represented an average population of 153,000, and an average of electors of between 9,000 and 10,000. [Major Anson: But have the minorities been deducted from those numbers?] They have not. On the ground that they stood there supported by a large mass of public opinion, he renewed his appeal to the Government. To strengthen it he would say that there was really no practical necessity to pass this measure, that it was likely to produce bad blood in the country, and that there was no practical difficulty in coming to a satisfactory arrangement at a future time. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and all the more moderate men who sat opposite had acknowledged that the people had a constitutional right to hold meetings, and many of them admitted that as a safety valve that right was necessary. No man among his friends on that (the Opposition) side of the House, and no member of the Reform League, ever denied that regulations were essential, not only for the interests of the people, but for those of the Government. They always deprecated the idea of public meetings degenerating into tumultuous assemblies. Nothing but a firmness, which he did not hesitate to call obstinacy, could make the Government persevere with this measure.

Mr. DENMAN said, the suggestion of the hon. Member for Stockport (Mr. Watkin) was well worthy the attention of a Select Committee, but not one for settlement across the table. Besides, the Government had not given any intimation that they would accede to the proposal to set apart a portion of the Park for public meetings. He must, therefore, press his Motion to a division.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 31; Noes 86; Majority 55.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE said, that after the satisfactory decision which had just taken place, and considering the speeches which had been delivered by the hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr.

Whalley) and another hon. Member (Mr. Taylor), who stated that they intended to oppose every possible obstacle to the further progress of the measure, considering also the advanced period of the Session and the impossibility of carrying any such measure this year, it would, in his opinion, be wise for the Government to withdraw the bill. The principle of the Bill had been already accepted. That fact would, he hoped, influence those who might otherwise have attempted to promote any demonstration. Knowing the firmness of the hon. Member for Peterborough, he ventured most humbly to suggest to Her Majesty's Government that they would consult the best interests of this question by dropping the measure until next Session.

MR. H. B. SHERIDAN said, he was not in favour of great meetings being held in the Royal Parks. Indeed, he looked with disfavour on any street demonstrations at all, as having a character of intimidation and menace rather than as being fit occasions for discussion and comment. At a former discussion on this Bill, it was suggested that if you excluded the public from those parks you virtually took away from them the constitutional privileges they enjoyed, because it would not be convenient to the great middle classes of this city to hold a large public meeting in any other place than Hyde Park. They knew, from the accounts in the newspapers, that the numbers attending the meetings in the Park were absolutely insignificant in comparison with its extent, and interfered hardly at all with the comfort or enjoyment of visitors. Government had done so much to satisfy the political requirements and wishes of the people that it was to be regretted they should now insist upon proceeding with a Bill that was directly aimed at the liberties of the people. It would be a far wiser course now to withdraw it, and to bring it forward next Session, when they could calmly consider what were the questions involved. It seemed like a note of defiance, sounded at a time when all was calm, tranquil, and contented out of doors, and when they had done much to satisfy the people. The public believed, rightly or wrongly, that they were lessees of the Parks, and that they had a right to the Parks. They paid a large annual revenue for the use of them. No one could dispute the right to re-consider the privileges and powers of the Crown in reference to the parks. Had those powers been clearly stated there would have been no occasion for legislation; but, as they were doubted, it was not in accordance with the spirit which ought to guide Englishmen in their deliberations to shut out discussion. It must be recollected that these Parks were swamps when the contracts subsisting were made in regard to them. They were reclaimed at the public cost, and £25,000 a year of the public money had been subsequently spent in adorning them. The reviews of the Household troops which occasionally took place in them were far more injurious than any public meetings. He recollected reading in a novel of Mrs. Gore how lamentable it was to see the Park turned into a scorched and blasted heath from being trampled down by the feet of the soldiery. He had reason to believe that the Government and the police were really favourable to street demonstrations, for on the 9th November last he had been requested to get out of his carriage at the end of the Strand on an occasion of the Lord Mayor's show. He could not help thinking that a meeting on a subject of Imperial interest was of greater importance than a street procession occasioned by the fact of the magistrates of the City having chosen their Chairman, and going to Westminster to get him approved by the Judges. The object they were now contending for was to have this important question considered calmly and in a manner accordant with the interests of the whole community. He begged to move that the Chairman report Progress.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY: The course taken by the hon. Member for Dudley places me in a position of difficulty. If I continue to withstand the opposition to the Bill, I shall be dealing with extreme harshness by my Friends who have supported it hitherto, and it will become practically impossible for the House of Lords to pass the Bill without adopting an unusual course consequent on the delay caused by hon. Members opposite. I wish to stand clear in this matter. I have been perfectly earnest in my intention to pass the Bill. I do not yield to threats, whether uttered out of doors or expressed in letters written to myself. I am prepared to justify the course I have taken in respect to the Bill, in which course I was backed by the House on the second reading. I have been supported by the House in reference to the provisions in this Bill, and not merely as has been said in reference to provisions contained in a former Bill. I have looked back to the former Bill, and I find in it the provisions with respect to unlawful assemblies which now appear on the face of this Bill. I find also that the regulations contained in it, though varied in form, are proposed for adoption by the present Bill. Again, the way in which I proposed to proceed with the Bill has been sanctioned by the House. To-day, in a division, carried, not by official Members, but by a considerable majority exclusive of official Members, the Bill has been again supported, and the feeling of the House again shown in its favour. At the same time, from the language of the hon. Member for Dudley (Mr. Sheridan) and the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Taylor), it is quite plain that they will pursue their opposition to the Bill. The hon. Member for Dudley also—and let me say it with great respect, he can speak very much better when the object which he has in view is different—by his frequent glances at the clock, enabled me to judge what was passing in his mind. I know, therefore, that I cannot get the Bill through Committee under the circumstances. Accordingly, yielding—must I say—to the obstinate minority who will not allow me to go on in the ordinary course, I must beg to move, Mr. Dodson, that you do leave the Chair.

Mr. DENMAN said, he must disclaim the supposition of having been actuated by any factious motives.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN said, that the handsome manner in which the right hon. Gentleman had given up the Bill would be appreciated by the House and the country.

Motion *negatived.*

House *resumed.*

[No Report.]

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS AND ST. EDMUND'S, DUDLEY.

QUESTION.

Mr. H. B. SHERIDAN asked the Judge Advocate, If it is true that the Rev. John Davies, incumbent of St. Edmund's, Dudley, is in the receipt of £26 per annum only from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, when all other district clergy had their incomes made up to £300 a year, he having a population exceeding

5,000 souls; and, if so, on what grounds the customary emoluments are denied to him which are given under like circumstances to all others of the district clergy?

Mr. MOWBRAY: In 1864 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in their Report presented to Parliament, said they trusted that within a period of five years they would be able to raise to £300 a year the income of every benefice in public patronage which then existed, and had, according to the Census of 1861, a population of 4,000 persons. In 1861 the population of the district of St. Edmund's was 3,213. It is true that an addition has since been made to the district of St. Edmund's, and the population of that district, with the addition, now exceeds 5,000; but that addition was not made until February, 1866; consequently, by the existing regulations, the incumbent of St. Edmund's is not entitled to an augmentation of income. All the financial calculations of the Commissioners have been based upon the observance of these regulations for the five years. These five years will expire in 1869, and it will then be open to the Commissioners, if their funds admit of it, to re-consider the case of St. Edmund's district with reference to its population.

CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES AND CHURCHYARDS BILL—(*Lords.*)

[BILL 276.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. GILPIN moved the insertion of the following new clause:—

> "When any land is added to an existing Churchyard, a portion of such land shall be allotted for burials otherwise than in accordance with the rites of the Church of England, and the amount and situation of such unconsecrated portion shall be determined by the vestry of the parish, subject to the approval of one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State."

He claimed for Dissenters, living or dying, the rights of parishioners as much as if they were members of the Church of England. Up to the year 1852 Dissenters were absolutely ignored in the arrangements made for public burial places; but in that year the Burial Acts were passed, and since that time the Legislature had shown the utmost desire to legislate fairly and equally for all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in this matter. He knew some hon. Gentlemen would think he was claiming something unfair in asking that on any gift of land added to a churchyard certain rules should be imposed which might not be in accordance with the views of the giver; but he did not seek to interfere with free gifts at all unless the parties came to Parliament to obtain Parliamentary sanction for what they did, and in that case he thought it was only right that the provision embodied in his clause should apply. If a Dissenter presented ground to enlarge a churchyard, he would ask hon. Members if they would agree to the giver providing that no part of that ground should be consecrated. The cases were similar, and he desired to put an end to those occurrences which he thought were on the increase in the country, where a clergyman of the Church of England should feel it his duty to refuse what he believed to be Christian burial to any one who had died unbaptized. In Scotland there were something like a thousand churches with graveyards attached, which graveyards were unconsecrated. He did not make this appeal on behalf of the members of the society to which he belonged, for they had graveyards of their own, and they did not believe in consecration, considering that no consecration could make the ground holier than it was originally created by the Almighty. He asked, in the words of William Howitt—

> "Does the honest quaker sleep less sound, or will he wake less joyful at the judgment day, because he sleeps in ground over which there have been no prelatical performances, and for which neither Priest nor Prelate has *portrates á doit?*"

Believing, then, that consecration was unnecessary, and that every parishioner had a right to Christian burial in the churchyard of his parish, whether he was a Dissenter or a Churchman, he begged to move the insertion of this clause.

Clause *brought up,* and read the first time.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY regretted that he could not accede to the clause. He had no wish, however, to treat with disrespect the feelings of those who differed from the Church. There was no doubt that the doctrine of the Church of England forbade clergymen to give Christian burial according to the usage of the Church of England to the bodies of unbaptized persons. But he did not think that a person who gave a piece of land to enlarge a churchyard should be compelled to give another piece for a purpose he did not contemplate; that was unreasonable, and could not be maintained in argument. It seemed to him that provision was made in every way for the burial of Dissenters. There were few parts of England in which there were not graveyards where Dissenters had their own burial ground. The present Bill was to lower the fees received by the Bishop or his officers for the consecration of churchyards, and to give a short form of conveyance of title. He regretted that he could not accede to the hon. Gentleman's Motion.

MR. NEATE supported the clause.

MR. CANDLISH also spoke in favour of the clause, and expressed his regret that it was opposed by the Government.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the clause be read a second time."

The House *divided:*—Ayes 14; Noes 33: Majority 19.

Bill read the third time, and *passed* with Amendments, and an amended Title.

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, August 16, 1867.

MINUTES.]—*Sat First in Parliament*—The Lord Willoughby d'Eresby, after the Death of his Father.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Consolidated Fund Appropriation*; Courts of Referees* (340); Hours of Labour Regulation (341); Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation, &c.* (322); Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses) (No. 2)* (330); Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* (323); Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* (295).

Committee—Expiring Laws Continuance* (321); Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (333); Investment of Trust Funds* (246).

Report—Expiring Laws Continuance* (321); Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (333); Investment of Trust Funds* (246).

Third Reading—Master and Servant (342), and *passed.*

HOURS OF LABOUR REGULATION BILL.

(*The Earl of Devon.*)

(No. 341.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF DEVON, in moving that the Bill be now read the second time, said, that its provisions were founded on the Report of a Commission, which reported that there were various employments, not included within the operation of the Factory Acts or any separate Act, with regard to which legislative interference was imperatively demanded in reference to the length of time during which women, children, and young persons were kept at work, in reference to education, in reference to the want of proper ventilation, and other matters. The Commission also came to the conclusion that no distinction could be drawn between the case of hired labour and the labour of children who were employed by their own parents, and that the labour of the latter class of children equally needed regulation. Their Lordships had only the other day passed the Factory Acts Extension Act, dealing with the larger establishments; but there were a considerable number of minor employments in which women, children, and young persons were engaged, perhaps, in smaller numbers, either in workshops or in their own homes, and with respect to which the Commissioners came to the conclusion, from the evidence adduced before them, that legislative regulation was necessary. It was to meet the case of these minor employments that the present Bill had been framed, and it took up the points which the Commission spoke of as requiring regulation, among which were the hours of labour, education, and ventilation. The measure also gave power to the local authorities for the purpose of securing, under certain penalties, an adherence to the provisions of the Bill. The measure had undergone careful investigation in the other House of Parliament, and considerable Amendments had been made in it. He trusted that their Lordships would give it their assent in order that it might pass as a supplementary measure to the Factory Acts Extension Act, which had already received the sanction of both Houses this Session.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Earl of Devon.*)

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, that the Bill had undergone very serious alteration, but though far from perfect it contained some very excellent provisions. It affirmed, above all, the great principle on which previous measures had been adopted, and which had conferred the greatest benefits on large masses of our industrial population. There could be no doubt that if they compared the machinery of this Bill with that of the other Bill which was the other day passed by their Lordships they might find it was defective. It did not provide the same system of inspection as was provided by the Factory Acts Extension Act, but left it necessary to have recourse to the local authorities. The measure might not produce all the good effects which they might all desire; but he felt sure that with patience and care it would enable them to work out great results; and they ought to be thankful to have such a Bill as that, when they considered the interests with which they had to contend, and the mighty influence which those interests exercised in the House of Commons and out of it. He thought they must express their very sincere and hearty thanks to all the employers of labour—both those connected with the great establishments and those connected with the smaller establishments—who had come forward in so manly and generous a way to put themselves under restrictions which they would have strenuously resisted some years ago—restrictions to which they were now ready to submit for the sake of the physical, the moral, and the social benefit of the great mass of the working people. He thought such conduct was highly creditable to those employers, and he hoped it would not be presumption in him to say that he felt deeply indebted to them for the course which they had pursued. But the Amendment which had been introduced only a few nights ago into this Bill in the House of Commons was not just towards those employers of labour. Before the Select Committee there took place a great deal of argumentation as to the hours at which all these industrial occupations should cease, and it was pressed very urgently indeed by all those employers and witnesses that, although there were two Bills dealing with this subject, the hour of concluding labour ought to be identical in each, and that unless this was so it would be utterly impossible to resist the infringement of the law. In the Workshops' Bill it was originally proposed that the hours of labour should terminate at nine o'clock; but after much discussion in the Committee it was determined by common consent that the hours of labour should terminate by the latest at eight o'clock. Suddenly, and without notice, a large proportion of those who had given their assent altered their views, and an Amendment was proposed and carried that the hours of labour should be from six to nine o'clock. This would almost render nugatory the provisions of the Bill. He thought that the Bill ought to be amended so as to be restored to the state in which it came down from the Select Committee of the other House, and if so there would not be much to complain of. The Act did not come into operation until January, and it would be possible in February at the meeting of Parliament to pass a Bill to amend the present measure, so as to make it agree with the Bill as it came down from the Commons' Committee. He feared that the Bill, as it stood, would cause great dissatisfaction among the class it was intended to benefit.

The Earl of LICHFIELD said, he regretted that the Bill had not been brought forward first in their Lordships' House, so that they might have had time to give it due consideration.

The Earl of DEVON concurred in the remarks of his noble Friend (the Earl of Shaftesbury), and said, that if his noble Friend brought in a Bill next Session to amend the present measure, he should be happy to give him all the aid in his power.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2^a, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of LICHFIELD rose to call attention to the Return of the Number of Friendly Societies in each County of England and Wales enrolled and certified since June, 1793 (33 *Geo.* III. c. 54), to the 31st of May, 1867; and also of the Number of such Societies which have been dissolved or broken up (laid before the House on the 11th of July last). The Return to which he desired to direct their Lordships' attention stated that in 1793 the number of those Friendly Societies was 38,315. Of these, 13,935 had been dissolved, and 24,380 remained. It should be remembered in considering these Returns that during the last ten or twelve years from 10,000 to 11,000 societies had been established, and that of these a very small proportion had proved themselves sound, and a very great amount of misery had been entailed on the working classes throughout the country through their failure. It was undesirable to point out the evils connected with these societies unless their Lordships were prepared to go somewhat deeply into the cause and ascertain whether some remedy could be provided. The first class of society was that which it was undoubtedly the intention of the Legislature to encourage when they passed the first Friendly Societies Act in 1793—those by which a certain number of persons clubbed together to provide relief for each other in case of sickness, and in some cases to provide a superannuation after a certain time of life. This class included not only the ordinary village club, but large affiliated bodies, like the Odd Fellows and Foresters. He was happy to say that latterly a great deal of the suspicion which had existed in the minds of the upper and educated classes as to these societies had been almost, if not entirely, removed; and, on the other hand, there was a growing disposition on the part of those societies to place confidence in any attempt which might be made to legislate with regard to them. There could be no doubt that though some of the lodges or branches of these societies might not be managed as well as could be wished, yet on the whole they had done a marvellous amount of good—especially the Odd Fellows and Foresters. Among the difficulties which in many cases existed to the satisfactory working of these societies was that of obtaining speedy redress in case of disputes. Under the rule providing for arbitration the matter had generally to be first referred to a district committee, and from them to the central body; so that the matter was decided upon at last probably at a great distance from the place where the claimant lived. This objection referred more particularly to the large affiliated bodies; and he could not help thinking that the anxiety shown by the managers to improve the position of those societies would lead them to see the necessity of some improvement in this respect. Another objection applied to almost all societies of this description—namely, that under the Friendly Societies Act now in operation—the 18 & 19 *Vict.*—any person bringing a complaint against one of these societies must do so on behalf of the society. It was very desirable to remedy this, and to provide that any member on his own account, or the Registrar, should be allowed to bring the complaint and to take proceedings in his own name in case of misappropriation of funds. Great complaint was also made of the manner in which the returns of the financial statements of these societies were made to the Registrar. During the last year, out of 22,834 returns asked for by the Registrar under this Act, only 10,345 were received. A great difficulty in the working of the Friendly Societies Act arose, also, from the time at which returns were required to be made to the Registrar. At present this time was fixed at the 1st of June; but they should be sent by March instead of June. No action could possibly be taken upon any matter which appeared to the Registrar to be contrary to the provisions of the Act of Parliament if the returns were not sent to him before the 1st of June, because after six months had elapsed it would be too late to take any action in the matter; and it followed that, as the returns related to what had taken place in the previous year, six months must in all cases have elapsed between the time of the irregularity and the return being laid before the Registrar. Of these large societies, the Odd Fellows numbered 400,000, with £2,000,000 of money put by; the Foresters 300,000, with £1,000,000. It was impossible to deny how much credit the managers deserved for their efforts to improve their respective societies; it did happen, however, that a large number of their lodges were not in the position they ought to hold, and some provision was necessary which would give the governing body a greater control over the lodges, and compel them to conform in all respects to the rules laid down by the governing body. Knowing how frequently these societies found themselves in difficulties, he would quote one case to show what a sound and well-managed society could do. The society he alluded to was established in 1828; it began with thirty-five members, and in 1867 it had 285 members, with an income of £850, and an available balance of £12,404, the expenses of management during that time not having exceeded 3 per cent. This showed what could be done by a society if it were properly managed; and any measure that would put such societies on a more secure footing than they at present occupied would be worthy of the most serious consideration. He wished to call special attention to a description of society which had sprung up of late years in London, Liverpool, and Manchester. These societies contemplated the provision of a sum at death for those who insured in them, and their ramifications extended to almost every village in the country, the premiums being obtained through the agency of collectors, who were paid a very large commission upon the sums they received for the societies. The business was in the hands of a committee at Liverpool, London, or Manchester; the members took no part in the management; they had no one but the collector to look to; and the annual meeting was a farce. It was quite clear that these societies in no way corresponded with the societies which the Legislature contemplated when they passed the first Friendly Societies Act. Notwithstanding the enormous funds of these societies and the lavishness with which they were squandered, they received all the benefits and privileges of friendly societies in being exempt from income and other taxes, and to a certain extent from probate duty—exemptions which were very considerable in amount. It was astonishing what an enormous proportion of their income some of these societies spent in management. He obtained his figures from their published reports, and he did not think there could be any objection to mentioning the names of the societies to which he referred, because, being under the Friendly Societies Act, they were bound annually to send in their accounts, which thus became public property. He would first of all call attention to the Royal Liver Society of Liverpool, which had been in existence seventeen years, and the number of members of which it would be very difficult to ascertain; the number was supposed to be from 130,000 to 150,000, and the premium income £125,000 a year. This money was obtained from the poorest classes of the people of this country; and yet during 1866 no less a sum than £45,864 was spent upon management. From every £100 received £36 12*s.* 9*d.* was spent on management, or 15*s.* for every 20*s.* spent for relief, sickness, and burials. Although the accumulated assets were said to amount to £103,000, the interest was only £2,795. Could it be conceived for a moment that a society established upon a basis of payments certified to be sufficient for certain benefits could be sound if 50 per cent were taken for the expenses of management? A number of members of this society wrote to Mr. Spens, who had certified its tables, asking him if he had done so with the knowledge that by the thirteenth rule 30 per cent was deducted for management expenses, and 25 per cent for collectors' commission. The reply was as follows:—

> "The table No. 2, to which you refer, was certified by me as an abstract table without reference to the rules of the Liver Society or anything beyond the table. At the time the table was submitted to me I thought it was my duty to examine it and give the opinion I did. The table which I certified bore simply the title, 'Table of weekly payments required for persons of the age under-

noted for burial money in the years of entry undernoted.' The rates are quite inadequate if subjected to a deduction of 55 per cent."

He wished also to refer to the Victoria Legal Provident Assurance Society of Birmingham. It had 8,637 members, and its available funds were £232. During 1866 it received in premiums from the working classes £1,764, and the expenses of management were £1,125. He was present at the Court of Quarter Sessions in Staffordshire on the occasion of the trial of a collector charged with defrauding the society of a sum of money. It came out in the course of the trial that the trustee, secretary, and treasurer were one and the same person, and that he, in fact, managed the society and controlled the collector. After the trial there was put into his hands a letter written by the wife of the trustee, secretary, and treasurer, and addressed to the collector who was tried; and this letter showed pretty clearly how the affairs of the society were conducted. It was in these terms—

> "Dear Sir,—Yours to hand this morning. Was sorry to hear that Mr. Rhodes had been showing your letter about. I am sure it was not Mr. Davies's wish, and I shall name it to him when he comes in the morning. As Mr. Davies is in London, I shall undertake to say that whatever he promised you when you were here yesterday you may take it for granted, as I can assure you he is a man to his word. If he promised you not to press the charge he will not do so. Bear in mind Mr. Davies is the prosecutor, not Mr. Rhodes; so I hope you will not trouble yourself any further about it, and in like manner we shall expect you to fulfil your promise in showing up the members to our agent.—Yours respectfully, M. A. Davies, *pro* William Davies."

In the case of this society, for every 20*s.* spent in relief £3 was spent on management. The next society he would name was the St. Patrick's. Its income was £33,270, and its management cost £16,552; or for every 20*s.* given in relief 16*s.* 3*d.* was spent on management. It was not known whether the number of members was 150,000 or 300,000; and, although it was established in 1832, the funds in hand did not amount to more than half one year's income. The society had often been before the Courts, and it was managed by one person. Another society he would name was the Liverpool United Legal, which had been established many years. It had as patron a noble Earl, who was very much surprised when certain figures were put before him. There were 57,350 members; the accumulated assets were £10,000; its premium income was £14,838; and its management cost £7,141 per year. There were some cases in which from friendly societies they had become joint-stock companies—a change which ought to be carefully guarded against; and under no circumstances whatever ought the privileges of a friendly society to be given to a society carrying on its operations by means of collectors. It was no slight undertaking to bring forward a subject of this magnitude at a period of the Session so far advanced, and with the knowledge that their Lordships must be already tired, but he was anxious that during the recess attention might be directed to the subject. Some suggestions which had occurred to himself he had embodied in the shape of a Bill; but for any substantial advance upon this question they could only trust to improved education of the working classes.

The Earl of DEVON said, there could be but one opinion as to the importance of the subject which the noble Earl had brought under consideration. There were few, indeed, having a wider or more extensive bearing on the position of the working classes, and the abuses which had been pointed out were of the most serious kind. He was quite sure their Lordships would be disposed to co-operate next Session in the endeavour of the noble Earl to remedy these defects.

COURTS OF LAW OFFICERS (IRELAND) BILL—(No. 294.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

COMMONS' REASONS CONSIDERED.

Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to One of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order).

Lord CRANWORTH rose to move that their Lordships should insist on the alteration which, at his instigation, the House had made in the Bill—an alteration which would have had the effect of assimilating the Irish to the English practice, and would have been in conformity with the opinions of Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Campbell, and with the recommendations of the English and Irish Law Commission. His attention was called to the fact that no provision was made in the Bill for putting the chief Judges in Ireland in the same position as those in England with respect to the appointment of Officers in the Courts. He accordingly moved a clause vesting the appointment in the chief Judge of each Court. That clause passed their Lordships' House without objection, but the Commons rejected it; and one of the Reasons they assigned for the rejection was that the clause was an interference with an ancient prerogative of the Crown in Ireland, no allegation having been made by anyone that the said prerogative had been exercised improperly. A similar reason might be assigned for the preservation of any piece of patronage enjoyed by the Government. There were other Reasons — though it was only by a stretch of courtesy they could be called "Reasons" at all—assigned, but he thought that none of them were better founded than the one to which he had just alluded. At this period of the Session legislation practically depended on the Government, and it was useless for an independent Member of either House to attempt to carry anything which the Government opposed.

Moved, to insist on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed.—(*The Lord Cranworth.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR was anxious to express to the House how strongly he agreed in the view presented by his noble and learned Friend, and how deeply he regretted that the Commons had thought proper to reject the clause which seemed to him founded on reasonable and just grounds. The support of that clause was not confined to the lawyers in that House. It was supported, indeed, by his noble and learned Friends Lord Cairns, Lord Westbury, Lord Romilly; but it also received the support of those who were formerly connected with the government of Ireland—of the Earl of Clarendon and the Earl of Kimberley—as well as of the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Marquess of Clanricarde. He was the more anxious that this should be known, because he knew it would be said that the lawyers would be sure to support a clause that gave them patronage; and he wished it to be understood that this clause of his noble and learned Friend was supported by those deservedly great authorities as well as by the lawyers. He must express his surprise as well as regret, that the House of Commons had rejected this clause; and if it were not for the late period of the Session, he would follow the course adopted by his distinguished predecessor, the late Lord Lyndhurst, and endeavour to induce the House to insist on the clause. But he knew what the consequence of that would be at the present period of the Session, that it would be decisive of the fate of the Bill, and as it was one of great importance he did not think he ought to interfere to prevent it from passing. He was anxious to explain to their Lordships and to the public that this was the reason, and the only reason, why he could not agree to the Motion of his noble and learned Friend.

On Question, whether to insist? their Lordships *divided* :—Contents 7; Not-Contents 11: Majority 4

CONTENTS.

Lichfield, E.
Sidmouth, V.
Colonsay, L.
Cranworth, L. [*Teller.*]
Foley, L. [*Teller.*]
Redesdale, L.
Vernon, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Chelmsford, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)
Marlborough, D.
Richmond, D.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Bagot, L.
Clinton, L.
Colville of Culross, L. [*Teller.*]
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

PROTEST.

"*DISSENTIENT :*

"1. Because the Right of filling the subordinate Offices in the Superior Courts of Justice ought to belong to the Heads of those Courts, as being the Persons best qualified to select fit and proper Officers for the Discharge of the Duties they are to fulfil:

"2. Because from Time immemorial this has been the Practice in *England*, and has always been regarded as essential to the well-conducting of the Business of the Courts:

"3. Because, in the Year 1862, a Royal Commission was issued to many of the most distinguished Judges and Lawyers both in *England* and *Ireland*, directing them to inquire, amongst other things, as to the Constitution and Establishment of the Superior Courts of Common Law in *Ireland*, and that Commission recommended the Adoption in *Ireland* of the Principle which has always prevailed in *England* as to the Appointment of Officers in the Courts, and no Reason has been given why that Recommendation has not been attended to:

"4. Because the withholding from the *Irish* Judges of the Rights and Privileges enjoyed by their Brethren in *England* places them in an invidious and humiliating Position, inasmuch as the Reason for the Distinction will be generally believed to be that it is not thought safe to trust the Judges in *Ireland* with the Exercise of Patronage which is without Hesitation confided to the Judges in *England*. "CRANWORTH."

A consequential Amendment made, and a Message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, August 16, 1867.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Considered as amended* — Traffic Regulation (Metropolis)* [97]; Royal Military Canal * [313].
Third Reading—Traffic Regulation (Metropolis)* [97]; Royal Military Canal * [313], and *passed.*

The House met at Three of the Clock.

METROPOLIS—THE NEW POOR LAW ACT.—QUESTION.

Colonel HOGG said, he would beg to ask the Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Whether, referring to the probable increase of cost beyond the estimate for the new buildings under the Metropolitan Poor Law Act, he will give an assurance that no contracts should be sanctioned by the Poor Law Board during the Parliamentary recess which will involve the ratepayers of the Metropolis in an expenditure in excess of £400,000, which was the sum mentioned by the President of the Poor Law Board as the probable extreme cost of all buildings necessary for lunatics, fever, and small pox patients, as well as for new district schools?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he thought his hon. and gallant Friend could hardly expect him to give a specific answer as to what the Poor Law Board might feel it right to do under a hypothetical state of circumstances, not at all likely to occur. The duty of sanctioning the necessary expenditure was laid on the Poor Law Board by an Act of this Session, and the House would doubtless agree that the duty must be discharged upon the responsibility of that department. He might, however, inform his hon. and gallant Friend that it would probably be necessary to provide more accommodation for the imbecile poor of the metropolis than was contemplated at the time when his right hon. Friend (Mr. G. Hardy) made his statement to the House; but, on the other hand, he had reason to believe that the estimate then made of the requirements in the case of fever and small pox patients would be in excess of the actual amount.

ARMY—SERGEANT INSTRUCTORS OF VOLUNTEERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. OTWAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is intended to withhold from the Sergeant Instructors attached to the Volunteer Corps from the Regiments of the Line the additional two pence per diem paid to Sergeants of the Line and Militia?

Sir JOHN PAKINGTON presumed that the Question of the hon. Member had reference to the increase of 2*d.* a day lately granted. Sergeant Instructors of Volunteers consisted of two classes—one lent from the regular service to the Volunteers, but still borne on the staff of the regiments to which they belonged respectively, with a view of completing the time necessary to obtain their pensions, and the other class those who had left the line and were already in receipt of pensions. To the first class he thought it would be fair and right to extend the 2*d.* extra; but he had some doubt about the second class. The subject, however, was under consideration, and he would not give a decided answer upon it.

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. DARBY GRIFFITH said, he would beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it will be the intention of the Government that the Bill for the prevention of Corrupt Practices at Elections, which has been considered and reported on by a Select Committee, should be brought forward at the earliest period next Session?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I do not feel myself capable of informing the House as to the mode in which the Parliamentary campaign for next Session will be planned. But I certainly should be very sorry if the Bill to which my hon. Friend refers is not passed next Session; and I think the best plan for passing it would be to introduce it as soon as possible.

METROPOLIS—PARK LANE.

QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE said, he would beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether, in order to give greater facilities for the circulation of traffic and relieve the present overcrowded thoroughfare of Park Lane, he will endeavour to obtain Her Majesty's consent for Cabs to cross the corner of Hyde Park from the gate at Hyde Park Corner to Stanhope Gate, in a similar manner as Cabs are now permitted to cross Hyde Park from Victoria Gate to Prince's Gate.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, no complaints whatever had reached him up to the present moment that there was too little traffic between Hyde Park Corner and Stanhope Gate. On the contrary, every statement which reached him went to show that there was too great a traffic for the convenience of the public in that direction. To pour an additional stream of cab traffic upon that already existing would certainly not be the way to facilitate public communication. He would remind the hon. Gentleman that Her Majesty had most graciously placed at the disposal of the metropolitan authorities portions of the Park for the purpose of widening Park Lane, and that the real and proper mode of getting rid of the difficulty which undoubtedly existed was to widen the southernmost end of Park Lane, so as to continue a thoroughfare with facilities as great as would soon belong to nine-tenths of Park Lane. The only reason why Her Majesty's Government had not during the present Session been able to recommend a scheme to put the Metropolitan Board of Works in funds for the purposes of this work was that certain unfortunate dissensions had sprung up between the City on the one hand, and the Metropolitan Board of Works on the other. The influence of the hon. Member with the Corporation of London was so well known and so undoubted, that he would recommend him to exercise his influence with the City during the recess with a view of terminating these unfortunate dissensions, and thereby enabling Parliament next year to place the Metropolitan Board of Works in a position to complete this desirable improvement.

Mr. AYRTON, with reference to the answer just given by the noble Lord, wished to ask whether he had made any communication to the vestry or local Board of the wealthy and under-assessed parish of St. George's, Hanover Square, to induce them to act under the provisions of an Act of George III., for the improvement of the streets of the metropolis, and to undertake the duty naturally devolving upon them, of improving the lower end of Park Lane.

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, he had not brought the subject under the consideration of the authorities of St. George's parish, the recommendation emanating from the Select Committee lately presided over by the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Ayrton) being that the cost should be defrayed out of the continuation of the coal duties.

METROPOLIS—MARLBOROUGH HOUSE GATE.—QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE said, he would beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, Whether, in order to give greater facilities for the circulation of traffic, he will endeavour to obtain Her Majesty's consent to the passage of carriages down Constitution Hill to Pall Mall, through the gate by Marlborough House, during the absence of Her Majesty from Buckingham Palace?

Lord JOHN MANNERS said, that any advice tendered to Her Majesty as to the privilege to be conceded to carriages passing down Constitution Hill in the way suggested ought to be addressed, if at all, by the Home Secretary, and not by the First Commissioner of Works.

TRAFFIC OF THE METROPOLIS.

QUESTION.

Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will be prepared to introduce a measure in the next Session of Parliament, having for its object to give greater facilities for the circulation of traffic throughout the Metropolis, by removing all the present bars and barriers in the Whitechapel and Commercial Road Districts; the bars across the streets leading out of Gray's Inn Road; the bars in Doughty Street and throughout the Foundling Hospital Estate; the bars across the streets leading into the Euston Road; the bars on the Southampton Estate; the bars on the Bedford Estate; the bars on the Portland Estate; the bars on the Portman Estate; the bars on the Westminster Estate; the bars on the Lowndes Estate; the bars on the Brompton Estate; and all other bars whatever; and so place the Metropolis in this respect in the same position as Paris and other Cities on the Continent?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he was not as "well up" on the different bars of the metropolis as the hon. Member appeared to be, and he was not prepared to promise to bring in a Bill on the subject.

THE CATTLE PLAGUE.—QUESTION.

MR. READ said, he would beg to ask the Vice President of the Council, If, in conformity with the spirit of his statement that Her Majesty's Government, "having resolved upon the slaughter of all Foreign Cattle at the ports of landing, intended to revoke the Harwich and Southampton Orders," the permission to land Foreign Cattle at Thames Haven for the Metropolitan Market will be continued; and, to state the circumstances of the outbreak of the disease at Barking, the number of Cattle slaughtered, and what other precautions have been taken to prevent the spread of the disease?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU said, when leave had been given to import cattle from Harwich and Southampton into London, it was necessary to pass special Orders of Council to grant that permission. Those Orders, in consequence of the decision of the House, would be almost immediately revoked. No such Order had been required for Thames Haven as it is in the Port of London; but, as it is between thirty and forty miles from London, it was the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that the wishes of the House of Commons would not be carried out in spirit if foreign cattle were to be moved thence to the metropolis; and as the Bill of this year gave power to the Privy Council to define a part of a port for landing cattle, it was intended to exclude Thames Haven from the port of London. With regard to the outbreak in Essex, information was received on the 9th of August that the disease had made its appearance on the farm of the Sewage Utilization Company at Barking. Nine animals were killed at once. On the following day an inspector went down and ordered 102 more beasts to be slaughtered, four of which were suffering from the disease, and the remaining ninety-eight of which had been in contact with them. [MR. READ: May I ask if they have been slaughtered?] I believe they have not yet been killed. The local authorities, who had to carry out the orders, have been remiss. They are anxious to wait, I believe, till the first market day.

MAJOR JERVIS wished to know whether foreign cattle would still be allowed to be sent all over the metropolis for slaughter, or confined to the part or parts of the port of London where disembarked, and whether, as no foreign cattle were to be allowed to proceed inland alive, the present stringent regulations with reference to the importation of cattle from South Holland might not be modified with a view of cheapening so necessary an article of food for the working classes?

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU replied that both these subjects had been taken into consideration. It was certainly most advisable, as the hon. and gallant Member observed, to do almost anything, rather than allow foreign cattle to walk through the streets; it would also be their endeavour to relax the restrictions on the foreign trade as far as possible. But he was not in a position to give a definite answer to the hon. and gallant Gentleman's inquiries as to the measures which would eventually be adopted.

IRELAND — THE IRISH CHURCH COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he will lay upon the table, before the close of the Session, in accordance with the assurances given by the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the 5th of July, the names of the Commissioners to inquire into the Revenue of the Established Church in Ireland, and also the names of the Irish Education Commissioners?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I should be happy to lay on the table the names of the Commissioners if they were fixed upon; but, unfortunately, they are not. My noble Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland, whose absence we deplore, has informed me that he has been in communication with a number of individuals whose names would be calculated to give confidence to Parliament and the country; but I regret to say that he has received a great many answers declining the request that the writers should serve on the Commission. The correspondence on the subject is still going on. Our engagement was to place the names on the table provided they had been fixed upon; but, as this is not the case, we are not able to do so.

BUENOS AYRES—CASE OF THE "CESTUS."—QUESTION.

MR. NORWOOD said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign

Affairs, What progress has been made towards a settlement of the claim of the owners of the *Cestus* against the Buenos Ayres Government, which was referred to the decision of the President of the Republic of Chili in 1865?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I cannot say that any progress has been made in the case. It was referred to the arbitration of the President of Chili two years ago; but he seems to have been so much occupied with other affairs, that we have not received any communication as to what his opinion on the matter may be. I instructed the British Chargé d'Affaires to call the attention of the President to the subject, and to ask him to give a decision as soon as convenient. This letter was written on the 31st of May, and there has not been time for an answer to be received.

SUPREME COURT OF SIERRA LEONE.

QUESTION.

MR. O'BEIRNE said, he would beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether, as the system of trial by jury has been discontinued in the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone, and in consequence it is of vital importance to the people of that settlement that a Judge of known efficiency and legal acquirements should be appointed, it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to select a member of the English, Irish, or Scotch bar, to fill the present vacancy?

MR. ADDERLEY said, he was not aware of any vacancy in the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Carr had resigned, and was returning home, and a gentleman of eminence at the bar had been appointed to succeed him. The Assistant Judge had not yet been appointed; but the Government would choose the candidate for the office on the ground of merit, and not considering whether he belonged to the English, Irish, or Scotch bar.

ARMY—MILITARY STORE CLERKS.

QUESTION.

MR. OTWAY said, he would beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, If, during the recess, he will take into his consideration the position of the Military Store Clerks, with a view to remedy the disadvantage caused to them by the introduction of other officers to perform their duties?

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON said, the position of the Military Store clerks would receive consideration during the recess.

NAVY—GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

QUESTION.

MR. NORWOOD said, he would beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, The decision arrived at by the Board as to appropriating to the use of the authorities of the *Dreadnought* Hospital ship Queen Anne's quarter, or the infirmary of Greenwich Hospital; and, if a decision be not yet arrived at thereon, when the Committee of the *Dreadnought* Hospital may expect to receive it?

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, that the state of the case was this—The Admiralty had appointed an inquiry, consisting of the medical officers named by the Privy Council, to examine into the relative merits of the quarters of Queen Anne or Queen Mary, for the purposes of the *Dreadnought* Hospital. They reported that neither was suitable, nor could be made so without great expense, but that they were unanimous in the opinion that Queen Mary's quarter was preferable to Queen Anne's for such purposes. The Committee of the *Dreadnought* were not satisfied with that Report, and the Admiralty appointed a conference, composed of men whose decision was likely to be conclusive on the matter. Sir Peter Richards and Sir Charles Trevelyan were applied to, but they declined to act on the conference in consequence of having other business to attend to. At the request of the Committee of the *Dreadnought* Dr. Tatum was appointed; and the second Committee also reported that Queen Mary's quarter was preferable to Queen Anne's. Accordingly the Board of Admiralty were not prepared to give Queen Anne's quarter to the Committee of the *Dreadnought*; but having regard to the great usefulness of the institution presided over by that Committee, they were quite willing to abide by the offer they made some time ago—namely, to give that quarter which both sets of medical men reported to be the better adapted for a hospital.

In answer to Mr. NORWOOD,

LORD HENRY LENNOX said, that the propriety of appropriating the Infirmary in Greenwich Hospital to the purpose had never been brought before the Admiralty or mooted except in the speech of an hon. Gentleman in that House. The

Infirmary is appropriated to the use of the old pensioners now in Greenwich Hospital.

INDIA—THE INDIAN LOAN.

QUESTION.

MR. CRAWFORD said, it appeared from one portion of Mr. Massey's statement that a sum of £2,000,000 was required to be raised. In another part of the statement Mr. Massey seemed to intimate that £3,000,000 would be required. It would be satisfactory if the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for India could state for what amount the Indian loan was to be taken?

SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE: It would appear that in the early part of Mr. Massey's statement he informed the Council of India that he proposed to raise a sum of £700,000 for irrigation works, and certain other sums for local purposes. He mentioned that he had raised £600,000 for special works in Bombay. He stated that the sum he altogether proposed to raise would be about £2,000,000, and I apprehend that Mr. Massey included in the £2,000,000 the £600,000. What he said he has already raised confirmed that opinion. He stated that he had invited loans for £1,500,000, and that he had received £1,400,000; and therefore I suppose that nearly all he intended to raise has been raised. There was besides a sum of £1,000,000, which Mr. Massey proposed to borrow to complete the barracks; but that had been already raised in this country. In the winter, before the statement was received, the Government of India informed the Government here that it would require to raise £1,000,000 for expenditure on barracks. The Government at home said they would reduce the drafts on India from £7,000,000, as originally contemplated, to £6,000,000, and provide by the sale of stock for the additional £1,000,000. Accordingly the Government of India at home sold stock to the amount of £1,000,000 and were in a position to reduce, as they had promised, the drafts by £1,000,000. Mr. Massey took that into consideration when he said that he would transfer £1,000,000 of what he had to raise to the loan accounts; and, in my opinion, no more money will have to be raised.

INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE BILL (*Lords*)—[BILL 318.]

LORDS AMENDMENTS.

SIR ROUNDELL PALMER, in moving that the Lords' Reasons for disagreeing with certain of the Commons' Amendments in this Bill should be considered that day month, said, that the Bill was not introduced for the purpose of founding new bishoprics out of funds in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; it had never been discussed or justified upon such a principle, nor had it ever been shown that there were in the hands of the Commissioners any funds which could properly be applied to that purpose; and he regretted to find that in the House of Lords that had been made an obstacle to agreeing to certain of the Commons' Amendments. Another matter upon which there was a difference of opinion was as to whether or not the new Bishops should sit in the House of Lords. In that House there was a general opinion that they ought not; but some Members of the other House had felt themselves unable to agree to their exclusion. The failure of the Bill did not rest with that House, it rested entirely with those in the other House who had apparently felt that public funds, and not private subscriptions, ought to be relied upon for the support of these new bishoprics, and that if they were established they ought to be founded strictly upon the same system as applied to the existing bishoprics.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order *discharged:* Bill *withdrawn.*

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES ACT.

OBSERVATIONS.

On Motion, "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn to Monday next,"

MR. NEWDEGATE said*: Sir, I have given notice that I intend to direct the attention of the House to certain circumstances connected with the Select Committee recently appointed to consider the Ecclesiastical Titles Act of 1851, and also one of the clauses in the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829, which forbids the assumption by Roman Catholic Bishops of titles, held by the Bishops of the Established Church in Ireland; and in doing so I will not long detain the House. The circumstances connected with the appointment of the Committee, and some of the circumstances connected with its proceedings, are so very remarkable, that I deem it only fair to those, whose evidence has been practically rejected, or, at all events, was never entertained, that the position of the Committee should be understood. It is evident, Sir, from the records of the proceedings of this House, which I have here, that the House was very unwilling that the question involved in the Ecclesiastical Titles Act should be re-opened. I have in my hand the accounts of the proceedings which took place when the Bill for the repeal of this Act was introduced, and when the Motion for the appointment of the Committee stood upon the Paper. On more than one occasion the House was counted out, and it was only through the perseverance of the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. MacEvoy), and one or two other Roman Catholic Members, supported by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Louth (Mr. Chichester Fortescue), countenanced as it appeared to me by Her Majesty's Government, that the questions involved in these Acts were raised at all, and even then, not until after much delay and much manifest evasion. I protested against these proceedings, because I hold that Her Majesty's Government are the guardians of the prerogative of the Crown, as well as the guardians of the independence of the State, both of which matters are involved; I felt strongly that the Government ought, on their own responsibility, to have taken a decided course on these great questions. Yet I am far from being prepared to assert that what has occurred is fraught with no advantage. After having resisted every attempt to raise these questions, and to refer these statutes to a Select Committee late in this Session, I asked the House to excuse my serving as a member of this Committee. I did so on the grounds I have mentioned, and because I was convinced from the nature of the subject itself, and from the advanced period of the Session at which we had arrived, that it would be quite impossible that the Committee could inquire into the whole of the questions at issue as their importance demands. The result has proved that I judged rightly in forming that opinion. But before going further, I would remark that there is attached to the reference of this Committee a portion which ought not to be misunderstood; this is an extract from the Votes of this House, dated Wednesday the 31st of July, 1867, in these words—

> "Petition of the Chairman of the Committee of the Protestant Association praying to be allowed the opportunity of tendering evidence on the subject; referred to Select Committee on Ecclesiastical Titles Bill and the Roman Catholic Relief Acts."

Sir, that Order of the House was defeated. That Petition was referred by order of the House to the Select Committee; but by an irregularity on the part of an officer, or of the officers of this House, that Petition was never delivered to the Committee, nor were they regularly informed by any officer of the Order of the House. I have made further inquiries since last, Sir, I brought this matter under your particular attention in the House; I find that the greater part of the Members of that Committee had no notion or idea that any such Petition had been presented or referred to the Committee. I had also, Sir, to appeal to you with reference to the delay in returning certain evidence given before the Committee, of the excessive time taken for the correction of this evidence in contravention of the rules of the House. I find that Dr. Ullathorne, one of the witnesses examined, has written to the *Weekly Register*, a Roman Catholic paper, denying the accuracy of the reports of his evidence which appear in the public journals. I should weary the House if I were to attempt to go through any analysis of anything like the whole evidence given before the Committee; it is sufficient to say that it was tendered exclusively by persons who seek to obtain the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, and the repeal of the clause in the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829 to which I have referred. We know, Sir—for it appears from the tenour of the draft Report which was drawn up by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole), and rejected by a majority of 1 in the Committee—that he did not propose that the Committee should hear further evidence, because the reference to the Committee—or I might say the Commission of the Committee from this House—was simply to ascertain whether any practical grievance existed under the operation of these Acts, and not otherwise to consider the policy of these Acts. I felt confident, Sir, before the right hon. Gentleman went into the Committee, that he would never be able to limit the evidence to so narrow an issue, but that the evidence tendered would bear directly and chiefly upon the great questions that have existed as matters of difference between the Papacy and this country for the last 300 years in the form of direct antagonism; but these differences between this country and the Papacy were scarcely less distinct at far earlier periods, when the country professed spiritual allegiance to the See of Rome, than now; with regard, I mean, to the nature of the jurisdiction claimed by, and the temporal position of, the Roman Hierarchy. The result of the course pursued by the Select Committee is that a mass of evidence upon these general questions, exclusively on one side, has been received, and I am here now to state on the part of those whose counter-evidence — evidence in support of these statutes, as being consonant with, and declaratory of, the common law of this country; as being essential to the maintenance of the prerogative of the Crown and of the national independence, was not received—to state before the House that the evidence given before the Committee was exclusively one-sided and *ex parte.* It is very important that this should be distinctly understood; because if any attempt be hereafter made to act upon the Report of this Committee, which, by a majority of 1 only, impugns the present law, it ought to be known that the only evidence received by this Committee was from persons directly interested in, from persons avowedly seeking, the repeal of these laws. Sir, it is not enough in such a case as this to prove that the law inflicts no grievance upon a certain section of the community. When a law is assailed, is questioned, it is necessary to prove that it is advantageous to the community and the State. I thoroughly agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge, who displayed in his cross-examination of these witnesses great ability, that there is no real grievance suffered by the Roman Catholic Bishops, or by Roman Catholics generally; unless the operation of these laws is to be considered a grievance, because by them the Papacy is not permitted to supersede through the agency of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy the Established Church and the established Constitution of this country; that they are not permitted to enforce a jurisdiction in this country, which they call merely voluntary and merely spiritual; but which out of their own mouths I can show would, if unrestrained, involve questions of the deepest temporal importance—matters concerning the civil and the social and religious freedom no less than political rights of Her Majesty's subjects. But, Sir, this evidence, as I have already asserted, has not been received; and I hold, therefore, that the Report of that Committee is the result of a one-sided inquiry—an inquiry which, as the proceedings prove, was conducted by a majority of partizans, and as to the evidence it is clear it is admitted that only one side was heard. It is not enough, I repeat, to prove by direct evidence that the law inflicts no practical grievance. In order to maintain a law there should be direct evidence of the necessity for that law, and of the advantage which the State and the community derived from it. Such evidence, the evidence of thoroughly competent witnesses, was prepared—was intended to be laid before this Committee. This House ordered that the Committee should consider whether they would or would not receive this evidence. But the order of this House was intercepted, and no such evidence was taken, although it was tendered to the House. I have, therefore, a right to say that the Report which was adopted by the Committee is an *ex parte* Report. The House will permit me for a few moments to show the extent of the questions which the appointment and proceedings of this Committee have disturbed, but have not settled. I quote from the draft Report proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge, which was rejected in the Committee by a majority of 1, but which forms part of the proceedings of the Committee. These are the words—

> "Nor is it altogether unimportant to remark that this claim to a territorial hierarchy, 'as morally necessary to the Roman Catholic Church in England,' could only be recognized according to the opinion of the Roman Catholics themselves, by a negation or denial (practically speaking) of the existing Establishment, and the authority of its bishops."

When Mr. Hope Scott was asked the question—

> "Then if any bishop was to intrude into the See of another bishop in this country it would be in the eye at least of that portion of the Church, which was in this country a schismatical act?"

His answer was—

> "There is no doubt at all about it. The fact is that the Roman Catholic Church would not be justified in placing bishops anywhere in England, or in Ireland, if it did not deny the authority, practically speaking, of the bishops of the Establishment; it is, of course, an issue between the two religions, which it is of no use blinking."

And when Mr. Hope Scott was further asked—

> "But the Roman Catholic Church assume that the English Episcopate has no existence?"

His answer was—

> "Most undoubtedly. The appointment of any ecclesiastical officer whatever of the Roman Catholic religion, and the appointment of any priest exercising cure of souls, is a negation of the Established Church, and that is, of course, a part of the religion which is supposed to be freed by the Act of 1829."

The draft Report then goes on to say—

> "Your Committee are surprised at this last observation, since they had always understood that the Act of 1829 had expressly declared, with reference to the assumption of territorial titles by Catholic Prelates, as a reason for their not being assumed, that the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, and likewise the Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, are by the respective Acts of Union of England and Scotland, and of England and Ireland, established permanently and inviolably. Bishop Ullathorne concurs in the observations made by Mr. Hope Scott on this part of the subject."

Now, nothing can be more clearly in direct conflict with the claims put forward by the Papacy than the position of the Established Church; but, as I before mentioned, it is pretended that the jurisdiction, which is claimed by the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, is merely voluntary, merely spiritual. This is, however, in the eyes of those who understand the subject, a very flimsy pretext indeed. It is nothing more or less than the old Papal quibble with regard to the objects, covered by the words "spiritual and temporal," respectively. Then Dr. Moriarty was examined before the Committee, and said—

> "I need not tell the Committee that this enactment—the Ecclesiastical Titles Act of 1851—has been totally inoperative; we hold it to be unlawful and void. We never derived our jurisdiction from Parliament or from the Crown, and we believe that no power in the State can render the exercise of it either invalid or unlawful."

Again, the witness says elsewhere—

> "Now this we do not do (claim rank from the State), nor do I envy the distinction which the Protestant Bishop has in holding his title from the Crown, and being thereby constituted a Baron, or whatever he may be, of this Empire, for I prefer to hold direct from the Lord, and to let Dr. Graves, who is Bishop of my place, hold from the Lord Lieutenant."

This Question was then put to him—

> "You spoke of exceptional legislation, and you talked of this as a step backwards; with reference to exceptional legislation, what exceptional legislation, which is still in force, do you refer to?"

The answer was—

> "There is the existence of the Established Church and all its consequences."

He was then asked—

> "Is there anything else?"

His reply was—

> "I think that that is quite enough."

Dr. Moriarty went on to say—

> "I say more, that it is absurd that the Bishop of 7,000 persons or less should be competent to sit in your Legislature, while the Bishop of 223,600 is deprived even of the name and semblance of social rank. I am not ambitious of a seat in the Legislature; but I insist that we should be both either admitted or excluded together, and if only one is admitted, I have the best right to be there. Now while this inequality lasts, there will be strife and hatred and national antipathy, and England and Ireland can never become one united Empire."

I ask the House, then, is not this a temporal matter? Dr. Moriarty goes on to say—

> "The repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act would be a very small instalment of justice, but it would be a step in the right direction; it would be a graceful and prudent beginning, and it would convince many, of what I am myself firmly persuaded, that the English people sincerely, and earnestly, and honestly desire to see Ireland governed with justice and kindness, and without distinction of class or creed. In order to be better understood, I will say that I do not want or wish for any positive legal recognition of our titles, for we do not derive them, or any spiritual power, from the Legislature or the Government. The Government can neither give them nor take them away. I wish merely that the prohibition should be removed, and that we should be let alone; and I wish this for the sake of the highest moral interests of society, which depend upon the establishment and maintenance of right relations between the people and those whom God has placed over them."

This witness had before said—

> "There is only one body in the country, and that is the Catholic Hierarchy and clergy, who could bridge over the deep and sharp chasm which divides the upper and lower classes in Ireland."

Well, is not that a temporal matter? Again, Dr. Moriarty continues—

> "My proper title is Bishop of Ardfert. It is by usage that I have been called Bishop of Kerry. I consider that I no more assume a title when I call myself Bishop of Kerry than I do when I call myself parish priest of Killarney, which I also am; and I consider that the county treasurer, or the county surveyor of Kerry, has a title in the very same sense in which I have. If things were understood in that way, I should think that it never could be imagined that there was any interference with the prerogative of the Crown in assuming titles. These are the observations which I have to make."

Thus, Sir, Dr. Moriarty places the title, which he claims to have derived from the Pope, on exactly the same footing as a designation conferred by the law of this country. Dr. Moriarty subsequently said, in reply to the following Question:—

"As to the purely spiritual title and jurisdiction, exercised by a Roman Catholic bishop, say, in a Roman Catholic country, by the law of his Church is he supposed to possess any power of temporal punishment over the members of his Church?—Yes, he has power by the canon law to punish certain crimes, and to hold a court which implies compulsory jurisdiction; but it is quite obvious that such a power never can be exercised without the aid of the secular arm, and that if the secular arm refuses its aid, there is *de facto* an end of his compulsory jurisdiction."

Therefore it is only by the negation of such jurisdiction, as the Ecclesiastical Titles Act repels, that the power of the Papal Church has not become compulsory and coercive by means of the law of England. He is next asked this Question—

"If the Ecclesiastical Titles Act had not been passed, and if the Roman Catholic prelates had been allowed without any interference to assume the position of Bishops in ordinary, would they under the canon law have been allowed to possess that authority?"

He answers—

"Certainly not, for the State would not lend its aid."

The next Question asked was—

"How are they prevented from possessing it under the canon law?"

And the answer stands thus—

"Simply because you will not send your policeman to execute the power."

Yes, Sir; and that is what we, who desire to retain the Ecclesiastical Titles Act as declaratory of the common law, desire should continue. We do not wish to lend the police for any such purposes. The next Question asked was—

"Is it (temporal and coercive jurisdiction) possessed in other countries?—Yes. There are appointed officers of the Bishop's court, such as his beadle and his citator, and other officers, who are bound to execute his summons, and to bring persons before his court, because the civil law of the country permits them to do so."

Mr. Chichester Fortescue asked—

"You mean in countries where the Roman Catholic Church is the State Church?—I do."

I think, then, I have shown, from the evidence of this learned person, that the statement that this jurisdiction is merely spiritual is a mere quibble, since the object sought by this witness clearly is to release the Papal jurisdiction from the restraint of the law, which prevents its becoming here what it is elsewhere, coercive and temporal in its operation; and the statutes, which prevent this, a Committee of this House, I am sorry to say, has recommended us to abrogate. Nothing can, Sir, be more perfectly clear than that the position of this House is at this moment exactly analagous to that of the House of Commons some centuries ago: this appears from an extract I will read to the House, from a record of its own proceedings in former days, which is very much to the point. It is an extract from the Remonstrance of the Commons addressed to James I., in 1621, against his countenancing Popery—

"And from these causes, as bitter roots, we humbly offer to your Majesty, that we foresee and fear there will necessarily follow very dangerous effects both to Church and State, for—1. The Popish religion is incompatible with ours in respect of their positions. 2. It draweth with it an inviolable dependency on foreign Princes. 3. It openeth too wide a gap for popularity to any who shall draw too great a party. 4. It hath a restless spirit, and will strive by these gradations—if it once gets but a connivance it will press for a toleration; if that should be obtained they must have an equality, from thence they will aspire to superiority, and will never rest until they get a subversion of the true religion."

Could evidence be more directly in support of such a Remonstrance than that which I have quoted, as given before this Committee, which sat, comparatively speaking, but yesterday? Might not the House, with as good reason, adopt the substance of that Remonstrance now, as in the year 1621? I most deeply lament that these questions should be forced upon us. When I am forced by a sense of duty to resist the continual encroachments that are attempted by the advocates of the Papacy, I sometimes feel bitterly that some people are taught to regard me as an aggressor. It is now two years since I have originated any Motion in this House, touching or concerning Roman Catholic institutions, the Roman clergy, or the Roman Catholic laity. Two years ago I moved for an inquiry into monasteries and convents. Since then I have been too often compelled to intrude upon the attention of the House. I feel, therefore, that I owe my sincere thanks to the House for the indulgence that has been shown me. But why have I been contending thus? Because month after month, week after week, night after night, there has been carried on in this House a constant system of aggression, continual attacks have been made upon the institutions of this country. I thank the House for having allowed me thus to disavow any desire to attack my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. But with regard to this question of jurisdiction, there is another circumstance to which I would call the attention of the House and the Government. The evidence given before the

Committee is very astutely guarded. I shall not attempt to unravel the evidence of Dr. Manning or that of Dr. Ullathorne. Time and state of the House forbid my attempting this. But, Sir, these Roman Catholic prelates have their organs, and there is one especially, which was established, I understand, by Cardinal Wiseman, and which is certainly held to represent the views of the Ultramontane section of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in Ireland —I mean the *Dublin Review.* What is the character of the writing in that *Review?* In previous numbers there have been articles, and in that for the month of July there is an article in defence of the Papacy with respect to the Inquisition, from which I will read a few extracts in order to show the temper of the writing. The article is entitled *The Holy See and the Spanish Inquisition;* and is in continuance of other articles on the same subject. This is an example of the substance of the article—

> "The Popes of Rome claimed the right, founded in the infallible certainty of their being the exclusive repository of truth on earth, of despotically rebuking error, whatsoever form it might assume; and they discharged their divinely-imposed duty by erecting a tribunal to eradicate the odious heresy. . . . The successors of St. Peter merit the gratitude of mankind for the establishment of an institution whose wise and merciful administration of the powers delegated to it adverted the most desolating calamities from Christendom. . . The Spanish Inquisition has often been represented, by very ignorant or dishonest writers, as a despotism of the Church of Rome; but the despotism of the Inquisition from the time of its foundation, until its existence ended, aimed, on the contrary, at crushing the influence of Rome in Spain."

This apology is little better than a mere quibble. It is based upon certain differences between the Papacy and the Dominician Order, and the Court of Spain; but the Inquisition had the sanction of the Papacy, nevertheless, and this—the fact that questions as to jurisdiction and power arose and were contested by the local Inquisitors and Sovereigns with Rome—cannot be disproved. The *Review* continues—

> "The only check upon its cruelty was the determined perseverance with which the Sovereign Pontiffs interfered in behalf of mercy, and by remonstrances, mandates of grace, and even excommunication, moderated its excessive rigour."

I am sorry to say, Sir, that there is a very different story to be told on the other side, if the history of the Inquisition were inquired into. I do not deny that some Popes have restrained Inquisitors; but I cannot compare the conduct of the Papacy generally, with respect to the Inquisition, otherwise than to that of a man who, having regularly hired an assassin, complains that he is difficult to manage, and claims credit to himself for interfering to save the lives of one or two of his intended victims. The *Review* proceeds—

> "The activity of the Inquisition was mainly employed, during the 16th century, in excluding the curse of Protestantism from the Spanish peninsula. Superficial, heretical, and infidel writers have made the so-called fanaticism of Philip II., in maintaining Catholicity as the exclusive religion of Spain, a favourite theme of obloquy; but his piety and statesmanship in using the Inquisition to save his country from the bloody brood of sectaries that were desolating the rest of Europe, merit for him the name of a wise, well-intentioned, and good Christian Prince. . . . The claims made by the Church are of infallible certainty that all its teachings are true; that all other teachings are false, and that it is endowed with the right to exclude pernicious doctrine and punish heresy. . . . The first of these elements, guided by the sublimely merciful spirit of the Founder of Christianity, prevailed through the first epoch of the Inquisition. It checked the savage barbarity of State instincts, interposed a barrier between millions of souls and temporal and eternal destruction, and is the glory and pride of the Catholic Church. It was planned by the wisest of Popes, sanctioned by the most devout and merciful of saints, ruled over by the holiest and most disinterested of religious corporations, and accomplished ends, which Pagan Emperors and Christian Kings had, during long centuries, vainly sought to attain."

This shows that, whilst the Roman Catholic Church professes to aim at spiritual jurisdiction only, it will assign no limit to the temporal means and power it considers necessary to the extension of its *quasi*-ecclesiastical authority. There is a spirit in these writings which it would be unsafe to unloose. The present state of the Roman Catholic Church, the relations of the Papacy with Italy, and the laws of Italy prove this. The laws of France prove this. The able despatch of Prince Gortschakoff, which now lies upon the table of the House, giving a history of the relations of the Court of Russia with the Holy See for more than thirty years, proves this. I sincerely thank the House for the attention it has given me in the endeavour to show the House and my fellow-countrymen that no conclusion against these Acts of Parliament—the Ecclesiastical Titles Act and the analogous section of the Relief Act of 1829—can be safely drawn from the Report of a Committee which has heard direct evidence only on one side, and whose Report is, therefore, founded solely on *ex parte* evidence.

Mr. WHALLEY said, the course which had been pursued with reference to the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was unwarrantable, unjustifiable, and discreditable to the Government. That measure passed under remarkable circumstances in 1851, but was never enforced. It remained until the present day, when a Bill was brought in to repeal it. The Government never expressed any opinion upon that Bill, but referred it to a Select Committee, endeavouring to absolve itself from its fair responsibility. Now, what had been the course of that Committee? He brought before one of the members of that Committee—the hon. and learned Attorney General—the expediency of examining a gentleman named M'Gee, who had written a great deal upon the subject, which he thoroughly understood, showing the dangers impending over us by the assumption of authority, and by the proceedings of the Roman Catholic Church. The hon. and learned Gentleman fully acquiesced in the propriety of examining the Rev. Mr. M'Gee, and arrangements were made for that gentleman to give evidence; but he was never called before the Committee, and the Attorney General had told him (Mr. Whalley), a few days ago, that the reason why he had not considered it necessary to examine him was that it was only necessary for the parties promoting the repeal of the Act to establish their own case; and that as he did not think they had established their case it was not necessary to reply to it. Not only had the Government endeavoured to absolve themselves from responsibility in the matter by referring the question to a Committee, but their representative on the Committee, the Attorney General, thought fit to be absent when the Committee divided upon their Report, and the consequence was that a Report in favour of the Act was rejected, and a Report for repealing it affirmed by the casting vote of the Chairman. Altogether this was a state of things which he thought was without precedent. He protested against no evidence having been taken except on behalf of the promoters of the repeal of the Act, and against the course which had been taken by the Government in dealing with the matter.

Mr. WALPOLE: In replying to the remarks of my hon. Friend who has called the attention of the House to this matter, and the remarks of the hon. Member opposite, I think I shall best discharge my duty by not adverting to the general topics of theological and ecclesiastical controversy raised by my hon. Friend. At the same time, I feel it my duty to put the House in possession of the facts with reference to the proceedings taken before the Committee. With regard to the original appointment of that Committee I had very little to do. I was absent from London at the time it was appointed, and it was from no desire of my own that I was made a Member of it, because I knew that that kind of conversation would go on in Committee which it would be anything but pleasant to listen to. That Committee was not appointed for the purpose either of avoiding or coming to any foregone conclusion respecting any question which might be brought under their notice. The object of the Committee was, a Bill having been brought into the House on the subject, to consider the propriety of repealing the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, and whether there was anything in the operation of the law which practically weighed upon Roman Catholics, and which made it expedient that the law should be repealed or amended. That was the object of the appointment, and to my mind that was the only justifiable object for which the Committee could have been appointed. If the Committee had gone into questions of theological controversy, and had taken evidence on historical matters, they would have been instituting an inquiry which could have led to no practical result, because evidence could not be taken upon such matters which are open to the knowledge of every Member of this House, without any particular evidence respecting them being taken. And now, with regard to the proceedings of the Committee, I must confess there was one occurrence which I regret, as I think the House will do. I shall advert to this presently; but with reference to the general proceedings of the Committee, I may mention that evidence was taken on the part of those who moved for the Committee to establish their case by showing that the law was oppressive to the Roman Catholics. The Attorney General for Ireland, and three or four other Members of the Committee, including myself, arrived at the conclusion, after hearing the evidence, that no case of practical grievance had been made out, and that, therefore, there was no necessity for us to have any general evidence on questions of historical or theological controversy. That is the plain, simple truth of the case, and I believe that if we had prolonged the proceedings of the Committee, we should have had a most unpleasant, disagreeable, and unprofitable inquiry. As, however, I have already remarked, there is one circumstance which I regret as a misfortune, and which the other members of the Committee and the House generally will, I believe, also regret. I refer to the Petition which has been alluded to by my hon. Friend the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate). That Petition was not brought before the Committee from an unintentional mistake on the part of one or two of the officers of the House. Until we had reported, I, as a member of the Committee, was totally unaware that that Petition had been presented to the House and referred to the Committee, requesting that evidence might be taken in answer to the testimony which had been given against the Act. I believe that the Attorney General for Ireland was also ignorant of the fact that such a Petition had been presented. Owing to a mistake in some department of the House, it was not brought under the notice of the Committee, though whether it was submitted to the notice of the Chairman I am not quite certain. If we had known of that Petition we should, in my opinion, have been bound to have taken the evidence of persons who desired to urge reasons in favour of the Act. I think it was a great misfortune that the Petition was not brought under our notice, and also that such evidence was not tendered before the Committee, as it was not desirable to exclude testimony which any gentleman might desire to give. The evidence taken, I admit, is tendered only on one side, but is sufficient to enable the Committee to judge of the particular question referred to them, as to whether there is anything in the operation of the law bearing oppressively on Roman Catholics which requires either repeal or alteration? All the facts were presented in the evidence which was taken, and as that evidence is open to everybody, the case can be dealt with whenever it shall be again brought before the attention of the House in a much more full and complete manner than would have been the case if the question had not been referred to a Committee. You have now before you all the allegations made by able lawyers and ecclesiastics on the subject, and when you have a statement from such a gentleman as Mr. Hope Scott, who is perfectly conversant with all the facts of the case, and when you have also the answers given to those facts by the counter-evidence elicited from himself and others, I think the House could not have been in a better position to judge of the question. As regards the great question whether the Act should be repealed or not, and with regard to the historical and theological arguments to which my hon. Friend has so strikingly adverted, these are matters for discussion in this House, and when they are raised I shall be prepared to give my opinion upon them, though I always regret such subjects as these being brought forward. The Committee arrived at a conclusion in regard to which I was unfortunately in a minority; but the views of the minority are fully represented in the draft Report which I submitted to the Committee. On the whole, I think there is no reason to complain of the proceedings taken by the Committee, which I believe painfully and honestly discharged its duty, although I regret that the knowledge of the Petition having been presented was not brought under our notice.

MR. WHALLEY wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman, If the Committee were precluded from inquiring into any other matters except the practical inconveniences sustained by Roman Catholics? [" Order! "]

CASE OF MARTIN CUNCANON.

QUESTION.

MAJOR ANSON rose to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department a Question with regard to the sentence passed on a man named Cuncanon at the last Stafford Assizes. The hon. and gallant Member said, that a man named Martin Cuncanon was arrested at Lichfield a short time ago on the charge of having murdered his brother-in-law. It appeared that the two men had been out drinking, and had come home late at night in a state of intoxication. Cuncanon knocked down his brother-in-law, and left the house; the brother-in-law followed him, and shortly afterwards came back stabbed in the belly. Cuncanon was committed to the assizes on a charge of wilful murder, and the Grand Jury found a true bill against him for manslaughter. After a short trial, at which there was apparently no evidence to show that the death of the brother-in-law was an accident, Mr. Justice Shee, the presiding Judge, summed up in a very few words, and was reported to have directed the jury to the effect that it was quite clear that in a moment of excitement and slight anger the prisoner had stabbed his brother-in-law. The Judge, in sentencing the prisoner, said that if in a moment of anger the prisoner had struck his brother-in-law a blow, and death had resulted from it, he would have inflicted but a slight punishment; and considering the good character the prisoner had received, he felt justified in not pronouncing any very severe sentence; but still the prisoner had used a knife, and should be made an example of, and then, "to the astonishment of a crowded court," the learned Judge sentenced the prisoner to four months' imprisonment. That sentence had created a great deal of excitement in the district, and he (Major Anson) had been requested to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Home Department, Whether the case had been brought under his notice, or whether he was aware of any facts which justified the Judge in passing so lenient a sentence?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, that the case to which the hon. and gallant Member referred had not been in any way brought before him officially. Criminal cases only came under the notice of the Secretary of State upon an application for a remission or mitigation of sentence through the interposition of the mercy of the Crown, and were never submitted to his consideration on the ground that the sentence was too lenient. There might be complaints addressed to him with respect to the conduct of magistrates, but the action of the Judges did not come within his jurisdiction, and could only be reviewed by Parliament. The present case had not been brought before him, and he could not have formed any opinion upon it without having examined the Judge's notes of the trial. He had not, however, seen those notes, and he had no right to interfere in any way in the matter.

Mr. NEATE asked the right hon. Gentleman, whether there was not a Royal Commission of gaol delivery for every assize, and whether the Crown, in the exercise of its prerogative, might not omit from that Commission the name of any Judge who had forfeited its confidence?

Mr. GATHORNE HARDY said, he assumed that Her Majesty would only make out Her Commission to such persons as she might think would properly discharge the duties imposed upon them.

Motion *agreed to.*

House at rising to adjourn till *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter after Six o'clock, till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Saturday, August 17, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—County Courts Proceedings* (348); Friendly Societies* (349).

Committee—Courts of Referees* (340); Hours of Labour Regulation* (341); Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation, &c.* (322); Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses) (No. 2)* (330); Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* (323); Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* (295).

Report—Courts of Referees* (340); Hours of Labour Regulation* (341); Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation, &c.* (322); Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses) (No. 2)* (330); Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* (323); Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* (295).

Third Reading—Expiring Laws Continuance* (321); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; Companies Act (1862) Amendment* (333); Investment of Trust Funds* (246), and *passed.*

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate,

House adjourned at a quarter past Two o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, August 19, 1867.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Third Reading*—Courts of Referees* (340); Hours of Labour Regulation* (341); Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation, &c.* (322); Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances* (323); Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage* (295), and *passed.*

RITUALISM—THE ROYAL COMMISSION —REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS.

OBSERVATIONS.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY said, it might be some satisfaction to their Lordships to know that the Ritual Commission had now settled their first Report. Those of their Lordships who had read the Royal Commission would know that they had been enjoined by Her Majesty to report from time to time, and especially to take into their first consideration the subject of vestments. The Report on that subject had been agreed to. It would be immediately sent to absent Members of the Commission, to be signed by them, and then placed before Her Majesty. In what way it would be published afterwards he was not at liberty to say, as that rested entirely with the Government. But he thought he might say it was the wish of the Commissioners that it should be made public as soon as might be. He might add that not only the Report, but all the evidence on which it was founded was also ready to be produced. He thought it due to their Lordships to make this announcement.

CLERICAL VESTMENTS (No. 2) BILL.

(*The Earl of Shaftesbury.*)

(NO. 72.) SECOND READING.

On Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned Debate on the Second Reading of this Bill,

THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY said, that he would not withdraw the Bill, but would allow its life to expire with the life of the Session, only saying a few words in explanation of the course he had pursued in reference to the measure. It was clear that as soon as the Ritual Commission was appointed it became impossible for him to propose that the second reading of the Bill should be proceeded with, for, if he had, he would have been told that it was first of all desirable to wait for the Report of the Commission. He had therefore postponed the Bill from day to day in the hope that before long the Report of the Commission would be presented. It was on the 14th of May that the appointment of the Commission was promised, and its first sitting did not take place until the 17th of June. It was now beyond the 17th of August, and their Lordships had only that evening heard, simultaneously with the closing of the Session, that the Report was prepared. He was not going to pass any comment on this state of things, as he was satisfied that the country would pass a more severe censure on it than he could presume to do, for the Report was not ready until it was too late to take either the Bill or the Report into consideration. The country was far from indifferent with respect to this subject, as was shown by the number of Petitions which had been presented in favour of the Clerical Vestments Bill. They amounted to 1,120, while the Petitions against the measure only amounted to five. The course pursued by the Commission had not tended to abate suspicion, or allay irritation. He really thought that the Church of England stood in a worse position at the present moment than it had done when he first brought this matter forward. There was a large party in the Church, commonly called the High Church party, who thought that they could be severed from the State and still preserve the temporalities of the Church. That was just as impossible as for a man to walk this earth and not be subject to the laws of gravitation. Another party was still connected with the Church, but no longer so affectionately attached to it as formerly, for the indifference beginning to prevail among members of the Church of England was positively alarming. A third party, zealously and conscientiously attached to the Church of England, was anxious to maintain the Church in all its purity; but the prevailing sentiment among these was that they would rather have no Establishment at all than an Establishment apostate from the doctrines and discipline of the Reformation. He concluded by stating that he would now leave the Clerical Vestments Bill to lie on the table and to expire with the close of the Session.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY said, he thought it right, as the noble Earl had censured the Ritual Commission for not presenting the Report earlier, to state that the Commission had already had nineteen sittings, and had spared neither time nor labour in arriving at the conclusion it had come to, The question submitted to the Commission was one of the gravest character and of the greatest possible importance to the Church of England. A more important matter had not been brought under the consideration of a Commission since the Reformation; and it would have been improper to proceed with the investigation hastily and without receiving full evidence. He thought the noble Earl's censure undeserved, for the Commission had honestly and steadfastly discharged its duty.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON said, he felt bound to express his concurrence in what had fallen from the most reverend Prelate; and the noble Earl, if he had acceded to the proposal to be a member of the Commission, would have found that the labour of the Commission was hard work, and he would not have been surprised that it had occupied so long a time. There had been the most earnest desire on the part of the Commissioners to go into the matter fully and in as expeditious a way as possible; and if it should happen that the Session came to an end before the Report of the Commissioners appeared, that was no fault of theirs. No persons were more convinced than the Commissioners of the gravity of the circumstances, and of that fact the noble Earl would be convinced when he read the Report.

Further debate on the Motion for Second Reading *put off sine die.*

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, August 19, 1867.

The House met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at half after Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, August 20, 1867.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Third Reading*—Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses) (No.2)* (330), and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Consolidated Fund Appropriation [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 120]; District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 118]; Barrack Lane, Windsor (Rights of Way) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 109]; Industrial and Provident Societies [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 117]; Poor Law Board, &c. [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 106]; Canongate Annuity Tax (Edinburgh) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 107]; Guarantee of Government Officers [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 108]; Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act (1865) Amendment [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 116]; Sewage [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 113]; Admiralty Court (Ireland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 114]; Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 115]; Army Reserve [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 110]; Militia Reserve [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 111]; Public Works (Ireland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 112]; Naval Stores (No. 2) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 119]; Local Government Supplemental (No. 6) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 123]; Courts of Law Fees, &c. [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 122]; Turnpike Acts Continuance, &c. [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 121]; Merchant Shipping [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 124]; Contagious Diseases (Animals) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 125]; Railway Companies (Scotland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 126]; Railway Companies [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 127]; War Department Stores [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 128]; Agricultural Gangs [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 130]; Companies Act (1862) Amendment [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 131]; Investment of Trust Funds [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 132]; Consecration of Churchyards [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 133]; Traffic Regulation (Metropolis) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 134]; Consecration and Ordination Fees [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 135]; Courts of Referees [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 136]; Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation, &c. [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 137]; Railway Companies (Ireland) Advances [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 138]; Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 139]; Royal Military Canal [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 140]; Master and Servant [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 141]; County Courts Acts Amendment [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 142]; Expiring Laws Continuance [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 143]; Policies of Assurance [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 144]; Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 129].

Their Lordships met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, August 20, 1867.

The House met; and having gone through the Business on the Paper, without debate—

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, August 21, 1867.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Report*—On Ritual Commission [First Report].

PUBLIC BILLS—*Royal Assent*—Fortifications Provision for Expenses (No. 2) [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 145]; Hours of Labour Regulation [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 146].

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT. SPEECH OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The PARLIAMENT was this day prorogued by Commission.

The LORDS COMMISSIONERS — namely, The LORD CHANCELLOR; The DUKE OF RICHMOND (President of the Board of Trade); The LORD CHAMBERLAIN (The Earl of Bradford); The DUKE OF BEAUFORT (Master of the Horse); and The EARL of

Devon (President of the Poor Law Board)—being in their robes, and seated on a Form between the Throne and the Woolsack; and the Commons being come, with their Speaker, the Royal Assent was given to several Bills.

Then The LORD CHANCELLOR *delivered* the Speech of the Lords Commissioners as follows:—

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"I am happy to be enabled to release you from the Labours of a long and more than usually eventful Session, and to offer you My Acknowledgments for the successful Diligence with which you have applied yourselves to your Parliamentary Duties.

"My Relations with Foreign Countries continue on a friendly Footing.

"At the Commencement of the present Year great Fears were entertained that Differences which had arisen between *France* and *Prussia* might have led to a War of which it was impossible to foresee the ultimate Result. Happily the Advice tendered by My Government, and by those of the other neutral States, aided by the Moderation of the Two Powers chiefly interested, sufficed to avert the threatened Calamity; and I trust that no Ground at present exists for apprehending any Disturbance of the general Peace.

"The Communications which I have made to the reigning Monarch of *Abyssinia,* with a view to obtain the Release of the *British* Subjects whom he detains in his Dominions, have, I regret to say, thus far proved ineffectual. I have therefore found it necessary to address to him a peremptory Demand for their immediate Liberation, and to take Measures for supporting that Demand, should it ultimately be found necessary to resort to Force.

"The treasonable Conspiracy in *Ireland,* to which I have before called your Attention, broke out in the early Part of the present Year in a futile Attempt at Insurrection. That it was suppressed, almost without Bloodshed, is due not more to the disciplined Valour of My Troops, and to the admirable Conduct of the Police, than to the general Loyalty of the Population and the Absence of any Token of Sympathy with the Insurgents on the Part of any considerable Portion of My Subjects. I rejoice that the Supremacy of the Law was vindicated without imposing on Me the painful Necessity of sacrificing a single Life.

"The Bill for the Abolition of certain Local Exemptions from Taxation enabled Me to avail Myself of a liberal Concession made, in anticipation, by The Emperor of the *French,* whereby several Taxes were removed which pressed heavily upon *British* Shipping.

"I have concluded a Postal Convention with the United States of *America,* whereby the Rate of Postage between the Two Countries will be diminished by One Half, and further Arrangements are in progress for increasing the Intercourse between this Country and the Continent of *North America.*

"The Act for the Union of the *British North American* Provinces is the final Accomplishment of a Scheme long contemplated, whereby those Colonies, now combined in One Dominion, may be expected not only to gain additional Strength for the Purposes of Defence against external Aggression, but may be united among themselves by fresh Ties of mutual Interest, and attached to the Mother Country by the only Bonds which can effectually secure such important Dependencies, those of Loyalty to the Crown and Attachment to *British* Connexion.

"*Gentlemen of the House of Commons,*

"I thank you for the liberal Supplies which you have voted for the Public Service.

"*My Lords, and Gentlemen,*

"I have had great Satisfaction in giving My Assent to a Bill for amending the Representation of the People in Parliament. I earnestly trust that the extensive and liberal Measure which you have passed may effect a durable Settlement of a Question which has long engaged Public Attention; and that the large Number of My Subjects who will be for the First Time admitted to the Exercise of the Elective Franchise may, in the Discharge of the Duties thereby devolved upon them, prove themselves worthy of the Confidence which Parliament has reposed in them.

"It is gratifying to Me to find that the lengthened Consideration which you have necessarily given to this important Question has not prevented your entering on many Subjects to which your Attention was directed at the Commencement of the Session, and particularly to such as have immediate Reference to the Well-being of the Industrial Classes.

"I have had especial Pleasure in giving My Assent to Bills for extending to various Trades, with such Modifications as have been found necessary, the Provisions of the Factory Acts, the Success of which has proved the Possibility of combining effectual Protection to the Labour of Women and Children with a due Consideration for the Interests of the Trades immediately concerned.

"I confidently anticipate from the Operation of the present Acts the same Improvement in the Physical, Social, and Moral Condition of the Working Classes which has been found to accompany the Application of the Acts to those Trades to which they have been hitherto confined.

"The Restraints alleged to be imposed on Workmen and their Employers by Trade Unions and other Associations appeared to Me to call for Inquiry; and the Revelations derived from the Examinations before the Commission, to which you gave your Legislative Sanction, have disclosed a State of Things which will demand your most earnest Attention.

"The Administration of the Poor Laws, which generally has conferred great Benefit on the Community, and especially on the Poor themselves, requires constant Supervision; and I have readily assented to a Bill which, applied to the Metropolis alone, will tend to equalize the Pressure of Taxation and improve the Treatment of the Sick Poor, whose Condition will be greatly benefited by your well-considered Legislation.

"The Bill for the Regulation of the Merchant Shipping contains important Provisions calculated to add to the Health and Comfort of those engaged in the Mercantile Marine.

"These and other valuable Amendments of the Law have been the Result of your Labours during the present Session; and in returning to your Homes you will carry with you the gratifying Consciousness that your Time and Pains have not been misapplied, and that they have resulted in a Series of Measures which I hope and earnestly pray may contribute to the Welfare of the Country and the Contentment and Happiness of My People."

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Wednesday* the Sixth Day of *November* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Wednesday* the Sixth Day of *November* next.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, August 21, 1867.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* the College of the Holy Trinity of Dublin, *v.* The Right Hon. Hedges Eyre Chatterton, Vice Chancellor of Ireland.

NEW MEMBER SWORN—Henry Self Page Winterbotham, esquire, *for* Stroud.

The House met at half after One of the Clock.

REPORT OF THE RITUAL COMMISSION.

QUESTION.

MR. MONK, who had a Notice on the Paper to ask the Home Secretary, Whether he could give the House any information as to the progress made by the Ritual Commissioners, and when it was probable that their primary Report would be published? said, after the announcement made on Monday by the most rev. Prelate (the Archbishop of Canterbury) in "another place," it was unnecessary that he should ask the first part of that Question; but he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would be able to assure the House that the primary Report of the Commission would be made public as soon as possible.

MR. GATHORNE HARDY said, that in order that the Report might be printed as soon as possible, he had that day presented it informally to the House.

VAGRANCY IN THE METROPOLIS.

QUESTION.

LORD ELCHO asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether a large increase of vagrancy had not taken place in the Metropolis?

MR. GATHORNE HARDY admitted that the subject was worthy of attention, but he was not aware that a large increase of vagrancy had taken place in London, though undoubtedly there was a great amount of it existing there. There could be no doubt that the Houseless Poor Act gave encouragement to vagrancy of every kind, and that a great number of able-bodied men took advantage of it.

PROROGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT.

Message to attend The LORDS COMMISSIONERS.

The House went, and the ROYAL ASSENT was given to several Bills.

And afterwards a Speech of The LORDS COMMISSIONERS was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by THE LORD CHANCELLOR.

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said—

My Lords, and Gentlemen,

By virtue of Her Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in Her Majesty's Name, and in obedience to Her Commands, prorogue this Parliament to *Wednesday* the Sixth Day of *November* next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to *Wednesday* the Sixth Day of *November* next.

[TABLE OF STATUTES.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1867.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 30 July 1867;—*for*,

A RETURN "of the Number of DAYS on which THE HOUSE SAT in the Session of 1867, stating, for each Day, the Date of the Month, and the Day of the Week, the Hour of Meeting, and the Hour of Adjournment; and the Total Number of Hours occupied in the Sittings of the House, and the Average Time; and showing the Number of Hours on which The House Sat each Day, and the Number of Hours after Midnight; and the Number of Entries in each Day's Votes and Proceedings (in Continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.111, of Session 1866)."

(*Mr. Charles Forster.*)

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1867			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
Feb. 5	Tu	1½	7	0	5	30	-	-	33
,, 6	W	12	12	45	0	45	-	-	19
,, 7	Th	4	7	30	3	30	-	-	240
,, 8	F	4	9	45	5	45	-	-	215
,, 11	M	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	77
,, 12	Tu	4	6	30	2	30	-	-	88
,, 13	W	12	4	15	4	15	-	-	159
,, 14	Th	4	7	15	3	15	-	-	62
,, 15	F	4	8	45	4	45	-	-	72
,, 18	M	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	115
,, 19	Tu	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	44
,, 20	W	12	4	45	4	45	-	-	48
,, 21	Th	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	62
,, 22	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	60
,, 25	M	4	11	45	7	45	-	-	69
,, 26	Tu	4	11	0	7	0	-	-	53
,, 27	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	34
,, 28	Th	4	10	45	6	45	-	-	61
Total...	18	- -	-	-	99	35	2	0	1,511

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1867			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
Apr. 1	M	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	97
,, 2	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	94
,, 3	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	36
,, 4	Th	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	98
,, 5	F	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	103
,, 8	M	4	10	0	6	0	-	-	111
,, 9	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	81
,, 10	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	43
,, 11	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	97
,, 12	F	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	93
	Adjourned till Monday, 29th April.								
,, 29	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	119
,, 30	Tu	4	8	0	4	0	-	-	105
Total...	12	- -	-	-	96	25	10	45	1,077

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
Mar. 1	F	4	9	30	5	30	-	-	62
,, 4	M	4	8	0	4	0	-	-	57
,, 5	Tu	4	11	45	7	45	-	-	51
,, 6	W	2	3	0	1	0	-	-	25
,, 7	Th	4	11	30	7	30	-	-	71
,, 8	F	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	62
,, 11	M	4	11	45	7	45	-	-	68
,, 12	Tu	4	5	45	1	45	-	-	68
,, 13	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	47
,, 14	Th	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	73
,, 15	F	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	83
,, 18	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	82
,, 19	Tu	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	79
,, 20	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	55
,, 21	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	73
,, 22	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	87
,, 25	M	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	106
,, 26	T	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	91
,, 27	W	12	5	58	5	58	-	-	48
,, 28	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	94
,, 29	F	4	12	30	8	30	0	30	93
Total...	21	- -	-	-	151	48	10	45	1,475

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
May 1	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	46
,, 2	Th	4	9	0	5	0	-	-	78
,, 3	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	88
,, 6	M	4	12	15	8	15	0	15	91
,, 7	Tu	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	99
,, 8	W	12	5	45	5	45	-	-	46
,, 9	Th	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	89
,, 10	F	4	5	15	1	15	-	-	55
,, 13	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	93
,, 14	Tu	4	9	0	5	0	-	-	88
,, 15	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	50
,, 16	Th	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	87
,, 17	F	4	12	45	8	45	0	45	78
,, 20	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	85
,, 21	Tu	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	94
	Adjourned till Thursday, 23rd May.								
,, 23	Th	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	116
,, 24	F	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	76
,, 27	M	4	11	45	7	45	-	-	100
,, 28	Tu	2	9	5	7	5	-	-	59
,, 29	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	66
,, 30	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	87
,, 31	F	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	79
Total...	22	- -	-	-	174	40	19	15	1,750

Month.	Day.	House met.	House adjourned.		Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
1867			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
June 3	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	124
„ 4	Tu	2	1	15	11	15	1	15	90
„ 5	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	51
„ 6	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	101
„ 7	F	4	1	0	9	0	1	0	82
	Adjourned till Thursday, June 13.								
„ 13	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	86
„ 14	F	2	1	0	11	0	1	0	67
„ 17	M	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	100
„ 18	Tu	2	1	30	11	30	1	30	96
„ 19	W	12	5	55	5	5	-	-	58
„ 20	Th	4	1	15	9	15	1	15	87
„ 21	F	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	56
„ 24	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	97
„ 25	Tu	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	58
„ 26	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	42
„ 27	Th	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	82
„ 28	F	2	2	0	12	0	2	0	71
Total...	17	- -	-	-	164	20	23	30	1,348
July 1	M	4	1	45	9	45	1	45	76
„ 2	Tu	2	1	15	11	15	1	15	71
„ 3	W	12	5	30	5	30	-	-	38
„ 4	Th	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	74
„ 5	F	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	47
„ 8	M	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	113
„ 9	Tu	2	1	0	11	0	1	0	73
„ 10	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	36
„ 11	Th	4	8	15	4	15	-	-	81
„ 12	F	2	3	0	13	0	3	0	67
„ 15	M	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	126
1867			H.	M.	H.	M.	H.	M.	
July 16	Tu	4	9	15	5	15	-	-	55
—*cont.*	Adjourned till Thursday, 18th July.								
„ 18	Th	12	5	59	5	59	-	-	88
„ 19	F	12	5	59	5	59	-	-	82
„ 22	M	4	2	0	10	0	2	0	137
„ 23	Tu	12	8	0	8	0	-	-	44
„ 24	W	12	5	55	5	55	-	-	72
„ 25	Th	4	3	15	11	15	3	15	85
„ 26	F	4	1	30	9	30	1	30	85
„ 29	M	4	2	45	10	45	2	45	100
„ 30	Tu	2	9	10	7	10	-	-	58
„ 31	W	12	6	0	6	0	-	-	61
Total...	22	- -	-	-	188	23	24	30	1,669
Aug. 1	Th	4	2	45	10	45	2	45	82
„ 2	F	12	3	0	15	0	3	0	61
„ 5	M	4	2	30	10	30	2	30	83
„ 6	T	2	1	30	11	30	1	30	71
„ 7	W	12	5	45	5	45	-	-	38
„ 8	Th	4	2	15	10	15	2	15	73
„ 9	F	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	55
„ 10	S	12	1	45	1	45	-	-	20
„ 12	M	4	3	0	11	0	3	0	57
„ 13	Tu	2	2	15	12	15	2	15	78
„ 14	W	12	5	50	5	50	-	-	50
„ 15	Th	2	1	45	11	45	1	45	59
„ 16	F	3	6	15	3	15	-	-	52
„ 19	M	3½	4	30	1	0	-	-	29
„ 20	Tu	12	12	45	0	45	-	-	18
„ 21	W	1½	Prorogation.				-	-	21
Total...	16	- -	-	-	167	50	21	15	847

SUMMARY.

Month.	Days of Sitting.	Hours of Sitting.		Hours after Midnight.		Entries in Votes.
		H.	M.	H.	M.	
February......	18	99	35	2	0	1,511
March.........	21	151	48	10	45	1,475
April	12	96	25	10	45	1,077
May	22	174	40	19	15	1,750
June...........	17	164	20	23	30	1,348
July	22	188	23	24	30	1,669
August...	16	167	50	21	15	847
Total......	128	1,043	1	112	0	9,677

Average Time of Sitting, 8 Hours, $8\frac{117}{128}$ Minutes.

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE, SESSION 1867.

(PARL. PAPER 0·145.)

SUMMARY.

Number of Divisions on Public Business before Midnight	109
Ditto „ „ „ after Midnight	55
Ditto—Private Business	0
Total Number of Divisions in Session 1867	164

A

TABLE OF ALL THE STATUTES

PASSED IN THE SECOND SESSION OF

THE NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

30° & 31° *VICT.*

PUBLIC GENERAL ACTS.

I. AN Act to further continue the Act of the Twenty-ninth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty, Chapter One, intituled *An Act to empower the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of* Ireland *to apprehend, and detain for a limited Time, such Persons as he or they shall suspect of conspiring against Her Majesty's Person and Government.*

II. An Act for removing Doubts as to the Validity of certain Marriages between *British* Subjects at *Odessa.*

III. An Act for the Union of *Canada, Nova Scotia,* and *New Brunswick,* and the Government thereof; and for Purposes connected therewith.

IV. An Act to apply the Sum of Three hundred and sixty-nine thousand one hundred and eighteen Pounds Five Shillings and Sixpence out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Years ending the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-six and the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven.

V. An Act to repeal the Duties of Assessed Taxes on Dogs, and to impose in lieu thereof a Duty of Excise.

VI. An Act for the Establishment in the Metropolis of Asylums for the Sick, Insane, and other Classes of the Poor, and of Dispensaries; and for the Distribution over the Metropolis of Portions of the Charge for Poor Relief; and for other Purposes relating to Poor Relief in the Metropolis.

VII. An Act to apply the Sum of Seven million nine hundred and twenty-four thousand Pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year ending the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight.

VIII. An Act for facilitating in certain Cases the Proceedings of the Commissioners appointed to make Inquiry respecting Trades Unions and other Associations of Employers or Workmen.

IX. An Act to open the Professorships of Anatomy and Chirurgery, Chemistry and Botany, in the University of *Dublin,* to all Persons irrespective of their religious Creed; and to amend the Act 40 *Geo.* 3. (*Ireland*), Chapter Eighty-four.

X. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Duties and Drawbacks on Sugar.

XI. An Act to facilitate the Recovery of Arrears of Alimony in certain Cases under Decrees and Orders of the Provincial and Diocesan Courts in *Ireland.*

XII. An Act to amend the Law relating to Criminal Lunatics.

XIII. An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better Payment of the Army and their Quarters.

XIV. An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on shore.

XV. An Act for the Abolition of certain Exemptions from Local Dues on Shipping and on Goods carried in Ships.

XVI. An Act for authorizing a Guarantee of Interest on a Loan to be raised by *Canada* towards the Construction of a Railway connecting *Quebec* and *Halifax*.

XVII. An Act to regulate the Court and Office of the Lyon King of Arms in *Scotland*, and the Emoluments of the Officers of the same.

XVIII. An Act for the Preservation and further Protection of Oyster Fisheries.

XIX. An Act to amend the Petty Sessions Act (*Ireland*), 1851, as to the backing of Warrants.

XX. An Act to authorize the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales*.

XXI. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Gainsborough, Farsley, Bideford, Canterbury, Chepping Wycombe, Worthing*, and *Wednesfield;* and for other Purposes relative to certain Districts under that Act.

XXII. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Land Drainage Act, 1861."

XXIII. An Act to grant and alter certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue, and for other Purposes relating thereto.

XXIV. An Act to amend an Act of the Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth Years of Her present Majesty, Chapter Sixty-one, for providing a further Sum towards defraying the Expenses of constructing Fortifications for the Protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards and the Ports of *Dover* and *Portland*, and of creating a Central Arsenal.

XXV. An Act to further continue the Act of the Twenty-ninth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty, Chapter One, intituled *An Act to empower the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of* Ireland *to apprehend, and detain for a limited Time, such Persons as he or they shall suspect of conspiring against Her Majesty's Person and Government.*

XXVI. An Act to provide for the Conversion of Twenty-four million Pounds Sterling of the National Debt into Terminable Annuities.

XXVII. An Act to allow Warehoused *British* Spirits to be bottled for Home Consumption.

XXVIII. An Act to amend "The Labouring Classes Dwellings Acts, 1866."

XXIX. An Act to amend the Law in respect of the Sale and Purchase of Shares in Joint Stock Banking Companies.

XXX. An Act to apply the Sum of Fourteen million Pounds out of the Consolidated Fund to the Service of the Year ending on the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight.

XXXI. An Act for raising the Sum of One million seven hundred thousand Pounds by Exchequer Bonds for the Service of the Year ending on the Thirty-first Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight.

XXXII. An Act to authorize further Advances of Money out of the Consolidated Fund for carrying on Public Works and Fisheries and for the Employment of the Poor; for the Purposes of the Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Acts, 1863, 1864; and to amend the Acts authorizing Advances for Public Works.

XXXIII. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to *Balbriggan, Cromer, Dingwall, Girvan, Rothesay*, and *Seaford*.

XXXIV. An Act for limiting the Period of Enlistment in Her Majesty's Army.

XXXV. An Act to remove some Defects in the Administration of the Criminal Law.

XXXVI. An Act to authorize the Quarter Sessions of the Peace for the Borough and City of *Chester* and County of the same City, and the Portmote and Pentice Courts for the City of *Chester*, to be held at the Castle of *Chester*, and to confer additional Powers upon the Sheriff of the County of *Chester* in exoneration of the Sheriff of the City of *Chester*.

XXXVII. An Act to amend and consolidate the Public Libraries Acts (*Scotland*).

XXXVIII. An Act for the Preservation of *Bunhill Fields* Burial Ground in the County of *Middlesex* as an open Space; and for other Purposes relating thereto.

XXXIX. An Act for amending the Law with respect to the Accounts of the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District; and for other Purposes relating to the Metropolitan Police.

XL. An Act to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Works and Public Buildings to acquire Lands for the Purposes of the New Palace at *Westminster*, and to construct an Embankment on the North Shore of the River *Thames* in the Parish of *Saint John the Evangelist, Westminster*.

XLI. An Act to make further Provision for the Enlargement of the National Gallery.

XLII. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Landlord's Right of Hypothec in *Scotland*, in so far as respects Land held for Agricultural or Grazing Purposes.

XLIII. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (*Ireland*) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same.

XLIV. An Act to amend the Constitution, Practice, and Procedure of the Court of Chancery in *Ireland*.

XLV. An Act to extend and amend the Vice-Admiralty Courts Act, 1863.

XLVI. An Act to amend the Law relating to the Office of County Treasurer in *Ireland*.

XLVII. An Act to amend the Companies Act, 1862, and also the Act passed in the Session held in the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Years of the Reign of Her Majesty, intituled *An Act to simplify and amend the Practice as to the Entry of Satisfaction on Crown Debts and on Judgments.*

XLVIII. An Act for amending the Law of Auctions of Estates.

XLIX. An Act to confirm a certain Provisional Order under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the District of *Halifax;* and for other Purposes relative to the said District under that Act.

L. An Act to afford further Facilities for the Erection of certain Bridges in *Ireland*.

LI. An Act to appoint additional Commissioners for executing the Acts for granting a Land Tax and other Rates and Taxes.

LII. An Act to alter and amend the Acts relating to the *British* White Herring Fishery.

LIII. An Act to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to compound the Public Debt and Interest due by the *Limerick* Harbour Commissioners, and to make Arrangements for the Payment of the Amount for which such Debt is to be compounded; and for the

Transfer of *Wellesley Bridge* in the City of *Limerick* to the Commissioners of Public Works; and for other Purposes.

LIV. An Act to amend the Law of Charitable Donations and Bequests in *Ireland*.

LV. An Act to enlarge for the present Year the Time within which certain Certificates regarding Lunatics in *Scotland* may be granted.

LVI. An Act to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to compound the public Debt and Interest due by the *Galway* Harbour Commissioners, and to make Arrangements for the Payment of the Amounts for which such Debt and another Debt are to be compounded; and for other Purposes.

LVII. An Act to authorize the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to compound the Public Debt due by the Commissioners of the Bridge across the River *Blackwater* near the Town of *Youghal* in the County of *Cork*, and for the Transfer of the said Bridge to the Grand Juries of the Counties of *Cork* and *Waterford;* and for other Purposes relating thereto.

LVIII. An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under the General Police and Improvement (*Scotland*) Act, 1862, relating to the City of *Edinburgh*.

LIX. An Act for further promoting the Revision of the Statute Law by repealing certain Enactments which have ceased to be in force or have become unnecessary.

LX. An Act to amend certain Acts relating to Linen, Hempen, and other Manufactures in *Ireland*.

LXI. An Act for confirming a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade relating to the Construction of a Pier at *Cleethorpes* in the County of *Lincoln*.

LXII. An Act to abolish a certain Declaration, commonly called the Declaration against Transubstantiation, the Invocation of the Saints, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as practised in the Church of *Rome;* and to render it unnecessary to take, make, or subscribe the same as a Qualification for the Exercise or Enjoyment of any Civil Office, Franchise, or Right.

LXIII. An Act for the Appointment of a Stipendiary Magistrate for *Chatham* and *Sheerness* in the County of *Kent*.

LXIV. An Act to make further Provision for the Despatch of Business in the Court of Appeal in Chancery.

LXV. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Sheffield*, *Derby*, *Sherborne*, *Royton*, *Bedford* (*Lancashire*), *Slough*, *Sandown*, *Burton-upon-Trent*, *West Cowes*, and *Accrington*.

LXVI. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made under an Act of the Fifteenth Year of Her present Majesty, to facilitate Arrangements for the Relief of Turnpike Trusts.

LXVII. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Oswaldtwistle*, *Devizes*, *Layton-with-Warbrick* (*Blackpool*), and *Harrogate;* and for other Purposes relative to certain Districts under the said Act.

LXVIII. An Act to provide for the better Despatch of Business in the Chambers of the Judges of the Superior Courts of Common Law.

LXIX. An Act to explain the Operation of an Act passed in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Years of Her present Majesty, Chapter One hundred and thirteen, intituled *An Act to amend the Law relating to the Administration of deceased Persons.*

LXX. An Act to provide for keeping safely the Public Records of *Ireland*.

LXXI. An Act to authorize the Inclosure of certain Lands in pursuance of a Special Report of the Inclosure Commissioners for *England* and *Wales*.

LXXII. An Act for abolishing the Office of Vice-President of the Board of Trade and substituting a Secretary with a Seat in Parliament.

LXXIII. An Act for confirming certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to *Bray* and *Irvine*.

LXXIV. An Act to extend the "Trades Union Commission Act, 1867."

LXXV. An Act to remove certain Religious Disabilities affecting some of Her Majesty's Subjects, and to amend the Law relating to Oaths of Office.

LXXVI. An Act to repeal certain Ordinances made for the Cathedral or House of *Christ Church* in *Oxford* by the Commissioners appointed under the *Oxford University* Act, 1854, and to substitute a new Ordinance in lieu thereof.

LXXVII. An Act to validate certain Proceedings of the Grand Jury of the County of *Wexford*.

LXXVIII. An Act to amend The *Tyne* Pilotage Order Confirmation Act, 1865.

LXXIX. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The General Police and Improvement (*Scotland*) Act, 1862," relating to the Burgh of *Dundee*.

LXXX. An Act to define the Duties of the Assessor of Railways in *Scotland* in making up the Valuation Roll of Railways, and to amend in certain respects the Valuation of Lands (*Scotland*) Acts.

LXXXI. An Act to simplify the Forms of Prorogation during the Recess of Parliament.

LXXXII. An Act to alter certain Duties and to amend the Laws relating to the Customs.

LXXXIII. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Ramsgate*, *Tunbridge Wells*, *Bognor*, *Newport*, *Chesterfield*, *Malvern*, *Great Harwood*, and *Barrow;* and for other Purposes relating to certain Districts under that Act.

LXXXIV. An Act to consolidate and amend the Laws relating to Vaccination.

LXXXV. An Act to include the whole of the Burgh of *Galashiels* within the County, Sheriffdom, and Commissariot of *Selkirk*.

LXXXVI. An Act to alter certain Duties of Customs in the *Isle of Man*.

LXXXVII. An Act to facilitate the Transaction of Business in the Chambers of the Judges of the High Court of Chancery, and in the Offices of the Registrars and Accountant General of the said Court, and in Lunacy.

LXXXVIII. An Act to indemnify such Persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for Offices and Employments, and to extend the Time limited for those Purposes respectively.

LXXXIX. An Act to render perpetual an Act passed in the Session holden in the Twenty-seventh and Twenty-eighth Years of Her present Majesty, intituled *An Act to permit for a limited Period Compositions for Stamp Duty on Bank Post Bills of Five Pounds and upwards in* Ireland.

XC. An Act to alter certain Duties and to amend the Laws relating to the Inland Revenue.

XCI. An Act to authorize an Alteration in the Mode of Repayment of a Loan made by the *West India* Relief Commissioners to the Island of *Dominica*.

XCII. An Act to defray the Charge of the Pay, Clothing, and contingent and other Expenses of the Disembodied Militia in *Great Britain* and *Ireland;* to grant Allowances in certain Cases to Subaltern Officers, Adjutants, Paymasters, Quartermasters, Surgeons, Assistant Surgeons, and Surgeon's Mates of the Militia; and to authorize the Employment of the Non-Commissioned Officers.

XCIII. An Act to legalize certain Marriages solemnized at *Morro Velho* in *Brazil*.

XCIV. An Act to provide for the Inspection of Weights and Measures, and to regulate the Law relating thereto in certain Parts of the Police District of *Dublin* Metropolis.

XCV. An Act to amend the Laws regulating the Superannuation Allowances of the *Dublin* Metropolitan Police.

XCVI. An Act to facilitate the Recovery of certain Debts in the Sheriff Courts in *Scotland*.

XCVII. An Act to facilitate the Administration of Trusts in *Scotland*.

XCVIII. An Act to make better Provision for the Administration of the Patriotic Fund.

XCIX. An Act for confirming an amended Scheme of the Charity Commissioners for the Charity called Sir *John Port's* Hospital in *Etwall* and School in *Repton* in the County of *Derby*.

C. An Act to make further Provision respecting the Naval Knights of *Windsor*.

CI. An Act to consolidate and amend the Law relating to the Public Health in *Scotland*.

CII. An Act further to amend the Laws relating to the Representation of the People in *England* and *Wales*.

CIII. An Act for the Extension of the Factory Acts.

CIV. An Act to amend and extend as to Railways in *Ireland* the Provisions of an Act of the Seventh and Eighth Years of *Victoria*, intituled *An Act to attach certain Conditions to the Construction of future Railways authorized or to be authorized by any Act of the present or succeeding Sessions of Parliament; and for other Purposes in relation to Railways.*

CV. An Act to establish Equitable Councils of Conciliation to adjust Differences between Masters and Workmen.

CVI. An Act to make the Poor Law Board permanent, and to provide sundry Amendments in the Laws for the Relief of the Poor.

CVII. An Act to uncollegiate the Parish of *Canongate* within the Parliamentary Burgh of *Edinburgh*, to reduce the Amount of the Annuity Tax within the said Parish, and to make Provision for the Maintenance of Two Ministers therein.

CVIII. An Act to provide for the Guarantee of Persons holding Situations of Trust under Government by Companies, Societies, or Associations.

CIX. An Act for extinguishing certain Rights of Way over and along *Barrack Lane* in the Borough of *New Windsor* in the County of *Berks*.

CX. An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts for rendering effective the Service of *Chelsea* and Naval Out-Pensioners and Pensioners of the *East India* Company, and for establishing a Reserve Force of Men who have been in Her Majesty's Service.

CXI. An Act to form a Reserve of Men in the Militia to join Her Majesty's Army in the event of War.

CXII. An Act to provide further Facilities for the Repair of Roads, Bridges, and other Public Works in *Ireland* in case of sudden Damage.

CXIII. An Act for facilitating the Distribution of Sewage Matter over Land, and otherwise amending the Law relating to Sewer Authorities.

CXIV. An Act to extend the Jurisdiction, alter and amend the Procedure and Practice, and to regulate the Establishment of the Court of Admiralty in *Ireland*.

CXV. An Act to remove Disqualifications of Justices of the Peace in certain Cases.

CXVI. An Act to amend the Act of the Twenty-eighth and Twenty-ninth *Victoria*, Chapter Fifty, for regulating the keeping of Dogs, and for the Protection of Sheep and other Property from Dogs, in *Ireland*.

CXVII. An Act to amend the Industrial and Provident Societies Acts.

CXVIII. An Act to provide for the Appointment of the Officers and Servants of District Lunatic Asylums in *Ireland*, and to alter and amend the Law relating to the Custody of dangerous Lunatics and dangerous Idiots in *Ireland*.

CXIX. An Act for the Protection of Naval Stores.

CXX. An Act to apply a Sum out of the Consolidated Fund and the Surplus of Ways and Means to the Service of the Year ending the Thirty-First Day of *March* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament.

CXXI. An Act to continue certain Turnpike Acts in *Great Britain*, to repeal certain other Turnpike Acts, and to make further Provisions concerning Turnpike Roads.

CXXII. An Act for the Application of Surplus Fees paid by Suitors in the Superior Courts of Law and other Courts towards the Expenses of providing the intended Courts of Justice; and for other Purposes.

CXXIII. An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders under "The Local Government Act, 1858," relating to the Districts of *Exeter*, *Devonport*, *Reading*, *Warley*, and *Midgley*, and for other Purposes relative to certain Districts under the said Act.

CXXIV. An Act to amend The Merchant Shipping Act, 1854.

CXXV. An Act to continue and amend the Acts relating to Contagious or Infectious Diseases among Cattle and other Animals.

CXXVI. An Act to amend the Law relating to Railway Companies in *Scotland*.

CXXVII. An Act to amend the Law relating to Railway Companies.

CXXVIII. An Act for the Protection of War Department Stores.

CXXIX. An Act to alter and regulate the Official Establishment of the High Court of Chancery and of the Superior Courts of Common Law in *Ireland*.

CXXX. An Act for the Regulation of Agricultural Gangs.

CXXXI. An Act to amend "The Companies Act, 1862."

CXXXII. An Act to remove Doubts as to the Power of Trustees, Executors, and Administrators to invest Trust Funds in certain Securities, and to declare and amend the Law relating to such Investments.

CXXXIII. An Act relating to the Consecration of Churchyards.

CXXXIV. An Act for regulating the Traffic in the Metropolis, and for making Provision for the greater Security of Persons passing through the Streets, and for other Purposes.

CXXXV. An Act for the Establishment of a Table of Fees to be taken on the Consecration of Churches, Chapels, and Burial Grounds, on the Ordination of Deacons and Priests, and on Visitations.

CXXXVI. An Act to enable the Courts of Referees to administer Oaths and award Costs in certain Cases, in the same Manner as Committees on Private Bills.

CXXXVII. An Act to validate certain Orders made by the Lord Lieutenant in Council under the Church Temporalities Acts in *Ireland*, and to increase the Stipends payable by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for *Ireland* to certain Incumbents in *Ireland*.

CXXXVIII. An Act to authorize the Extension of the Period for Repayment of Advances made under The Railway Companies (*Ireland*) Temporary Advances Act, 1866.

CXXXIX. An Act to confirm Provisional Orders for the *Quinagh* and *Parsonstown* Drainage Districts respectively.

CXL. An Act to authorize a Sale or Lease of the Royal Military Canal and its collateral Works; and for other Purposes.

CXLI. An Act to amend the Statute Law as between Master and Servant.

CXLII. An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Jurisdiction of the County Courts.

CXLIII. An Act to continue various expiring Laws.

CXLIV. An Act to enable Assignees of Policies of Life Assurance to sue thereon in their own Names.

CXLV. An Act for providing a further Sum towards defraying the Expenses of constructing Fortifications for the Protection of the Royal Arsenals and Dockyards and the Ports of *Dover* and *Portland*.

CXLVI. An Act for regulating the Hours of Labour for Children, Young Persons, and Women employed in Workshops; and for other Purposes relating thereto.

LOCAL AND PERSONAL ACTS,

DECLARED PUBLIC,

AND TO BE JUDICIALLY NOTICED.

i. AN Act to amend an Act passed in the Thirteenth Year of Her Majesty's Reign, intituled *An Act to amend an Act passed in the Eleventh Year of the Reign of King* George *the First, for regulating Elections within the City of* London, *and for preserving the Peace, good Order, and Government of the said City.*

ii. An Act for more effectually lighting *New Windsor* and its Neighbourhood with Gas.

iii. An Act to enable the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City of London to borrow a further Sum of Money on the Security of the *Bridge House* Estates, to complete the rebuilding of *Blackfriars Bridge,* and for the Purchase of *Southwark Bridge;* and for other Purposes.

iv. An Act for conferring Powers on the *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire* Railway Company with respect to the Construction and Abandonment of Works, and in relation to their Capital; and for conferring other Powers on that Company and on the *South Yorkshire* Railway Company in relation to the *Trent, Ancholme, and Grimsby* Railway; and for other Purposes.

v. An Act to empower the *Southwark and Vauxhall* Water Company to raise further Money; to acquire additional Land; and for other Purposes.

vi. An Act to extend the Time limited for completing the Works of the *Milford Haven* Dock and Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

vii. An Act providing for the Management, Improvement, and better Government, and for extending the Objects and regulating the Appropriation of the Income, of the Hospital of *Saint Mary Magdalene* in the Town and County of *Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

viii. An Act for regulating the Capital and Debt of the *South-eastern* Railway Company, and for other Purposes, and of which the Short Title is "*South-eastern* Railway (Capital) Act, 1867."

ix. An Act to authorize the *Northumberland Central* Railway Company to abandon a Portion of their authorized Line; and for other Purposes.

x. An Act for the Improvement of Roads, Sewers, and other Works in the Parish of *Saint Mary* in the Borough of *Nottingham;* and for other Purposes.

xi. An Act to enable "the *Scarborough* Gas Company" to raise a further Sum of Money; and for other Purposes.

xii. An Act to incorporate "The *Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool* Gaslight Company (Limited)," by the Name of "The *Sutton, Southcoates, and Drypool* Gas Company," and to make further Provision for lighting with Gas the District now lighted by the Company and adjoining Places in the Borough of *Kingston-upon-Hull* and in the East Riding of the County of *York;* to authorize the raising of additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

xiii. An Act for better lighting with Gas the Borough of *Kidderminster,* and certain Parishes and Places adjacent thereto, in the County of *Worcester.*

xiv. An Act to make Alterations in the Deed of Settlement of the *Metropolitan* Life Assurance Society.

xv. An Act for extending the Limits of "The *Barnsley* Gas Act, 1852," and for authorizing the *Barnsley* Gas Company to construct new Works and raise more Money; and for other Purposes.

xvi. An Act to extend the Time for the Completion of Works authorized by the *Garstang and Knot End* Railway Act, 1864.

xvii. An Act to authorize the *Stratford-upon-Avon* Gas Company to raise further Capital; and for other Purposes.

xviii. An Act to incorporate a Company for better supplying with Gas the Town and Parish of *Barking,* except that Part of it known as *Great Ilford* Ward, and the Parish of *Dagenham* in the County of *Essex,* and the Neighbourhood thereof; and for other Purposes.

xix. An Act for the better Regulation of the Market at *Exmouth* in the County of *Devon,* and for other Purposes, and of which the Short Title is "*Exmouth* Market Act, 1867."

xx. An Act for better supplying with Water Part of the Parish of *Fisherton Anger* and the Tything of *Bemerton* in the County of *Wilts.*

xxi. An Act for better supplying with Water the Parish of *Paignton* in the County of *Devon.*

xxii. An Act to authorize the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Town of *Brighton* to borrow further Sums of Money for improving the *Pavilion* Estate; and for other Purposes.

xxiii. An Act for the Union of the Prisons of the County of *Worcester* and of the City and County of the City of *Worcester;* and for other Purposes.

xxiv. An Act for authorizing the *South Shields* Gas Company to extend their Works and increase their Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxv. An Act to authorize the Dock Company at *Kingston-upon-Hull* further to enlarge the Works connected with the Western Dock; and to acquire additional Lands in connection with such Dock; and for other Purposes.

xxvi. An Act for vesting the Glebe Lands and Endowments of the Rectory of *Bishop Wearmouth* in the County and Diocese of *Durham* in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for *England,* and for making Provision for the Endowment of the said Rectory in lieu thereof; and for the Promotion of other Eccesiastical Purposes connected therewith.

xxvii. An Act for authorizing the Acquisition by the *Midland* Railway Company of Land and Property of the *Derby* Gaslight and Coke Company, and the Sale by the *Midland* Railway Company to the *Derby* Gaslight and Coke Company of other Lands, and for the Erection of Gas Works thereon; and for other Purposes.

xxviii. An Act to alter and amend the Acts relating to the *Atlantic* Telegraph Company; to enable the Company to raise additional Capital; to extend their Borrowing Powers; and for other Purposes.

xxix. An Act for authorizing the *Stalybridge* Gas Company to extend their Works and increase their Capital; and for other Purposes.

xxx. An Act for enabling the *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Gateshead* Gas Company to raise additional Capital, and to extend their Works; for amending the Acts relating to the Company; and for other Purposes.

xxxi. An Act to cancel Two Bonds entered into by the *Norwich and Spalding* Railway Company; and for other Purposes relating to the Company.

xxxii. An Act for authorizing the *Hartlepool* Gas and Water Company to provide additional Waterworks, and an additional Supply of Water, and to raise further Monies, and for extending the Limits within which they may supply Gas and Water, and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "The *Hartlepool* Gas and Water Act, 1867."

xxxiii. An Act for the Re-incorporation of the *Woolton* Gaslight Company, Limited, by the Name of the *Woolton* Gas Company, and for conferring additional Powers on the Company.

xxxiv. An Act to repeal an Act passed in the Fifth Year of the Reign of His late Majesty King *William* the Fourth, intituled *An Act for more effectually repairing the* Launceston *Turnpike Roads, and making certain additional Roads*, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof; and for other Purposes.

xxxv. An Act to enable the Trustees of the Port and Harbours of *Greenock* to construct a new Quay, and Accesses and other Works; and for other Purposes.

xxxvi. An Act for enabling the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the City of *Manchester* to extend their Waterworks and the Limits of their Water Supply, to make a new Street in *Ardwick* and other Improvements, to acquire additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

xxxvii. An Act to repeal certain Provisions of "The *Ayr* Water Company's Act, 1865," and for other Purposes.

xxxviii. An Act to enable the *Rixton and Warburton* Bridge Company to raise further Money, and to create Preference Shares; and for other Purposes.

xxxix. An Act to reconstitute the *Prescot* Gaslight Company, and to provide for more effectually lighting the Town of *Prescot* and its Neighbourhood with Gas; and for other Purposes.

xl. An Act for the *Poole* Roads in the County of *Dorset*.

xli. An Act to make further Provision for making, repairing, maintaining, and extending the Highways, Roads, and Bridges within the County of *Orkney;* and for other Purposes.

xlii. An Act to incorporate "the *Eton* Gas Company (Limited)" by the Name of "the *Eton* Gas Company;" to enable the Company to raise additional Capital; to light the Parish of *Eton* with Gas; and for other Purposes.

xliii. An Act to grant further Powers to the *Tendring Hundred* Railway Company.

xliv. An Act for the Improvement of the City of *Edinburgh*, and constructing new, and widening, altering, improving, and diverting existing Streets in the said City; and for other Purposes.

xlv. An Act to enlarge the Powers of "the *Horsey Island* Reclamation Company."

xlvi. An Act to amend and enlarge the Powers of "The *Ipswich* Fishery Act, 1859;" and to enable the Corporation to grant a Lease of the Fishery.

xlvii. An Act for more effectually maintaining and keeping in repair the Roads, Highways, and Bridges in the County of *Selkirk;* for making new Roads in the said County; and for other Purposes.

xlviii. An Act for extending the Limits within which the *Wells* Gaslight Company may supply Gas, and for empowering the Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

xlix. An Act to make further Provision with respect to the Station at *Wakefield*.

l. An Act to enable "the *Tees* Conservancy Commissioners" to improve the Navigation of the River *Tees;* to construct Landing Places and a Graving Dock; to alter existing and impose new Tolls, Rates, and Charges, and raise further Monies; to confer Powers to take Tolls and Charges, and to repeal and amend Acts; and for other Purposes.

li. An Act to amend "The *Aberdeen* Police and Waterworks Act, 1862," and to authorize the Commissioners of Police to raise further Sums of Money for the Purposes thereof.

lii. An Act to extend the Powers of the *Great Eastern* Railway Company with respect to the Use of Steam Vessels between *Harwich* and certain Foreign Ports.

liii. An Act for regulating the Capital of the *Cape Town* Railway and Dock Company, and conferring further Powers upon that Company; and for other Purposes.

liv. An Act to enable the Local Board of Health for the District of *Keighley* to purchase the existing Waterworks; to effect various Improvements in the Town of *Keighley;* and for other Purposes.

lv. An Act for authorizing additional Works in connexion with the *Holborn Valley* Viaduct; and for other Purposes.

lvi. An Act for enabling the Local Board of Health for the District of *West Ham* in the County of *Essex* to erect a Hall and Offices for the Transaction of the Business of the said Board and of the Parish Officers of the said Parish, and for granting additional Powers to the said Local Board.

lvii. An Act to extend the Time for the Completion of the *Wilts and Gloucestershire* Railway; and for other Purposes.

lviii. An Act for altering, amending, and extending the Provisions of "The *Salford* Improvement Act, 1862," for authorizing the Extension of the Gasworks, the Construction of a new Street, the raising of further Monies; and for other Purposes.

lix. An Act for authorizing the *Ryde* Pier Company to make and maintain a Railway at *Ryde* in the *Isle of Wight* instead of Tramways authorized to be made by them there; for giving effect to an Agreement between that Company and the *Ryde* Station Company; and for other Purposes.

lx. An Act for enabling the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make certain Branch Railways in the Counties of *Lanark* and *Midlothian*, and to acquire additional Station Ground at *Carlisle;* and for other Purposes.

lxi. An Act to authorize the *Aylesbury* Market Company to raise more Money; and to amend the Act relating to the said Company.

lxii. An Act to authorize the *Dewsbury, Batley*, and *Heckmondwike* Local Boards to construct new Reservoirs and Works, and to alter the Provisions of the Acts relating to their existing Waterworks with respect to the Millowners on the River *Dun;* and for other Purposes.

lxiii. An Act to incorporate "The *Hampton Court United* Gas Company" by the Name of "The *Hampton Court* Gas Company;" to authorize the lighting of an extended District, the raising of additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

lxiv. An Act to alter and extend the Constitution and Powers of the Local Board for the District of the Middle Division of *Heap* in *Lancashire*, to extend such District, and to provide for the better paving, lighting, and otherwise improving the Town of *Heywood* in *Lancashire;* and for other Purposes.

lxv. An Act for authorizing the *Middle Level* Commissioners to levy a Special Tax and to raise additional Funds, and for terminating the Canal and *Nene* Trust; and for other Purposes.

lxvi. An Act for incorporating and conferring further Powers on the *Mold* Gas and Water Company; and for other Purposes.

lxvii. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands for and Completion of the *Ross and Monmouth* Railway; to enable the *Ross and Monmouth* Railway Company to divert a Portion of their Railway; and for other Purposes.

lxviii. An Act for incorporating and granting certain Powers to the *Mitcham* and *Wimbledon* District Gaslight Company.

lxix. An Act for incorporating and granting certain Powers to the *West Kent* Gas Company.

lxx. An Act to improve the Drainage of the *Winestead Level* and of other Lands in the Parishes of *Patrington* and *Welwick*.

lxxi. An Act for better supplying with Water the Parishes of *Camborne, Crowan*, and *Illogan*, in the County of *Cornwall*.

lxxii. An Act to alter and amend the "*Rochester* Oyster Fishery Act, 1865," and to make further and better Provision as to the raising of Money on Mortgage of the Fishery and otherwise; and for other Purposes.

lxxiii. An Act for confirming the Gift of a Park by *Thomas Barnes* Esquire to the Local Board of Health of the District of *Farnworth*, for the Benefit of the Inhabitants thereof; and for authorizing the said Local Board to maintain and regulate the said Park, and to erect a Town Hall and Market Houses, and to make new Streets, and for defining the Boundaries of and for making further Provisions for the Improvement of the District; and for other Purposes.

lxxiv. An Act to further extend the Time for the Completion of the *Athenry and Ennis Junction* Railway; and for other Purposes.

lxxv. An Act to extend the Time limited for the Completion of the Bridge, Roads, and other Works authorized by the "*Wilford Bridge* Act, 1862;" and for other Purposes.

lxxvi. An Act for granting further Powers to "The *Rochester, Chatham*, and *Strood* Gaslight Company."

lxxvii. An Act to change the Name of the *Cambridge* Gaslight Company, to confer further Powers on the Company, and for other Purposes.

lxxviii. An Act for enabling the *North London* Railway Company to widen further Portions of their Railway, and for granting various additional Powers to the Company.

lxxix. An Act for empowering the Corporation of *Sunderland* to improve the Approaches to the *Bodlewell Lane Ferry* over the River *Wear;* and for amending the *Wearmouth Bridge* Act, 1857; and for other Purposes.

lxxx. An Act to revive the Powers for the Purchase of Lands, and to extend the Time for the Completion of Works authorized by "The *Greenwich and South-eastern* Docks Act, 1859;" and for other Purposes.

lxxxi. An Act to alter the Constitution of the Corporation for preserving and improving the Port of *Dublin*, and for other Purposes connected with that Body and with the Port of *Dublin* Corporation.

lxxxii. An Act for the Re-incorporation of the *Huyton and Roby* Gas Company (Limited), and for conferring additional Powers on the Company.

lxxxiii. An Act for authorizing the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Gateshead* to erect a Town Hall and other Buildings; and for regulating their Rates, and authorizing them to raise further Monies; and for the further Improvement of the Borough; and of which the Short Title is "*Gateshead* Improvement Act, 1867."

lxxxiv. An Act for maintaining certain Roads and Bridges in the County of *Northumberland* called the *Ford* and *Lowick* Turnpikes, and for the Liquidation of the Debt due on the Security of the Tolls taken at the said Roads and Bridges.

lxxxv. An Act for granting further Powers to the *Metropolitan* Railway Company, and for authorizing them to make a Junction between their Railway and the *Metropolitan and Saint John's Wood* Railway; for extending the Time limited for the Purchase of certain Lands and Completion of certain Works; for amending the Acts relating to the Company; and for other Purposes.

lxxxvi. An Act for enabling the *North Metropolitan* Railway Company to make a Deviation and Branch Railway in substitution for Portions of their authorized Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

lxxxvii. An Act for amending the Acts relating to the Company of Proprietors of the *Sheffield* Waterworks, and for extending the Limits within which the Company may supply Water; and for other Purposes.

lxxxviii. An Act to alter and amend "The

Bingley Improvement Act, 1847;" to extend the Limits of the District of the *Bingley* Improvement Commissioners; to enable the Commissioners to purchase the Works of the *Bingley* Gas Company; and for other Purposes.

lxxxix. An Act to incorporate the *Dartford* Gaslight Company, and to make further Provision for lighting with Gas the Town and Parish of *Dartford* and certain Parishes and Places in the Neighbourhood thereof.

xc. An Act for extending the Limits of the District within which the *Great Grimsby* Gas Company may manufacture and supply Gas; and for empowering the Company to raise additional Capital; and for other Purposes.

xci. An Act to authorize the Improvement of the Communications between *Lombard Street, Nag's Head Court*, and *Clement's Lane*, in the City of *London;* and for other Purposes.

xcii. An Act to authorize the *Birkenhead* Improvement Commissioners to make new Waterworks, and to extend the Jurisdiction of the Stipendiary Magistrate for *Birkenhead*, and to amend the Acts relating to the said Commissioners with respect to Matters of Police, and otherwise.

xciii. An Act for granting further Powers to the *Llanelly* Railway and Dock Company, and for other Purposes connected with the Undertakings of that Company.

xciv. An Act to vest in the *London and Northwestern* Railway Company, jointly with the *Midland* Railway Company, certain Railways between *Ashby* and *Nuneaton* in the County of *Leicester;* and for other Purposes.

xcv. An Act for vesting the Undertaking of the *Fleetwood, Preston, and West Riding Junction* Railway Company in the *London and Northwestern* Railway Company and the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

xcvi. An Act for extending the Powers of the *Newry and Greenore* Railway Company.

xcvii. An Act for empowering the Company of Proprietors of the *Sheffield* Waterworks to construct additional Reservoirs and alter their authorized Works, and raise further Money, and for altering Provisions of the Company's Acts respecting Compensation Supply of Water; and for other Purposes.

xcviii. An Act for enabling the *Swansea Vale* Railway Company to construct Branch Railways; and for other Purposes.

xcix. An Act to enable the Corporation of the Borough of *Stockport* better to supply with Water that Borough and the Neighbourhood thereof; and for other Purposes.

c. An Act for incorporating "the *Richmond* Gas Company, 1853, Limited," and for conferring upon them further Powers for the Supply of Gas to the Parish of *Richmond* and certain neighbouring Parishes and Places in the County of *Surrey*.

ci. An Act for extending to the *Thames* between *Staines* and the Metropolis the Provisions of the *Thames* Navigation Act, 1866, relating to the Prevention of the Pollution of the River, and for otherwise extending and amending the *Thames* Conservancy and Navigation Acts; and for other Purposes.

cii. An Act for the better sewering of the City of *Norwich*, and the applying of the Sewage to the Irrigation of Land, and for the making of the *Trowse Road*, and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "City of *Norwich* Act, 1867."

ciii. An Act for incorporating the *Weymouth* Gas Consumers Company, Limited, and to make further Provision for lighting with Gas the Parishes of *Weymouth, Melcombe Regis, Wyke Regis*, and *Radipole*, in the County of *Dorset*.

civ. An Act for conferring further Powers upon the *Furness* Railway Company for the Construction of Works and the Acquisition of Lands, and otherwise in relation to their Undertaking; to provide for the Abandonment of the Railway authorized by "The *Furness and Lancaster and Carlisle Union* Railway Act, 1865," and the Dissolution of the *Furness and Lancaster and Carlisle Union* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

cv. An Act to enable the *Sidmouth* Railway and Harbour Company to make certain Deviations in their authorized Line; and for other Purposes.

cvi. An Act for vesting in the *Caledonian* Railway Company the Undertaking of the Company of Proprietors of the *Forth and Clyde* Navigation; and for other Purposes.

cvii. An Act to authorize the *Dundee* Gaslight Company to raise a further Sum of Money; and for other Purposes.

cviii. An Act to empower the *Dundee* New Gaslight Company to raise a further Sum of Money; and for other Purposes.

cix. An Act to constitute certain Railways authorized to be made by the *Great Eastern* Railway Company in and near the Metropolis a separate Undertaking, and to extend the Time limited for Purchase of Lands and Completion of Works with respect to certain of such Railways, and to confer various Powers upon the Company in reference to their Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

cx. An Act to amend and enlarge the Provisions of "The *Southport* Waterworks Act, 1854," and "The *Southport* Waterworks Act, 1856;" to extend the Limits of the Company for the Supply of Water; to make further and better Provision for supplying the Town of *Southport* and the adjoining Districts with Water; and for other Purposes.

cxi. An Act to extend the Time for completing the *Chichester* Harbour Embankment.

cxii. An Act for supplying with Water the Town of *Herne Bay* and the Places adjacent thereto in the County of *Kent*.

cxiii. An Act for enabling the *London and Northwestern* Railway Company to construct new Railways, Deviations, and other Works; and for other Purposes.

cxiv. An Act for supplying with Water the Town of *Peterborough* and certain Parishes and Places adjacent thereto in the Counties of *Northampton* and *Lincoln*.

cxv. An Act to enable the *Llynvi and Ogmore* Railway Company to increase their Capital; and for other Purposes.

cxvi. An Act to enable the *Solway Junction* Railway Company to make a Junction with the *Carlisle and Silloth Bay* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cxvii. An Act for extending and altering the Boundaries of the Borough of *Sunderland*, and for empowering the Corporation of the Borough to make new Streets and improve existing Streets; and for other Purposes.

cxviii. An Act for supplying with Gas the Towns of *Lampeter, Llandyssil, Tregaron,* and *Aberayron,* and the Neighbourhoods thereof, respectively within the Parishes of *Lampeter-pont-Stephen, Llandyssil, Caron-is-clawdd, Llandewi-Aberarth,* and *Henfeniw,* all in the County of *Cardigan.*

cxix. An Act for conferring further Powers upon the *Bodmin* Railway Company.

cxx. An Act for authorizing the Maintenance and Repair of the Road leading from *Cardiff* to *Penarth,* with the Bridges thereon, and the Construction of a new Road and Bridge, and the levying of Tolls; and for other Purposes.

cxxi. An Act for the better supplying with Gas and Water the Town of *Crickhowell* and its Vicinity in the County of *Brecon;* and for other Purposes.

cxxii. An Act to authorize the *Neath and Brecon* Railway Company to acquire certain Lands at and near *Swansea;* to transfer to the Company the *Oystermouth* Tramway and Part of the *Brecon Forest* Tramway; and to confer other Powers on the Company.

cxxiii. An Act for authorizing the making by the *Bedford and Northampton* Railway Company of Lines of Railway by way of Substitution of Lines of Railway already authorized to be made by them; and for other Purposes.

cxxiv. An Act for authorizing the Abandonment of the making of the *Wensum Valley* Railway; and for other Purposes.

cxxv. An Act for conferring further Powers upon the *Devon and Cornwall* Railway Company with reference to their Extensions to *Bude* and *Torrington;* and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*Devon and Cornwall* Railway Act, 1867."

cxxvi. An Act for authorizing the Local Board for the District of *Widnes* in the County Palatine of *Lancaster* to supply with Gas and with Water their District and Places near thereto, and to purchase and to acquire the Undertaking, Gasworks, Waterworks, and Property of the *Widnes* Gas and Water Company, and to improve their District, and to raise Monies; and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*Widnes* Improvement Act, 1867."

cxxvii. An Act for incorporating the *Enfield* Gas Company, Limited, and extending their Powers; and for other Purposes.

cxxviii. An Act for authorizing the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Plymouth* to improve their Waterworks, and to provide a better Supply of Water to *Plymouth* and Places in the Neighbourhood thereof, and for the Regulation of Markets and Fairs in the Borough; and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*Plymouth* Corporation Water and Markets Act, 1867."

cxxix. An Act to authorize the *Waterford, New Ross, and Wexford Junction* Railway Company to make Deviations from their authorized Railway, and to construct new Railways; and for other Purposes.

cxxx. An Act for conferring further Powers on the *Bristol and Exeter* Railway Company with reference to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cxxxi. An Act to transfer to the *Great Northern* Railway Company the Undertakings of the *Edgware, Highgate, and London* and the *Watford and Edgware Junction* Railway Companies; to extend the Time for the Construction of the last-named Railway; and for other Purposes with respect to the same Companies.

cxxxii. An Act for making further Provision with respect to the Ferries of the *Wallasey* Local Board, and to empower them to extend their Gasworks and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cxxxiii. An Act to transfer the Undertaking of the *Wolverhampton* New Waterworks Company to the Corporation of *Wolverhampton;* to confirm certain Agreements between that Company and the *South Staffordshire* Waterworks Company; and for other Purposes.

cxxxiv. An Act for the Improvement of the Township and District of *Dalkey* in the Barony of *Rathdown* and County of *Dublin.*

cxxxv. An Act to authorize the *Tyne* Improvement Commissioners to borrow further Sums of Money, and to construct Railways and Shipping Places in connection with the *Northumberland* Docks; and for other Purposes.

cxxxvi. An Act to authorize the *Lancashire and Yorkshire* Railway Company to complete the *North Lancashire* Loop Line between *Blackburn* and *Burnley;* and for other Purposes relating to their Undertaking.

cxxxvii. An Act to confer upon the *Cambrian* Railways Company special Facilities for raising Part of their authorized Loan Capital; and to extend the Time for the Purchase of certain Lands and the Completion of certain Works; and for other Purposes.

cxxxviii. An Act to provide additional Means for draining the Fourth District of the *Witham* Drainage in the County of *Lincoln;* and for other Purposes relating to the *Witham* Drainage.

cxxxix. An Act for the better supplying with Water the Parliamentary Burghs of *Kirkcaldy* and *Dysart* and Suburbs and Places adjacent; and for other Purposes.

cxl. An Act to extend the Time granted to the *Waterford and Wexford* Railway Company for the Purchase of Lands and Execution of Works; to afford Facilities to the Company for raising the Funds necessary to execute their Undertaking; and for other Purposes.

cxli. An Act for authorizing the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of *Leeds* to make and maintain additional Waterworks; and for other Purposes.

cxlii. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands and Completion of certain Railways by the *North Staffordshire* Railway Company, and to enable the said Company to widen certain Parts of their Railways, and to confer various Powers upon the Company in reference to their Capital and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cxliii. An Act to extend the Time granted to the *East Gloucestershire* Railway Company for the Purchase of Land and Construction of their Railways; and for other Purposes.

cxliv. An Act for conferring additional Powers on the *London and North-western* Railway Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cxlv. An Act to authorize the *North British*

Railway Company to make certain Deviations in their *Glasgow* Branches, and in the *Forth and Clyde* Canal; and to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands and Completion of certain Railways, and to acquire certain Lands; and for other Purposes.

cxlvi. An Act to enable the *Navan and Kingscourt* Railway Company to make Deviations in their authorized Railway; and for other Purposes.

cxlvii. An Act to enable the *Devon and Somerset* Railway Company to make a Deviation from their authorized Railway; to make a Junction Railway; to abandon a Portion of their authorized Railway; and for other Purposes.

cxlviii. An Act for authorizing the *East London* Waterworks Company to obtain a Supply of Water from the River *Thames*, and to make Works for the Purpose, and to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*East London* Waterworks (*Thames* Supply) Act, 1867."

cxlix. An Act for authorizing the *East London* Waterworks Company to make and maintain Works in connexion with their present Waterworks; and to raise further Monies; and to make Arrangements with other Parties; and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*East London* Waterworks (Powers) Act, 1867."

cl. An Act for conferring further Powers on the *Great Western* Railway Company in relation to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

cli. An Act to authorize the *London and North-western* Railway Company to become Joint Owners of Part of the *Carnarvon and Llanberis* Railway; and for other Purposes.

clii. An Act for vesting the Undertaking of the *Nantlle* Railway Company in the *Carnarvonshire* Railway Company, and for other Purposes.

cliii. An Act for incorporating the *Tynemouth* Gas Company, and defining the Limits of Supply of Gas by them, and regulating their Capital; and for other Purposes.

cliv. An Act to extend the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands for and for the completion of the *West Sussex Junction* Railway.

clv. An Act to carry into effect certain Arrangements made with the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury for the Liquidation of the Debt and Interest due by the *Limerick* Harbour Commissioners to the Commissioners of Public Works in *Ireland;* to repeal the Rates and Duties now levied in the Port of *Limerick*, and to authorize other Harbour Rates to be levied in lieu thereof; to reconstitute the Harbour Commissioners; and for other Purposes.

clvi. An Act for authorizing the *London and South-western* Railway Company to make new Works, and for authorizing divers Arrangements between that Company and other Railway Companies, and for defining and regulating the Capital and Debt of that Company, and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*South-western* Railway (General) Act, 1867."

clvii. An Act for making a Deviation of part of the *Newport* Railway; for relinquishing a Portion of said Railway; and for other Purposes.

clviii. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands and for the Completion of the Works authorized by the *Saint Clement Danes* Improvement Act, 1865; and for other Purposes.

clix. An Act to authorize the *Kilkenny Junction* Railway Company to abandon the Construction of their authorized *Kilpurcell* Branch Railway; and for other Purposes.

clx. An Act for enabling the *Surrey and Sussex Junction* Railway Company to make alterations in the Mode of constructing their Railway; to acquire additional Lands; and for other Purposes.

clxi. An Act to further extend the Time limited for the Completion of Works by the Acts relating to "The *Waterford and Passage* Railway Company."

clxii. An Act to enable the *Carnarvonshire* Railway Company to make Deviations in their authorized Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxiii. An Act for authorizing the *London, Brighton, and South Coast* Railway Company to execute new Works and Alterations of authorized Works, and to acquire additional Lands in *Surrey, Sussex* and *Kent;* for extending the Time for exercising the Powers relating to certain Railways in *Sussex;* for sanctioning Arrangements with the *South-eastern* Railway Company; and for other Purposes.

clxiv. An Act to enable the *Mold and Denbigh Junction* Railway Company to run over and use Portions of the Railways of certain other Railway Companies; and to revive and extend the Powers of Purchase over certain Lands; and to extend the Time limited by "The *Mold and Denbigh Junction* Railway Act, 1861," for the Completion of Works; and for other Purposes.

clxv. An Act for making Docks at *Seabrook*, and for constructing a Pier and other Works in connection therewith; and for other Purposes.

clxvi. An Act to enable the *City of Glasgow Union* Railway Company to make a further Deviation of their authorized Railway; to construct Railways to join the Railway from *Glasgow* to *Coatbridge;* and for other Purposes.

clxvii. An Act for making a Railway from *Easton* in the *Isle of Portland* to *Church Hope Cove*, with a Pier in connection therewith; and for other Purposes.

clxviii. An Act for authorizing the making of new Streets, the widening of existing Streets, and the making of other Improvements in the Borough of Liverpool, and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*Liverpool* Improvement Act, 1867."

clxix. An Act for Lighting with Gas the Parishes of *Risca, Mynyddyslwyn, Abercarn,* and *Machen* in the County of *Monmouth.*

clxx. An Act for enabling the *Midland* Railway Company to construct new Railways and other Works, and for conferring Powers on them with respect to their own Undertaking and the Undertakings of other Companies; and for other Purposes.

clxxi. An Act for authorizing the *Rhymney* Railway Company to make additional Railways and to use Parts of the *Great Western* Railway, and to raise additional Monies, and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*Rhymney* Railway Act, 1867."

clxxii. An Act for the Repeal of certain Provisions of "The *Ilfracombe* Railway Act, 1864," and of "The *Ilfracombe* Railway Act, 1865," and for other Purposes.

clxxiii. An Act for incorporating and empowering the Towns Drainage and Sewage Utilization Company.

clxxiv. An Act for making further Provision with respect to the Capital of the *Isle of Wight* Railway Company, and for authorizing the Company to raise further Monies, and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "*Isle of Wight* Railways Act, 1867."

clxxv. An Act for making a Railway from the *North British* (*Edinburgh and Glasgow*) Railway to near *Broxburn* in the County of *Linlithgow;* and for other Purposes.

clxxvi. An Act for enabling the *Caledonian* Railway Company to make certain Railways and other Works in the County of *Forfar;* and for other Purposes.

clxxvii. An Act for authorizing the *Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction* Railway Company to make a Deviation and a new Line of Railway, and to abandon Part of an authorized Railway; and for making further Provision with respect to other Undertakings and Companies in which such Company is interested; and for other Purposes.

clxxviii. An Act to enable the *Halifax and Ovenden Junction* Railway Company to vary the Line of their Railway; to increase their Capital; and for other Purposes.

clxxix. An Act for making a Railway in the West Riding of *Yorkshire* from *Idle* in the Neighbourhood of *Bradford* to *Shipley*.

clxxx. An Act to authorize the *Wolverhampton and Walsall* Railway Company to make a Deviation from their authorized Railway at *Walsall:* and for other purposes with respect to the Company.

clxxxi. An Act for making and maintaining a Railway from *Barnoldswick* to the *Leeds and Bradford* Extension of the *Midland* Railway at or near *Sough Bridge* in the West Riding of the County of *York;* and for other Purposes.

clxxxii. An Act to enable the *Devon and Somerset* Railway Company to extend their Railway at *Barnstaple;* and for other Purposes.

clxxxiii. An Act to extend the Time for the Completion of the Railway of the *Dundalk and Greenore* Railway Company; to enable that Company to construct new Railways at *Dundalk*, and to complete the joint Works authorized by "The *Newry and Greenore* Railway Act, 1863;" and for other Purposes.

clxxxiv. An Act to extend the Time for the Completion of Part of the Undertaking of the *Sevenoaks, Maidstone, and Tunbridge* Railway Company.

clxxxv. An Act to confirm certain Agreements between the *Midland* Railway Company and the *Great Northern* Railway Company on the one hand, and the *Midland and Eastern*, the *Norwich and Spalding*, and the *Stamford and Essendine* Railway Companies on the other hand; and for other Purposes connected with the Undertakings of those Companies.

clxxxvi. An Act for supplying with Gas and Water *Abertillery* and the Parish of *Aberystruth* in the County of *Monmouth;* and for other Purposes.

clxxxvii. An Act for the Construction of a Pier at *Hastings* in the County of *Sussex;* and for other Purposes.

clxxxviii. An Act for making Railways in the County of *Glamorgan*, to be called the *Rhondda Valley and Hirwain Junction* Railway; and for other Purposes.

clxxxix. An Act for enabling the *Hayling* Railways Company to abandon Portions of their authorized Railway; to make a substituted Line of Railway; and for other Purposes.

cxc. An Act to authorize the Amalgamation of the *Banffshire* Railway with the *Great North of Scotland* Railway, and the Abandonment of the Extension of the *Banffshire* Railway to *Buckie;* and for other Purposes.

cxci. An Act to grant further Powers to the *Rathkeale and Newcastle Junction* Railway Company.

cxcii. An Act to grant further Powers to the *West Cork* Railway Company.

cxciii. An Act for the Abandonment of the Railway authorized by "The *Bourton on the Water* Railway (Extension to *Cheltenham*) Act, 1864."

cxciv. An Act for making a Railway at *Southsea* in the County of *Southampton*, and for other Purposes.

cxcv. An Act for subjecting to further Taxation Lands draining by the River *Welland*, and for increasing the Area of such Taxation.

cxcvi. An Act for incorporating the *Newcastle-upon-Tyne* High Level Hoist Company; and for other Purposes.

cxcvii. An Act to enlarge the Powers of the *Waterloo and Whitehall* Railway Company.

cxcviii. An Act to authorize a Deviation in One of the *Carlisle Citadel* Station Branches of the *North British* Railway Company, and to extend the Time for the Purchase of Land and Completion of One of that Company's authorized Lines near *Edinburgh;* and to make Provision with respect to the Undertaking, Capital, and Borrowing Powers of that Company; and for other Purposes.

cxcix. An Act to confer further Powers upon the *Central Cornwall* Railway Company with reference to the Purchase of Lands and Completion of Works; and for other Purposes.

cc. An Act to extend the Time for the Purchase of Lands and for the Completion of a Portion of the *Wrexham, Mold, and Connah's Quay* Railway.

cci. An Act to extend the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands for and for the Completion of the *Wandsworth Bridge*, and to enable the *Wandsworth Bridge* Company to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

ccii. An Act to extend the Time for the compulsory Purchase of Lands for and for the Completion of the *Fulham* Railway, and to enable the *Fulham* Railway Company to raise further Monies; and for other Purposes.

cciii. An Act to confer further Powers upon the *Blyth and Tyne* Railway Company with reference to the Construction of Branches and other Works and the Purchase of Lands and Wayleave and other Rents; and for other Purposes.

cciv. An Act to authorize the *Bristol Port* Railway and Pier Company to construct Railways for connecting their existing Railway with the *Bristol and South Wales Union* Railway and the *Bristol and Birmingham* Line of the *Midland* Railway; and for other Purposes.

ccv. An Act to extend the Powers of the *Dublin Trunk Connecting* Railway Company for the taking of Lands and Completion of their Undertaking.

ccvi. An Act to confirm the Expenditure by the *Mersey* Docks and Harbour Board of certain Monies; and for other Purposes.

ccvii. An Act for incorporating the *Cheshire* Lines Committee, and for authorizing that Committee to make a new road; and for other Purposes.

ccviii. An Act to confer upon the *Great Eastern* Railway Company Facilities for raising Money; and for other Purposes.

ccix. An Act to authorize the *London, Chatham, and Dover* Railway Company to raise a Sum of Money for the Satisfaction of certain Claims; and for other Purposes relating to the Undertaking of the Company.

PRIVATE ACTS,

PRINTED BY THE QUEEN'S PRINTER,

AND WHEREOF THE PRINTED COPIES MAY BE GIVEN IN EVIDENCE.

1. AN Act for authorizing Building and Improving Leases and Sales of certain Parts of the Estates at *Darlington* and *Barnard Castle* in the County of *Durham*, and at *Wolverhampton* in the County of *Stafford*, comprised in or subject to certain Deeds of Settlement and the Will of the late *William Harry* First Duke of *Cleveland;* and for other Purposes.
2. An Act for authorizing Leases of the Settled Estates of Sir *John William Ramsden* Baronet in the Parishes of *Huddersfield, Almondbury,* and *Kirkheaton,* in the West Riding of the County of *York,* and for other Purposes; and of which the Short Title is "The *Ramsden* Estate Act, 1867."
3. An Act for facilitating the Acceptance of Stock of the *Snailbeach* Mine Company (Limited) in substitution for Shares in the *Snailbeach* Mine Company; and for other Purposes.
4. An Act for authorizing Trustees of the Settled Family Estates of the Marquess of *Anglesey* to become the Undertakers under "The *Stapenhill Bridge* Act, 1865," and for extending their Powers over the Settled Estates; and of which the Short Title is "Marquess of *Anglesey's* Estate Act, 1867."
5. An Act for the better Regulation of the Grammar School and *John Kendricke's* Loan Charity, *Reading*.
6. An Act for the Regulation of the *Queen's College* at *Birmingham,* and for incorporating the *Queen's Hospital* at *Birmingham.*
7. An Act for continuing and extending some of the Powers and Provisions of *Barker Mill's* Estate Act, 1852, and for other Purposes, and to be called "*Barker Mill's* Estate Act, 1867."
8. An Act for enabling the Governors of the Lands, Possessions, Revenues, and Goods of the Hospital of King *James,* founded in *Charterhouse* within the County of *Middlesex* at the humble Petition and only Costs and Charges of *Thomas Sutton* Esquire, to sell the Site of the School of the said Hospital and other Lands; to acquire a new Site for the School, and to erect a new School thereon; and for other Purposes.
9. An Act for the better Regulation of *Skipton* Grammar School.

PRIVATE ACTS,

NOT PRINTED.

10. An Act to dissolve the Marriage of *James Sinclair Thomson*, Lieutenant-Colonel of Her Majesty's 54th Regiment of Infantry, with *Roberta Spencer Thomson* his now Wife, and to enable him to marry again; and for other Purposes.

11. An Act to naturalize *Henri Louis Bischoffsheim*, and to grant to and confer upon him all the Rights, Privileges, and Capacities of a natural-born Subject of Her Majesty the Queen.

12. An Act to naturalize *Charles Conrad Adolphus Du Bois de Ferrieres*, commonly known as the Baron *de Ferrieres*, and to grant to and confer upon him all the Rights, Privileges, and Capacities of a natural-born Subject of Her Majesty the Queen.

13. An Act to naturalize *Daniel Adolphus Lange*, and to grant to and confer upon him all the Rights, Privileges, and Capacities of a natural-born Subject of Her Majesty the Queen.

GENERAL INDEX TO SESSION 1867.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

It being a principal object of this Index, that the proceedings on each Motion shall be completely recorded, some abbreviations of forms were necessary. Those who are accustomed to the proceedings of Parliament will readily fill up the voids. Those who are not so familiar, may find the following explanation useful, but will find the whole *formulæ* set out at length in the "Contents."

The names which immediately follow the title of a Bill are those of the Peers or hon. Members who have charge of the Bill.

The numbers which are added at stages of Bills are the official numbers of the prints and reprints ordered at each stage, and, with the Statute, will enable the reader to follow all the changes the Bill has undergone.

The entries—Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a;" Amendt. "this day six months;" Question put, "That 'now,' &c."—indicate the usual form of raising the issue—namely, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

"*The Ballot,* Amendt. on Committee of Supply" indicates that the Question was raised by means of an Amendment moved on the Motion (after the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee of Supply had been read), "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." In this case the issue is formally raised by the Motion "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add" other words. The decision is taken on the Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Nos. added to the "Parliamentary Papers" are in most cases those given in the Commons' "List of Papers for Sale."

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE SECOND SESSION OF

THE NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

30° & 31° VICTORIA.

1867.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1ª, 2ª, 3ª, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—1*st. Div.*, 2*nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

ABINGDON, Earl of
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 306

ABINGER, Lord
Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 3R. Amendt. [188] 1063

Abyssinia
185] *Imprisonment of British Subjects in,* Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord
Stanley *Mar* 5, 1336 :—Question, Mr. Wyld;
187] Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 14, 524 :—
Questions, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe;
188] Answer, The Earl of Derby *June* 21, 239;
Question, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe;
Answer, The Earl of Derby *July* 9, 1252;
Question, Mr. B. Cochrane; Answer, Lord
Stanley *July* 19, 1723 :—Question, Mr. Henry
Seymour; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 8,
189] 1107 [*cont.*

Abyssinia—cont.
Military Expedition against, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 15, [188] 1511
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 26, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty that proper steps may be taken to procure the release of Her Majesty's Consul and other subjects of Her Majesty at present held prisoners by the King of Abyssinia, if necessary, by force of arms" (*Mr. Henry Seymour*), [189] 232; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn
English Consul at Massowah, Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 9, [189] 1222
Parl. P. No. 532 [3918]
Coast of Abyssinia, Sovereignty of, Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 12, [189] 1337

Acland, Mr. T. D., *Devonshire, N.*
Cattle Plague—Exhibition of Live Stock, [186] 1337
Church Rates Abolition, 3R. [189] 34
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 12, [189] 1002
Educational Building Grants, [187] 1659, 1660
Ireland—Queen's University, [187] 1449
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1644
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 35, [187] 1202 ; *cl.* 5, 1235 ; *cl.* 8, 1329
Supply — Volunteers, Report, [188] 844 ;—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1233

Adair, Mr. H. E., *Ipswich*
Corrupt Practices at Elections, [186] 1879
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1572, 1917, 1924 ; Consid. [187] 362

Adderley, Right Hon. C. B. (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies) *Staffordshire, N.*
Bermuda—Yellow Fever at, [189] 1561
British Columbia, &c.—Church in the Colonies, [186] 290
British Honduras—Colony of, [185] 1805
British North America, 2R. [185] 1164, 1181 ; Comm. *cl.* 41, 1316 ; *cl.* 53, *ib.* ; *cl.* 56, 1317 ; *cl.* 58, 1318 ; *cl.* 69, 1319 ; *cl.* 91, *ib.*; *cl.* 145, 1320
Canada—Extradition of M. Lamirande, [185] 1339
Canada Railway Loan, Comm. [186] 736, 747 ; 2R. 973, 1338
Cape of Good Hope, Motion for an Address, [187] 1599
Ceylon—Government of, [188] 988
Colonial Bishops, [185] 337 ; [187] 256 ; [189] 769, 770
Colonial Governors, Instructions to, [188] 1724 ; Motion for an Address, 1741
Coolies, Exportation of (East Indies), [185] 1252
Ecclesiastical Appointments (West Indies), [189] 171
Jamaica—Alleged Excesses in, [186] 275 ;—Ecclesiastical Establishment, [185] 460
Martial Law in the Colonies, [188] 268
Mauritius—Yellow Fever in the, [187] 1293 ; [188] 1192 ; [189] 1044
Missionaries, Grants for, [185] 726
New Zealand—British Troops in, [185] 282, 1933
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, [188] 461, 475 ; *add. cl.* 813, 815, 1082
Sierra Leone—Law Courts, [189] 1043
  Supreme Court, [189] 1611
  Trial by Jury, [186] 1106
South Australia—Mr. Justice Boothby, [187] 1494
Straits Settlements, [185] 1604, 1605, 1607 ; [186] 281
Supply—Coolie Emigration, [188] 1771
  Labuan, [188] 1770
  Transportation, [187] 1095
West India Bishops and Clergy, Leave, [186] 1825 ; [188] 1878
West Indies—Grants for Religious purposes, [186] 393
  Mortality in the Harbour of St. Thomas, [185] 722
  Quarantine in the, [185] 722

Adjutants of Volunteers Bill
(*The Lord Campbell*)
l. Read 1ª* *July* 1 (No. 192)
Read 2ª* *July* 2
Committee* ; Report *July* 4
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *July* 11, [188] 1385
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*) ; after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c. ; Cont. 6, Not-Cont. 18 ; M. 12 ; resolved in the negative ; and Bill to be read 3ª on this Day Three Months
List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1388

Admiralty Court (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Lord Naas*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *June* 26 [Bill 209]
Read 2°* *July* 8
Committee* *July* 15—R.P.
Committee* ; Report *July* 25
Considered as amended* *July* 26
Read 3°* *July* 29
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 30
Read 2ª* *August* 8 (No. 273)
Committee *August* 9, [189] 1212
Report* *August* 12 (No. 326)
Read 3ª* *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 114]

Admiralty Court, Judgeship of the
Question, Mr. Bouverie ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 23, [188] 2071 ; Question, Mr. Graves ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 15, [189] 1568

Admiralty Jurisdiction Bill
(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Cave*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° *Feb* 18, [185] 529 [Bill 28]
Question, Mr. Norwood ; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 23, [187] 939
Bill withdrawn* *July* 22

African Slave Trade
Question, Sir T. F. Buxton ; Answer, Mr. Corry *May* 16, [187] 614—*On the Nile*, Question Sir T. F. Buxton ; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 4, [188] 980—*Zanzibar*, Question, Mr. Gilpin ; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 8, [189] 1106

Agar-Ellis, Hon. L. G. F., *Kilkenny Co.*
Bridges (Ireland), 2R. [186] 797
Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1903
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 547

Agnew, Sir A., *Wigtonshire*
Army Estimates—Barrack Establishment, [187] 1749
Army—Fenian Raid in Canada—Field Allowance, [187] 1668
Dogs, Duty on, [185] 1143 ; [188] 1516
Metropolis—Street Outrages, [187] 1664

[*cont.*

AGNEW, Sir A.—*cont.*
Representation of the People—Polling Places, [187] 935
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 18, [188] 50; *add. cl.* 1211
Representation of the People (Scotland), [188] 1897
Russian America—Cession of, to the United States, [186] 1108
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [188] 1700

Agricultural Children's Education Bill
(*Mr. Fawcett, Mr. A. Peel, Mr. Trevelyan*)
c. Ordered *May* 14, [187] 559
Read 1° * *May* 15 [Bill 152]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *July* 31, [189] 487
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Beach*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Agricultural Employment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Portman*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 7 (No. 147)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 18, [188] 1661; Bill read 2ª, after short debate

Agricultural Exhibitions, Vienna, &c.—Professor Wilson's Report
Question, Mr. Holland, Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 11, [186] 1485—*Parl. P.* [3828]

Agricultural Gangs
Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, The Earl of Belmore *Feb* 25, [185] 906; Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Reply, The Earl of Belmore *April* 11, [186] 1465; discussion thereon; Question, The Earl of Lichfield; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *July* 26, [189] 164
Children's Employment Commission, Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 21, [186] 279
(See *Factory Acts*)

Agricultural Gangs Bill
(*The Duke of Richmond*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 29 (No. 268)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Duke of Buckingham*) *August* 1, [189] 595; Bill read 2ª
Committee* *August* 2 (No. 283)
Report* *August* 5
Read 3ª* *August* 6
c. Read 1° * *August* 9 [Bill 310]
Read 2° * *August* 10
Committee*; Report *August* 14
Considered as amended * *August* 15
Read 3° * *August* 15
l. Commons Amendts. (No. 346)
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 130]

Agricultural Statistics
Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 18, [185] 461; Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 6, [187] 1667; Question, Mr. Bass; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *August* 8, [189] 1104

Agriculture
Employment of Women and Children in, Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, the Employment of Women and Children in Agriculture should be regulated, as far as may be, by the principles of the Factory Acts" (*Mr. Dent*) *April* 2, [186] 1004; after long debate, Resolution agreed to; Question, Mr. Dent; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 9, [187] 258
Factory Acts—Educational Clauses, Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to extend the Educational Clauses of the Factory Acts to children who are employed in agriculture" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *Feb* 26, [185] 1066; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

AIRLIE, Earl of
Education—Revised Code—Certificated Teachers, [188] 1054
Galway Harbour (Composition of Debt), Comm. [188] 1256, 1257
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), 2R. [185] 1227
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 15, [189] 571

AKROYD, Mr. E., *Halifax*
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 240
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1071
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 483
Paris Universal Exhibition, [185] 1801
Parliament—Privilege—Signatures to a Petition, [188] 1126
Portugal—Commercial Treaty with, [186] 564; [187] 1491
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1209
Telegraphic and Postal Systems, [188] 1621
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1579

Alimony Arrears Bill [H.L.]
(*The Viscount Lifford*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 18 (No. 17)
Read 2ª* *Feb* 25
Committee*; Report *Mar* 11
Read 3ª* *Mar* 18
c. Read 1°* *Mar* 27 [Bill 98]
Read 2°* *Mar* 29
Committee*; Report *April* 2
Read 3°* *April* 4
l. Royal Assent *April* 12 [30 *Vict.* c. 11]

ALLEN, Mr. W. S., *Newcastle-under-Lyme*
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1306
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1406

AMBERLEY, Viscount, *Nottingham*
Libel, Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 543
Paris Exhibition—English Jurors, [185] 1143
Parks Regulation, Re-comm. [189] 386
Registration of Voters, 2R. [187] 915, 919
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 529; Comm. *cl.* 5, [187] 1232; *cl.* 9, 1546; [188] 37; Amendt. 300, 301, 302
Sunday Lectures, Leave, [186] 998, 1004; 2R. [188] 89, 112

Ancient Monuments, Preservation of
Question, Sir Harry Verney; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 31, [189] 486

Andersen, Case of Carl
Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 16, [187] 622

Animals, Trade in, Report of Select Committee on
Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 19, [185] 584

ANNESLEY, Hon. Colonel H., *Cavan*
Army—Regimental Courts Martial, [188] 16

Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh, Parish of Canongate) Bill
(*Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Baines*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 6 [Bill 2]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. M'Laren*) *Feb* 20, [185] 655
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir James Fergusson*); after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 74, N. 107; M. 33; words added; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill put off for six months; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 677

Annuity Tax (Edinburgh) Bill
(*Sir G. Montgomery, Mr. Walpole*)
c. Ordered * *June* 25
Read 1° * *June* 26 [Bill 210]
Read 2° * *July* 11
Committee *; Report *July* 22
Considered as amended * *July* 25
Read 3° * *July* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Montrose*) *July* 29
Read 2ª * *August* 2 (No. 264)
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 12
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 107]

ANSON, Hon. Major A. H. A., *Lichfield*
Army—Artillery—Rifled Cannon, Res. [189] 1498, 1506, 1509
Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1956
India and the Colonies, Motion for a Committee, [185] 1032, 1064
Report of the Transport Commission, [188] 855
Reward to Major Palliser, [186] 1582
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1712
[*cont.*

ANSON, Hon. Major A. H. A.—*cont.*
Cuncanon, Martin, Case of, [189] 1628
Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1886, 1906
Jamaica—Prosecution of Mr. Eyre, [189] 764
Parks Regulation, Re-comm. [189] 1588

ANSTRUTHER, Sir R., *Fifeshire*
Army—Medical Officers of the Guards, [185] 584; Res. [188] 1147
Military Store Department, [187] 773
Recruiting, Res. [187] 684
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 910
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 195
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 775; *add. cl.* 781
Representation of the People (Scotland), [186] 288, 1785
Scotland—Management of Scotch Business in Parliament, [186] 399
Poor Law, [185] 586
Road Reform, [185] 1231
Sanitary Laws, [185] 461
Turnpike Trusts, Leave, [186] 155
Warbourg's, Dr., Tincture, [187] 1200

Appropriation Bill
Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Speaker *August* 12, [189] 1340

ARCHDALL, Captain M. E., *Fermanagh*
Election Petitions Committees, [186] 1336
Ireland—Escape of John Kirwan, [186] 1583
Rumoured Disturbances in, [185] 336
Tyrone Magistrates, [186] 911; [188] 856
Wager, The Convict, [186] 567

ARGYLL, Duke of
Colonial Churches, [186] 374
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for Papers, [185] 1512, 1527, 1539, 1544; [188] 158
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), Comm. [185] 1429
Ireland—Established Church, Motion for an Address, [188] 401; Explanation, 489
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [188] 155;—The Collective Guarantee, 977
Masters and Operatives, 2R. [185] 697
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1942, 1959; Comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 303; *cl.* 4, 313; *cl.* 7, 417, 418; *cl.* 15, 547
Tenure of Land (Ireland), 1R. [185] 803
"Tornado," Case of the, [188] 1715
Trades Unions, Comm. *cl.* 4, [186] 272

"*Arkadi,*" *Case of the,* see *Turkey*

ARKWRIGHT, Mr. R., *Leominster*
Ireland—Tipperary and Waterford Elections, Res. [189] 110

ARMSTRONG, Mr. Serjeant R., *Sligo*
Mixed Marriages (Ireland), Leave, [186] 1373

ARMY
- *Aldershot and Colchester Camps*, Question, Colonel H. Fane; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 4, [188] 987
- 185] *Army Estimates*, Question, Captain Gridley; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 11, 213; Observations, General Peel *Feb* 18, 459; Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, General Peel *Mar* 4, 1308; Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, 1647—*Supplementary*, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, General Peel *Mar* 1, 1233:—Question, Sir Charles Russell;
  187] Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 9, 264; Observations, Sir John Pakington *May* 10, 369
  (See SUPPLY)
- *Army Organization*, Observations, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 10, [187] 373
- *Articles of War*, Resolution (*Mr. Darby Griffith*) *June* 6, [187] 1669

Artillery
- *Armstrong Guns — Chilled Shot*, Question, Mr. Henry Baillie; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 30, [187] 1289
- *Cast Iron Guns for Australia*, Question, Mr. Henry Baillie; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 7, [187] 91
- *Chilled Shot*, Question, Mr. Henry Baillie; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 11, [186] 1480
- *Elswick Company's Guns*, Question, Mr. Henry Baillie; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 16, [187] 617
- *Stud Shot, Halifax*, Question, Mr. Henry Baillie; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 21, [185] 725
- *Whitworth's Ordnance*, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 30, [187] 1295
  (*Parl. P.* No. 356)

Small Arms
- *Converted Enfield Rifle*, Question, Earl De Grey and Ripon; Answer, The Earl of Longford *Mar* 1, [185] 1211
- *Snider Ammunition*, Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 3, [187] 1493
- *Snider Rifle*, Question, Major Walker; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 15, [188] 1517; Question, Major Walker; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 25, [189] 79
  (*Parl. P.* No. 79, 256, 391)

- *Barrack Stores, Supply of*, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Sir J. Pakington *April* 12, [186] 1598
- *Canada, Fenian Raid in—Field Allowance*, Question, Sir Andrew Agnew *June* 6, [187] 1668
- *Cavalry Half Pay*, Question, Major Dickson; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 9, [187] 263
- *Ceylon—Barracks at Point de Galle*, Question, Mr. Oliphant; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 28, [186] 729
- *Chatham Garrison, Late Inspection of*, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 15, [189] 1565

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*
- *Civil Departments*, Question, General Dunne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 1, [186] 934—*Payment of Salaries in War Office*, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 1, [186] 912
- *Colour Serjeant T. Connell*, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 25, [186] 467; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 2, [188] 852
- *Conveyance of Troops from Chatham to Liverpool*, Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 27, [188] 604
- *Curragh of Kildare*, Question, Lord Otho Fitzgerald; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 3, [187] 1491
- *Flogging in the Army*—see titles *Flogging in the Army*, *Mutiny Bill*
- *Forts at Portsmouth and Spithead*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 8, [189] 1104
- *Good Conduct Medals*, Question, Mr. M'Laren; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 26, [189] 171
- *Government Powder Magazines*, Question, Mr. Serjeant Kinglake; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 22, [185] 812
- *Gunpowder at Leith Fort and Blackness Castle*, Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 7, [187] 91
- *Hartlepool, Batteries at*, Question, Mr. Freville-Surtees; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 20, [187] 772
- *Household Cavalry Regiments*, Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 28, [186] 732
- *Industrial Employment of Soldiers*, Petition from Colchester presented (*The Earl of Hardwicke*) *April* 1, [186] 896; after short debate, Petition ordered to lie on the table
- *Knightsbridge Barracks*, Observations, Lord Redesdale *May* 24, [187] 1013; Question, Lord Redesdale; Answer, The Duke of Cambridge *June* 3, 1470; Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 15, [188] 1515
- *Lieutenant Colonels of Cavalry*, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 24, [188] 429
- 188] *March of Troops to Hounslow*, Questions, Mr. Carington, Viscount Curzon; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 8, 1191; Question, Viscount Curzon; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 11, 1391; Question, Earl de Grey; Answer, The Earl of Longford; short debate thereon *July* 15, 1492; Personal Explanation, Sir John Pakington *July* 15, 1523
- *Martial Law in the Colonies—Instructions to Governors*, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 21, [188] 268
  (See *Martial Law—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice*)
- *Medical Officers of the Brigade of Guards*, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 19, [185] 584
- *Medical Officers, The New Warrant*, Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 21, [186] 281
  (*Warrant of October* 1, 1858—See title *Army—Medical Officers, &c., infra*)
- *Medical Officers on the West Coast of Africa*, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 30, [187] 1290

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Military Store Clerks, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 16, [189] 1612

Military Store Department, Question, Mr. Oliphant; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 18, [185] 463; Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 20, [187] 773

Militia Courts Martial—Deserters, Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 20, [187] 776; Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 24, 1023

Militia Regiments, Address for a Return of all Regiments of Militia in the United Kingdom; and other particulars (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *Mar* 29, [186] 804; after debate, Motion agreed to—(*Parl. P.* No. 134)

Militia Training, Question, Earl Cowper; Answer, The Earl of Longford *Mar* 8, [185] 1545—*Quartermasters of*, Question, Major Walker; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 18, 467

Mutiny Bill—Flogging in the Army—see titles *Flogging in the Army*, *Mutiny Bill*

New Zealand

British Troops in, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 12, [185] 282; Observations, Mr. Gorst; Reply, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 15, 1932

Medal to Troops in, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 30, [187] 1289

Withdrawal of Troops, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, for a Return of the Regiments in New Zealand since the 1st January, 1865, and the Dates of their Embarkation" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *July* 15, [188] 1496; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Affairs of New Zealand—*Parl. P.* [3833]

Ordnance Committee Report, Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 13, [187] 397

Pay, Increased, Question, Mr. Pugh; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 17, [187] 1938; Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 22, [188] 1873

Promotion in Cavalry Regiments in India, Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 20, [188] 168

Promotion in the 96*th Regiment*, Question, Captain Hayter; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 13, [189] 1450

Promotion for Distinguished Services, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 17, [187] 1935; Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 8, [189] 1105

Recruiting, Question, Colonel Hamlyn Fane; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 3, [187] 1489

Regimental Courts Martial, Question, Colonel Annesley; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *June* 18, [188] 16

Reserve Force, Question, Colonel Gilpin; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 9, [187] 255 (See title—*Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot*)

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Rewards for Military Service, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 13, [189] 1449

Rewards to Military Inventors—Major Palliser,
Question, Mr. Henry Baillie; Answer,
185] General Peel *Feb* 14, 340:—Question, Sir George
Stucley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 21,
186] 283; Question, Major Anson; Answer,
Sir John Pakington *April* 12, 1582—
Ordnance and Projectiles, Question, Sir
George Stucley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 4, 1103:—*Captain Scott's Claims*
for Rifling Ordnance, Question, Mr. Blake;
Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 12,
189] 1333

Royal Engineers, Civil Officers of, Question, Sir Benjamin Guinness; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 21, [187] 875

Sanitary Committee, Question, Sir George Stucley; Answer, Sir J. Pakington *Mar* 21, [186] 282

Simla Court Martial—see title *Simla Court Martial*

Staff Officers of Pensioners, Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 11, [188] 1390

The 13*th Hussars*, Question, Mr. Trevelyan; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 11, [188] 1393

The 86*th Regiment—Detention at the Cape*, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 29, [189] 330

The 98*th Regiment—Transport to Portsmouth*, Question, Sir Edward Buller; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 20, [187] 771

Transport and Supply Departments—Report
of the Committee, Question, Captain Vivian;
185] Answer, General Peel *Feb* 28, 1144:—
Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir
186] John Pakington *Mar* 28, 727; Question,
Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 2, 1873:—Observations, Major
187] Jervis *June* 6, 1684; Reply, Sir John
Pakington, 1698:—Observations, Earl de
Grey; Reply, The Duke of Cambridge
188] *June* 27, 586; Question, Major Anson;
Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 2, 855—
(*Parl P.* [3848]

Troops in Huts, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 16, [187] 618

The Volunteers

Capitation Money, The, Question, Mr. Finlay; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 30, [187] 1294; Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 7, 1732; Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 12, [189] 1334; Question, Mr. Schreiber; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 15, 1566

Serjeant Instructors of Volunteers, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 16, [189] 1606

Supply—The Volunteer Force, Report [13th June] *July* 1, [188] 844—Postponed Resolution considered; after short debate, Resolution agreed to

[*cont.*

ARMY—*cont.*

Volunteer Artillery, Inspectors of, Question, Mr. Aytoun; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 6, [187] 1698

(See title *Volunteers*)

Warbourgh's Tincture, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 28, [187] 1200

War Office, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 1, [186] 910; Motion for a Select Committee (*Lord Eustace Cecil*) *April* 5, 1175; Notice withdrawn; Question, General Dunne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 12, 1582

Army—Ceylon, &c., European Garrisons in

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to postpone the construction of barracks in Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, China, and Japan, until after the Report of the Select Committee upon the distribution of troops in India and the Colonies shall have been received" (*Mr. Oliphant*), [187] 1682; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Foot Guards, Exclusion of Irishmen from

Observations, Mr. Herbert; Reply, Sir John Pakington *June* 6, [187] 1671

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, no order should exist which has for its object the exclusion of Irishmen from Her Majesty's Regiments of Foot Guards" (*Mr. Herbert*), 1671; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army (*India and the Colonies*)

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the duties performed by the British Army in India and the Colonies; and also to inquire how far it might be desirable to employ certain portions of Her Majesty's Native Indian Army in our Colonial and Military Dependencies" (*Major Anson*) *Feb* 26, [185] 1032; Amendt. to add "or to organize a force of Asiatic Troops for general service in suitable climates" (*Mr. O'Reilly*); after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Select Committee appointed

And, on *March* 6, Committee nominated as follows:—Viscount Cranborne (Chairman), Major Anson, Mr. Childers, Sir James Fergusson, Viscount Hamilton, The Marquess of Hartington, Lord William Hay, Captain Hayter, Colonel Percy Herbert, Mr. Laing, Colonel North, Mr. Oliphant, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir William Russell, and Captain Vivian

Report *brought up, July* 26 (*Parl. P.* No. 478)

Army—Medical Officers—Royal Warrant of October 1, 1858

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, the alteration made in the Royal Warrant of the 1st day of October, 1858, has not only operated prejudicially to the interests of the medical profession, but produced an injurious effect upon the Military Service of the Country, and that it would tend to procure a better qualified class of Medical Officers, and thereby promote the greater efficiency of the Military Service generally if the recommendations of the said Committee were carried out in their integrity" (*Mr. Synan*), [188] 1141; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 11, 1390; Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *July* 15, 1514

Army—Military Reserve Funds

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the origin of the Military Reserve Funds, the sources from which they are derived, and the objects to which they are applied" (*Lord Hotham*) *May* 14, [187] 557; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed

And, on *June* 19, Committee nominated as follows: — Lord Hotham (Chairman), Mr. Baxter, Mr. Childers, Mr. Goschen, The Marquess of Hartington, Colonel Hogg, Colonel North, Mr. O'Reilly, Colonel Wilson Patten, General Peel, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Trevelyan, Sir John Trollope, Captain Vivian, and Mr. Percy Wyndham

Report *brought up, July* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 453)

Account of 1866 . . . 65

Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 25, To leave out from "That," and add "inasmuch as it is the ancient and undoubted prerogative of the Crown to require the Military service of its liege subjects, and inasmuch as liability to personal Service, within the limits of the United Kingdom, has always been and still is the principle on which the Militia Force is founded, it is desirable, in framing any scheme for the establishment of an Army of Reserve and for the more complete and economical organization of the Military capabilities and defensive power of the Nation, to consider how far this ancient principle should be practically enforced, and how it can be best applied with least inconvenience to the people" (*Lord Elcho*), [189] 87; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Ordnance Department

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 13, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to consider the present state and condition of the Ordnance Department" (*Mr. Henry Baillie*), [187] 1785; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—Purchase System

Commissions, Purchase of, Motion, "That, in the opinion of this House, the system of purchasing Commissions in the Army tends greatly to diminish the efficiency of our Military Force" (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *April* 30, [186] 1787; after long debate, A. 75, N. 116; M. 41

[*cont.*

Army—Purchase System—cont.
Commissions, Sale of, Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 6, [187] 1663; Question, Mr. Hayter; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 17, 1938

Army—Promotion in the
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, no money considerations should delay the promotion of Lieutenant Frederick Nind Woodall and Lieutenant and Adjutant Henry Currie of the 74th Highlanders, and Lieutenant and Adjutant Romaine F. Stirke, 69th Regiment" (*Colonel North*), [189] 335; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 65, N. 54; M. 11; Amendt. negatived

Army—Recruiting Commission
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Return of the Recommendations of the Recruiting Commission of 1866, and the Steps taken thereon" (*The Earl of Dalhousie*) *Mar* 14, [185] 1768; after long debate, Motion agreed to
Parl. P. l. [2137]—*c.* 203

Army—Recruiting for the
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 16, To leave out from "That," and add "the terms of the service into which they are about to enter should be fully explained to all Recruits before Enlistment; and that having regard to the success which has attended the system of Training Schools for the Navy it is desirable to give trial to a similar plan for obtaining Recruits for the Army" (*Mr. Whitbread*), [187] 672; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Another Amendt. To leave out from "That," and add "the terms of the service into which they are about to enter should be fully explained to all Recruits before Enlistment" (*Mr. Whitbread*); after further short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Army—Rifled Cannon
Moved, "That the experiments that have been made with Cast-iron Guns lined with coiled wrought-iron, justify the belief that these Guns may be thus made available for the purpose of modern warfare; that a great saving of public money would thus be effected, and that this system of conversion is deserving of the serious and immediate attention of the War Department" (*Major Anson*) *August* 13, [189] 1498; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Army—Staff Appointments
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 31, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address, &c.;" for "Return of all appointments made on the Staff, including Military Appointments at Horse Guards and War Office, from the year 1855 to 1867, inclusive [and other particulars]" (*Sir Patrick O'Brien*), [187] 1430; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army (System of Retirement)
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed, "to inquire into the system of retirement from the three non-purchase corps of Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers, and Royal Marines" (*Mr. Childers*) *May* 6, [187] 69; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed
And, on *May* 14, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Childers (Chairman), Mr. Pack-Beresford, Mr. De Grey, Mr. Evans, Mr. Grenfell, The Marquess of Hartington, Sir John Hay, Colonel Percy Herbert, Major Jervis, Colonel North, Major O'Reilly, Mr. Otway, Colonel Sturt, Mr. Trevelyan, and Captain Vivian
Report *brought up*, *July* 26 (*Parl. P.* No. 482)

Army Enlistment Bill
(*Sir J. Pakington, Mr. Hunt, Sir J. Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 13 [Bill 147]
Read 2°* *May* 20
Committee*; Report *May* 21
Read 3°* *May* 23
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Longford*) *May* 24
Read 2ª *May* 31, [187] 1382 (No. 112)
Committee *June* 3, 1478
Report* *June* 4
Read 3ª* *June* 6
Royal Assent *June* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 35]
c. Question, General Dunne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 13, [189] 1451

Army Reserve Bill
(*Sir J. Pakington, Mr. Hunt, Sir J. Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 13 [Bill 148]
Read 2°* *July* 25
Committee*; Report *August* 5
Considered as amended* *August* 6
Read 3°* *August* 8
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Longford*) *August* 9
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Longford*) *August* 12, [189] 1328; Bill read 2ª (No. 320)
Committee* Report *August* 13
Read 3ª* *August* 14
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 110]

Arrest for Debt (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Blake*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 5 [Bill 110]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 16

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Bill
(*Mr. M'C. Torrens, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Locke*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 12, [185] 290 [Bill 14]
Read 2°, after debate *Mar* 27, [186] 666
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 2, [189] 753

[*cont.*

Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Bill—cont.
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient that the provisions in this Bill by which it is proposed to impose upon the local authority the obligation, if and when required by the owners, to purchase condemned properties at prices to be ascertained under the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act, should receive the assent of this House" (*Mr. Bazley*) ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill considered in Committee—R.P.
Bill withdrawn *August* 14, [189] 1535

Art Unions
Question, Mr. Beresford Hope ; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 29, [186] 815

ARUNDELL OF WARDOUR, Lord
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 15, [189] 594
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 67

Associations of Workmen Bill
(*Mr. Neate, Mr. Thomas Hughes*)
c. Ordered *Feb* 12, [185] 299
Read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 21]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Neate*) *April* 10, [186] 1448
Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The († Sir J. Rolt) *Gloucestershire, W.*
Associations of Workmen, 2R. [186] 1449
Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1867, 1887 ; [186] 910, 1110 ; [188] 1065 ; Comm. 1415
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1556
Banns of Matrimony, [185] 1800 ; [186] 902
† County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 5, [188] 1911 ; *cl.* 7, 1912 ; *cl.* 9, 1913 ; *cl.* 29, 1914 ; *cl.* 30, *ib.*
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188] 1414
Criminal Law, Leave, [185] 206
Execution of Deeds, 2R. [185] 1134 ; Comm. Amendt. 1417
Law, Administration of the, [185] 852, 864
Light and Air to Ancient Windows, [185] 1245
Middlesex Registration, [186] 1872, 1873
Middlesex Registry, Res. [188] 82
Mortmain, Law of, [185] 583
Newspaper Proprietors, Securities given by, [187] 1082, 1084
Newspapers, Registration of, [187] 1493
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), Leave, [185] 1283
Representation of the People—The Lodger Franchise, [188] 667
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 592 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 50, 54, 56, 447, 454, 704, 705, 707, 735 ; *cl.* 4, 846 ; *cl.* 34, 1187 ; *cl.* 9, 1545 ; *cl.* 18, [188] 50 ; *cl.* 33, 290 ; *cl.* 36, 294, 298, 299 ; *cl.* 40, 437, 451, 464, 473 ; *cl.* 43, 520 ; *cl.* A, 621, 624 ; Amendt. 625 ; *add. cl.* 668, 672, 673, 807, 810, 883, 1028, 1031 [*cont.*

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The—*cont.*
Sale of Land by Auction, Comm. *cl.* 5, [187] 920 ; *cl.* 6, 922
Statute Law Consolidation, Motion for an Address, [187] 1595
Statute Law, Revision of the, [187] 89
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1224, 1225
† "Tornado," Case of the, [188] 2055
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 198 ; Comm. *cl.* 5, 998, 999
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1576, 1579 ; Res. [188] 731, 732
Watson, William, Case of, [188] 427

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir J. B. Karslake), *Andover*
Jamaica—Prosecution of Mr. Eyre, [189] 764 ; —Recent Court Martial in, 599
Libel, 3R. [189] 1066, 1067
Representation of the People, Lords' Amendts. *cl.* 3, [189] 1117

Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty Bill
(*Mr. Denman, Mr. Vance, Sir John Ogilvy*)
185] *c.* Ordered ; read 1° *Feb* 26, 1064 [Bill 53]
186] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Denman*) *April* 2, 1060
After short debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Ayrton*) ; A. 101, N. 100 ; M. 1
187] Adjourned Debate [2nd April], "That the Bill be now read 2°," resumed *May* 29, 1283
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Bentinck*) ; A. 91, N. 132 ; M. 41 ; after short debate, Debate further adjourned
Read 2° * *May* 31
188] Committee ; Report *June* 25, 549
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Denman*) *July* 2, 922
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Hunt*) ; after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c. ;" A. 66, N. 87 ; M. 21 ; words added ; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to ; Bill put off for three months

Austria and Denmark—Agriculture of—Professor Wilson's Report
Question, Mr. Holland ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 11, [186] 1485

Austria, Commercial Treaty with
Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens ; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 13, [189] 1448

AYRTON, Mr. A. S., *Tower Hamlets*
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, Motion for an Address, [189] 254
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1509, 1992 ;—Military Education, [187] 1719
Army—Flogging in the, [186] 292
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 678 ; Comm. *cl.* 15, [189] 763
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1062 ; [187] 1283
Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1883

AYRTON, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1581; Amendt. 1765, 1774
Business, Public, [185] 1370; [186] 1321
Carriers Act Amendment, Comm. [188] 1614
Cattle, Importation of, Res. [188] 349
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Comm. *cl.* 9, 1000; *cl.* 12, 1002; *cl.* 45, 1423, 1521, 1522; *add. cl.* 1523, 1524, 1525
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1207; Comm. 1335
County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 5, [188] 1911; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1913
Courts of Law, &c. (Salaries and Expenses), [187] 1666
Dogs, Duty on, Comm. Res. [185] 451; *cl.* 2, 1198; *cl.* 9, 1200
Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1591
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Amendt. [189] 1340, 1389
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [187] 1365
Education, [185] 1164
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1086
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [186] 451, 452; Re-comm. [189] 480; *cl.* 3, 482
Financial Statement, [186] 1153
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 301, 329
Hours of Labour Regulation, Re-comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 485
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1648; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [189] 1069; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1070; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1071, 1072; *cl.* 7, 1073, 1075; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1075; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1076; *add. cl.* 1078
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 884
Libel, Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 542; *cl.* 4, 543; *add. cl.* 545, 546, 548; Preamble, 549; 3R. 1659; Amendt. [189] 1050, 1068
London Coal and Wine Duties, 2R. Amendt. [189] 1534, 1535
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 556
Masters and Workmen, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 519; *cl.* 14, 520; *cl.* 16, 521
Metropolis Gas, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1580, 1913, 1918, 1923, 1924; Consid. Amendt. [187] 185, 362
Metropolis—Park Lane, [189] 1607
Metropolitan Improvement, 2R. Amendt. [189] 1533
Metropolitan Poor, Leave, [185] 175; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1612, 1614; *cl.* 9, 1616, 1622; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1623; *cl.* 41, 1675; *cl.* 49, 1681; *cl.* 55, 1682; *cl.* 59, 1686; *cl.* 65, 1688; *cl.* 69, 1689, 1692; *cl.* 79, 1695, 1697; 3R. 1863
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [187] 885
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 926
Navy Estimates, [185] 1992
Navy—Promotion in the, Res. [186] 305, 307
Newspaper Proprietors, Securities given by, [187] 1085, 1087
Parliament—Meeting in the Tea Room, [189] 767
Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1418; Re-comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [189] 142
Postal — East India, China, and Australian Mails, [189] 1563

[*cont.*

AYRTON, Mr. A. S.—*cont.*
Railway Companies, Consid. *cl.* 4, [187] 1725, 1726
Representation of the People—The Resolutions, [185] 480, 1573
186] Representation of the People, Comm. 1488; *cl.* 3, 1573, 1575; Amendt. 1882
187] Amendt. 15, 23, 28, 45, 47, 445, 712, 727, 728, 734, 741; *cl.* 4, 850, 997; Amendt. 1006, 1008, 1148; *cl.* 34, 1177, 1180, 1183; Amendt. 1186, 1188; *cl.* 35, 1206; *cl.* 8, 1243, 1297, 1331; *cl.* 9, 1526, 1540, 1781; *cl.* 10, 1985, 1987; *cl.* 14, 1991
188] *cl.* 15, 43; *cl.* 23, 54; *cl.* 24, 55; *cl.* 29, 215; *cl.* 33, 290; *cl.* 36, 296; *cl.* 37, 300; *add. cl.* 613; *cl.* A, 621, 623, 633; *cl.* D, 648; *add. cl.* 676, 683, 686, 889, 897, 1021, 1198, 1218, 1227, 1271; Schedule B, 1280; Preamble. 1291; Consid. *add. cl.* 1447; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1458, 1459; Schedule B, Amendt. 1476, 1481
189] 1003; Lords Amendts. *cl.* I, 1197; *cl.* L, 1198
Sale and Purchase of Shares, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 101
Sale of Land by Auction, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [187] 920; *cl.* 6, 922
Scott, James, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 1512
Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1069, 1091
Supply—British Museum, [189] 344
  Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1247, 1256
  Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 899
  Houses of Parliament, [188] 1699
  Post Office Packet Service, [189] 695, 699, 700, 702
  Royal Palaces, Amendt. [185] 505, 511; [188] 1681, 1686
  Salaries, &c. in the Offices of Houses of Parliament, [187] 853
  University of London, [187] 1469
Thames Embankment (Sheilds' Petition), Motion for a Committee, [186] 803
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1412
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 197; Comm. *cl.* 2, 996; *cl.* 5, 997, 999, 1000
Turnpike Trusts, Leave, [186] 157
Valuation of Property, Leave, [185] 255
Volunteers, Res. [188] 744

AYTOUN, Mr. R. S., *Kirkcaldy*
Army—Inspectors of Volunteer Artillery, [187] 1698
British North America, 2R. [185] 1180; Comm. *cl.* 145, 1320
Canada Railway Loan, Comm. [186] 744, 747
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [187] 1915
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 770
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 662
Railway Debenture Holders, 2R. [185] 783
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, [187] 1975, 1977

BAGGALLAY, Mr. R., *Hereford*
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1223

Bagge, Sir W., *Norfolk, W.*
Cattle Plague in the Metropolis, [187] 1291
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Removal of Magistrates, [186] 126

Bagnall, Mr. C., *Whitby*
Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Whitby Rectory, [186] 565
Mines, &c. Assessment, Leave, [185] 651; 2R. [186] 1427
Schools, Inspection of, [188] 169

Bagwell, Mr. J., *Clonmel*
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1677
District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland), Leave, [188] 1315
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 740; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 898
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. [188] 117
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 878
  Defence of Constabulary Barracks, [188] 603
  Fenian Prisoners, [186] 1989
  Rewards to Constabulary, [186] 419
  Rumoured Disturbances in, [185] 336
  Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 80
  Waterford Election, [185] 723
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1099
Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 954
Veal, Cruelties in the Preparation of, [188] 770

Bailey, Mr. C. *Monmouth, &c.*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1535

Baillie, Rt. Hon. H. J., *Inverness-shire*
Army—Artillery—Armstrong Guns and Chilled Shot, [187] 1289;—Chilled Shot, [186] 1480;—Stud Shot, [185] 725
  Australia—Cast Iron Guns for, [187] 91
  Elswick Company's Guns, [187] 617
  Ordnance Department, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1785, 1798, 1811, 1813
  Organization of the, [187] 374
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [187] 193
Palliser, Major, Rewards to Inventors, [185] 340
Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1824
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1002; Amendt. 1166, 1174; *cl.* 8, 1310; *cl.* 10, 1984; *add. cl.* [188] 698, 894, 1202, 1232
Scotland—Management of Scotch Business in Parliament, [186] 400
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1736

Baines, Mr. E., *Leeds*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [185] 77
Charities and Schools, Rating of, [188] 266
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 218
[*cont.*

Baines, Mr. E.—*cont.*
Greenland, Edward, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 873
Libel, 2R. [185] 1736
Representation of the People—Franchises, [185] 467
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, [187] 1947; Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 831, 843

Bandon, Earl of
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 1121
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [187] 1379; Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1370

Bank Post Bills (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 24 [Bill 281]
Read 2°* *July* 25
Committee*; Report *July* 26
Read 3°* *July* 29
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 30
Read 2ª* *August* 6 (No. 275)
Committee*; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª* *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 89]

Bankruptcy Acts Repeal Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 14 [Bill 76]
Read 2°* *April* 4
Committee*; Report *May* 3
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 4, [187] 1556; after long debate, Committee deferred [Bill 133]
Debate resumed *June* 7, [187] 1765
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and insert other words (*Mr. Ayrton*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; Bill considered in Committee—R.P.
Bill withdrawn* *July* 11

Bankruptcy Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Solicitor General*)
185] *c.* Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 14, 1867 [Bill 74]
186] Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 1, 909
Read 2°* *April* 4
. Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 4, 1110
Committee*; Report *May* 3
Committee* (*on re-comm.*) *June* 7—R.P.
188] Question, Mr. Leeman; Answer, The Attorney General *July* 5, 1065
. Committee* (*on re-comm*) *July* 11, 1415; Bill withdrawn, after short debate [Bill 131]

Banns of Matrimony
Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 14, [185] 1800; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 1, [186] 902; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 6, [187] 4

Banns of Matrimony Bill
(*Mr. Monk, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*)
187] Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 6, 4
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 141]
188] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Monk*) *July* 3, 926
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *July* 9
Read 3° * *July* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Houghton*) *July* 11 (No. 216)
189] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*Lord Houghton*) *July* 25, 40; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *August* 8, 1094
Report * *August* 9 (No. 311)
Read 3ª *August* 12, 1326

Barclay, Mr. A. C., *Taunton*
Sunday Trading, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. [189] 39

Baring, Mr. T., *Huntingdon*
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1342, 1344
Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 51, 52

Barnes, Mr. T., *Bolton*
India—Famine in Orissa, [185] 1645

Barnett, Mr. H., *Woodstock*
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1771
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1198
Sale and Purchase of Shares, Comm. [186] 98; *cl.* 1, 1063

Barrack Lane, Windsor (Right of Way) Bill (*Sir J. Pakington, Sir J. Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 4 [Bill 229]
Read 2° * *July* 8
Committee *; Report *July* 11
Read 3° * *July* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *July* 15
Read 2ª * *July* 18 (No. 226)
Select Committee nominated *August* 2:—Viscount Sidmouth, Lord Crofton, Lord Mont Eagle (Chairman), Lord Foxford, and Lord Londesborough
Report of Select Committee *August* 5
Committee * *August* 6 (No. 291)
Report * *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 109]

Barron, Sir H. W., *Waterford City*
Ireland—Importation of Cattle, [187] 1022, 1023
Metropolis—Park Lane and Halkin Street, [185] 465
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1277
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1097; Comm. Amendt. [187] 211
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [188] 1700

Barrow, Mr. W. H., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
Associations of Workmen, 2R. [186] 1453
Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 194
Criminal Law, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 701
Dogs, Duty on, 2R. [185] 781
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 1074; *cl.* 9, 1076
Ireland—Railways, Res. [185] 1948
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 551
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1426
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1276; *cl.* 3, [187] 444, 449; *cl.* 4, 847; *cl.* 33, [188] 290; *cl.* A, 629; *add. cl.* 1267; Consid. *add. cl.* 1450; 3R. 1574
Supply—Public Education, [189] 373
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 201; Comm. *cl.* 5, 998
Vaccination, [186] 1878; Comm. [187] 1870, 1874, 1875; 3R. [188] 651

Barry, Mr. Serjeant C. R., *Dungarvan*
Charitable Donations and Bequests (Ireland), Comm. [187] 377
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [187] 376
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 597
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 880
Waterford County Election, [185] 1030, 1031
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 577
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1400
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1099

Barttelot, Colonel W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Cattle Plague—Importation of Cattle into London, [187] 1295
Financial Statement, [186] 1145
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 526, 556
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 558; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1548
Vaccination, [187] 776; Comm. 1873
Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1650
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1559

Bass, Mr. M. T., *Derby*
Agricultural Statistics, [189] 1104
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Leave, [185] 1065; 2R. [186] 1062
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 239
Navy—Corporal Punishment of Naval Cadets, [187] 1490; [189] 82, 83
Dockyards, Res. [185] 644
Railway Commission, [189] 1336
Rating and Rentals, [185] 284
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1897, 1898; [187] 719; *cl.* 4, 847; *cl.* 40, [188] 455, 465; *cl.* 31, 536; *add. cl.* 1198; Schedule D, 1289
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1408; Comm. [186] 100; *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, 101
Storm Signals of the Board of Trade, [185] 1030; Res. [188] 1732

Bateson, Sir T., *Devizes*
Ireland—Military at Downpatrick, [189] 600
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1428

BATH, Marquess of
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 1122
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Comm. [188] 1384

BATHURST, Mr. A. A., *Cirencester*
Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot, Res. [189] 102

BAXTER, Mr. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh), 2R. [185] 667
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), 2R. [187] 194
Jamaica—Ecclesiastical Establishment, [185] 460
Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 369
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1123
Postal Service, Private, [188] 1391
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1301; Amendt. 1329; *cl.* 36, [188] 296; *cl.* 40, 455; *add. cl.* 784, 800, 999, 1210
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 414, 1023; [188] 1067
Scotland—Education, [188] 338
  Reform Bill, [187] 266
  Scotch Business in the House, [185] 283, 721; [186] 397
  Secretary of State for, [188] 166
Supply—Anglo-Chinese Flotilla, [185] 513
United States—Postal Service with the, [185] 811; — The "Alabama" Claims, [188] 769
Valuation of Property, Leave, [185] 255

BAZLEY, Mr. T., *Manchester*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 695; Comm. Amendt. [189] 753, 760
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [189] 1415
Education of the Poor, 2R. [188] 1365
India—Medical Retirement Funds, [187] 389
Liverpool, Importation of Cattle into, [189] 630
Navy—Claims of Mr. Clare, [186] 563
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, [187] 1954; *add. cl.* [188] 842
Storm Warnings, Res. [188] 1740

BEACH, Sir M. E. HICKS-, *Gloucestershire, E.*
Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [189] 134
Army of Reserve—Militia Barracks, Res. [189] 102
Church Rates, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [187] 207
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1158
Public Health Act, [186] 565
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, [187] 1977
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), Consid. [187] 213; 3R. [188] 83; Amendt. 1655
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1843
Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1663

BEACH, Mr. W. W. B., *Hampshire, N.*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. Amendt. [189] 494
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 543
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1423
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1174; *add. cl.* [188] 1078; Consid. *cl.* 46, 1471
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1841

BEAUCHAMP, Earl
Address in Answer to the Speech, [185] 9
Local Government Supplemental (No. 5), Comm. [188] 1619
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1846; Comm. *cl.* 47, [189] 746
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 377

BEAUMONT, Mr. H. F., *Yorkshire, W. R.—S.*
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1005; Amendt. 1209, 1237; Schedule B, Amendt. 1284

BEECROFT, Mr. G. S., *Leeds*
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 830

BELMORE, Earl of (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department)
Agricultural Gangs, [185] 906; [186] 1476
Chatham and Sheerness Stipendiary Magistrate, 2R. [188] 2
Coal Mines, Accidents in, Motion for Papers, [185] 80, 81
Criminal Lunatics, 2R. [186] 975, 978; Comm. 1101
Ireland—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1428
  Military at Elections, Motion for Papers, [185] 1219
  Police Barracks, [188] 505
Local Government Supplemental (No. 5), Comm. [188] 1619
Private Bills—Churchyards and Cemeteries, Standing Order, Amendt. [185] 906
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1432, 1443; Comm. 1765; *cl.* 2, [186] 270; *cl.* 4, 273
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [185] 274, 277, 278; Comm. 1909; *cl.* 11, 1911; *cl.* 22, 1913; Res. [186] 110, 111
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 372, 930; [187] 72

BENTINCK, Mr. G. Cavendish, *Whitehaven*
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [187] 1283
Burlington House Site, [186] 1245
Churchward, Mr., Case of, [186] 123; Motion for an Address, Amendt. 180
Courts of Justice Concentration Act, [185] 725
Courts of Justice, The New, Res. [185] 814, 818; [186] 2019, 2020; [188] 507, 606
Department of Science and Art, [187] 935
Ecclesiastical Commission, [186] 3;—Dean and Chapter of Westminster, 1266; [187] 93;—Non-Capitular Stipends, Motion for Papers, 895

[*cont.*

BENTINCK, Mr. G. C.—*cont.*
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 321
Ireland—Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 32
London University, [186] 982
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1429
Paris Universal Exhibition, [185] 686 ;—Purchase of Articles, [187] 692, 693
Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [185] 682 ; [188] 1696, 1703
  Office of Works, [187] 856
  Quarantine Establishment, [187] 926
  University of London, [187] 1468
Uniformity Act Amendment, Comm. [188] 962; 3R. Amendt. [189] 1048

BERKELEY, Hon. F. H. F., *Bristol*
Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [187] 64
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, &c. [187] 1835
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1287 ; *cl.* 29, [188] 199 ; *add. cl.* 841, 872 ; Amendt. 883 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1439
Totnes Election, Res. [186] 1368, 1369

Bermuda—Yellow Fever at
Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise ; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *Mar* 26, [186] 561 ; Question, Admiral Erskine ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *August* 15, [189] 1560

BERNERS, Lord
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [187] 872 ; Comm. *cl.* 31, 1550

BESSBOROUGH, Earl of
Ireland—Police Barracks, [188] 503, 505

BIDDULPH, Colonel R. M., *Denbighshire*
Street Outrages—The Militia, [188] 87

BIDDULPH, Mr. M., *Herefordshire*
India—Indian Securities, [188] 171
Poor Law—Rating of Charitable Unions, [185] 811
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1208

Birmingham Riots
188] *Addresses of Mr. Murphy*, Question, Mr. Monsell ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 18, 17 ; Question, Mr. Monsell ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 19, 88 ; Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 3, 925 ; Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 9, 1262 ; Observations, Mr. Whalley *July* 19, 1764
The Volunteers, Questions, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Whalley ; Answers, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 20, [188] 173; Question, Mr. Horsman ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 24, 428

Blackwater Bridge Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Lord Naas, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered * *May* 14
Read 1° * *May* 15 [Bill 156]
Read 2° * *June* 19
Committee * ; Report *June* 24
Read 3° * *June* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 25
Read 2ª * *July* 4 (No. 178)
Committee * ; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª * *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 57]

BLAKE, Mr. J. A., *Waterford City*
Andersen, Carl, Case of, [187] 622
Army—Captain Scott's Claim for Rifling Ordnance, [189] 1333
Fisheries, Sea, [187] 262
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 740 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 900, 903 ; [188] 2072
India—Claims on Oude, [186] 1172
Ireland—Case of Charles Flynn, [189] 1335
  Charitable Bequests, [185] 468
  Court of Admiralty, [185] 1447
  Dietary in County Prisons, Res. [189] 173
  Fishermen on the Lower Shannon, [186] 425
  Inspectors of County, &c. Prisons, [186] 1106
  Land Bills, [187] 397
  Lunatic Asylums, [189] 1219
  Mountjoy Convict Prison, [186] 1933
  Railways, Res. [185] 1937, 1950
  Salmon Fisheries, [185] 1915
  Tipperary and Waterford Elections, Res. [189] 111, 112
Political Prisoners, Memorials of, [189] 1218
Railways, Royal Commission on, [186] 1935 ; [187] 92
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1093, 1097; [187] 92; Comm. 211, 212; [189] 850
Supply—Board of Fisheries (Scotland), [188] 1904
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 550

Bleaching, Dyeing, and Printworks Acts
Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 25, [189] 81
(See title *Factory Acts*)

BLENNERHASSET, Sir R., *Galway Bo.*
Ireland—Public Records, [185] 213
Religious Rights in Workhouses, [189] 170

Board of Trade Returns
Question, Mr. Goschen ; Answer, Mr. S. Cave *Mar* 14, [185] 1806

BONHAM-CARTER, Mr. J., *Winchester*
Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1901, 1902
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1924
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 36, [188] 295 ; *add. cl.* Amendt. 811
Supply—Office of Woods, [187] 857

Bouverie, Rt. Hon. E. P., *Kilmarnock, &c.*
- Admiralty, Court of, [188] 2071
- Great North of Scotland Railway, Consid. [187] 1247
- Naval Review, The, [188] 1627
- Parliament—Business of the House, [187] 942; —Standing Orders, Amendt. [187] 1132
- Poor Law Board, New President of the, [187] 878
- Queen Anne's Bounty Office, [188] 1623
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 5, [187] 1233; *cl.* 8, 1297; *cl.* 31, [188] 528; *add. cl.* 1004, 1197, 1203; Schedule B, 1284; Consid. *add. cl.* 1452, 1454; *cl.* 29, 1461
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 422, 694
- Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1404
- Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1275; Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 963

Bowen, Mr. J. B., *Pembrokeshire*
- Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 590

Bowyer, Sir G., *Dundalk*
- Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1681
- Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, Comm. [185] 1327
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 364; 2R. [187] 569, 571, 573; Comm. [188] 487
- Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 989
- Financial Statement, [186] 1128
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 1, [185] 898
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 988
- Ireland—The Lord Mayor's Banquet, [185] 935; —Established Church, Res. [187] 180
- Kingston Assizes, [186] 1203
- Law, Administration of the, [185] 879
- Libel, 2R. [185] 1738
- Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 930, 931
- National Gallery, The New, Motion for Papers, [186] 835
- Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1107
- Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 47; Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 840; *cl.* 8, 1301, 1332; Comm. *cl.* 15, [188] 34, 37
- Supply — Exchequer and Audit Department, [187] 856
  - Houses of Parliament, Report, [185] 682
  - National Education (Ireland), [189] 1277
  - Public Record Office, [187] 858
  - Universal Exhibition at Paris, [185] 687

Bradford, Earl of (Lord Chamberlain)
- Princess of Wales—Her Majesty's Reply to Address, [185] 1002

Brady, Mr. J., *Leitrim Co.*
- Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, 2R. [186] 1062
- County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 29, [188] 1914
- District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland), [188] 1914
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 370

[*cont.*

Brady, Mr. J.—*cont.*
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [185] 691
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 982, 987
- Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 887
  - Case of Richard Jennings, [189] 851
  - Dietary in County Prisons, Res. [189] 175
  - Distress in, [187] 1746
  - Fenian Prisoners, [186] 1990
  - Railways, Res. [185] 1950
  - Reform Bill, [185] 585
- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [188] 584
- Metropolitan Poor, Leave, [185] 177; Comm. *cl.* 9, 1622; *cl.* 43, 1676; *cl.* 44, 1677; *cl.* 45, 1680; *cl.* 59, 1686
- Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 210
- Navy—Marine Depôt at Deal, [189] 1569
- Parliament—The Reporters' Gallery, [186] 122
- Prison Ministers Act, [188] 1768
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 41, 52; *cl.* A, [188] 618; *add. cl.* 1021, 1026, 1032
- Representation of the People (Ireland), [187] 1089
- Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1098
- Sunday Trading, Comm. *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, [189] 36
- Supply—Agricultural Statistics, [188] 1906;—Houses of Parliament, Report, [185] 682
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 550; 2R. [186] 1162
- Thames Embankment (Sheilds' Petition), Motion for a Committee, [186] 802
- Vaccination, Comm. [187] 1882; 3R. [188] 651

Brand, Right Hon. H. B. W., *Lewes*
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1697

Brazil
- *British Claims on the Government of*, Question, Mr. Ewart; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 27, [187] 1128
- *War in the River Plate*, Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 1, [185] 1233

Brett, Mr. W. B., *Helston*
- Army—Captain Jervis and the Simla Court Martial, [188] 606, 607; Motion for an Address, [189] 1004, 1039, 1100
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 273, 468, 737; *cl.* 36, [188] 294
- "Tornado," Case of the, [188] 2063

Bribery Commissioners' Report—Lancaster, Reigate, Totnes, and Yarmouth
- Question, Colonel Wilson Patten; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 21, [185] 726; Question, Captain Gridley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 28, 1145
- *Expenses of*, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 28, [185] 1146; Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 5, 1338

Bridges (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Lord Naas*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 22 [Bill 86]
Read 2° *Mar* 28, [186] 796
Question, Mr. Esmonde ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 11, 1483
Committee * ; Report *May* 9 [Bill 140]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) *May* 24—R.P.
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) *June* 5—R.P.
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) ; Report *June* 7
Considered as amended * *June* 17 [Bill 195]
Read 3° * *June* 18
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *June* 20
Read 2ª * *June* 25 (No. 164)
Committee * ; Report *June* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 28
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 50]

Bridges, Sir B. W., *Kent, E.*
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [187] 1364
Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 584 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 36 ; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 39

Bright, Mr. J., *Birmingham*
British North America, 2R. [185] 1180, 1181, 1187, 1192
Cattle Plague, [189] 80
Factory Acts Extension, [186] 1710, 1787
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 744
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 955, 958
Hyde Park — Reform Meeting, [186] 1937, 1938, 1955
India—Rights of the Ryots, [185] 145
Ireland—Established Church, Res. [187] 102, 108
Fenianism, [186] 1929, 1930, 1931
Pension to Mr. Young, [187] 257
Metropolis—Admission of Cabs to Hyde Park, [187] 370
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1365
Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 364, 369
Parks Regulation, Re-comm. [189] 398, 404
Parliament — Members' Seats in the House, [188] 164 ;—Public Business, 777
185] Representation of the People, Comm. 966,
. 1024 :—Leave, [186] 14, 78, 124, 472 ; 2R.
186] 626 ; Comm. 1497 ; *cl.* 3, 1661, 1900 :—
187] 19, 20, 51, 330, 351, 464 ; *cl.* 4, 993,
. 1010, 1158 ; *cl.* 34, 1183, 1186, 1187 ; *cl.* 35,
. 1219, 1224 ; *cl.* 8, 1297, 1315, 1324, 1342 ;
. *cl.* 9, 1544 ; *cl.* 10, 1949, 1951, 1952 :—
188] *cl.* 15, 24, 27 ; *cl.* 29, 179, 180, 200, 225 ;
. *cl.* 31, 271, 273, 281, 285, 287, 288, 611 ;
. *cl.* 36, 292 ; *cl.* 40, 437, 459, 461, 473 ; *cl.* 43,
. 518 ; *add. cl.* 694, 702, 788, 826, 864, 885,
. 886, 890, 993, 1090, 1114; 3R. 1550:—Lords
189] Amendts. *cl.* A, Amendt, 1125 ; *cl.* B,
. 1184 ; *cl.* C, 1191, 1192
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 105
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 3R. [188] 85
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1568 ; [186] 727

Bright, Sir C. T., *Greenwich*
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [185] 1803
Supply—Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 901

Bristol, Marquess of
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, Amendt. [189] 468

British Columbia and Vancouver's Island —Union of
Questions, Mr. Chichester Fortescue ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 21, [186] 290

British Honduras, Colony of
Question, Mr. Goschen ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 14, [185] 1805

British Museum—Natural History Collection
Question, Lord Lyveden ; Answer, Earl Stanhope *Mar* 11, [185] 1626

British North America Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Carnarvon*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Feb* 12 (No. 9)
185] Read 2ª *Feb* 19, 557
. Committee *Feb* 22, 804
Report * *Feb* 25
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *Feb* 26, 1011
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Month") (*Lord Campbell*) ; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; original Motion agreed to ; Bill read 3ª
c. Read 1° * *Feb* 26 [Bill 52]
. Question, Mr. Hadfield ; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 27, 1090
. Read 2° *Feb* 28, 1164
. Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 4, 1310
. Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Osborne*), 1311 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Bill considered in Committee, and reported
Considered * *Mar* 7
Read 3° * *Mar* 8
. *l.* Commons Amendts. considered, and, after short debate, agreed to *Mar* 12, 1701
Royal Assent *Mar* 29 [30 *Vict.* c. 3]

British Spirits Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Resolution ; Bill ordered * *May* 2
Read 1° * *May* 3 [Bill 135]
Read 2° * *May* 9
Committee * ; Report *May* 13
Considered as amended * *May* 14
Read 3° * *May* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *May* 17
Read 2ª * *May* 24 (No. 103)
Committee * Report *May* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 3
Royal Assent *June* 17 [30 *Vict.* c. 27]

British White Herring Fishery Bill
(*The Duke of Richmond*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 11 (No. 80)
Read 2ª* *May* 3
Committee* *May* 23
Report* *May* 24
Read 3ª* *May* 27
c. Read 1°* *May* 28 [Bill 173]
Read 2°* *June* 6
Committee*; Report *June* 20
Considered as amended* *June* 21
Read 3°* *June* 24
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 52]

Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum
Question, Mr. Floyer; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 8, [188] 1186

Bromley, Mr. W. Davenport- *Warwickshire, N.*
Army—Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1989
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 699
Houses of Parliament, Approaches to the, [185] 888
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1966
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 555, 655
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1503

Browne, Lord J. T., *Mayo Co.*
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1678
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 598
Ireland—Drainage Improvements, [187] 387, 389
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 674; Amendt. 676

Brown's Charity Bill
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Adderley*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 9 [Bill 142]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 3

Brown's Charity Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 6 (No. 143)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord President*) *June* 25, [188] 496
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months") (*The Earl of Rosse*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; Cont. 16, Not-Cont. 48; M. 32; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 503; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª on this Day Six Months

Brown's Charity Bill
Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 26, [189] 169

Bruce, Right Hon. Lord E. A. C. B. *Marlborough*
Parliament—Access of Members to the House, [185] 83
Theatres, Regulation of, [187] 1938

Bruce, Lord C. W. B., *Wiltshire, N.*
Metropolitan Poor Law Act, [189] 957

Bruce, Rt. Hon. H. A., *Merthyr Tydvil*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 682
Canning and Peel, Statues of, [187] 2
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1001; *cl.* 12, *ib.*; *cl.* 45, 1427, 1431
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 3, [185] 1761; *cl.* 5, 1764
Education, [185] 1158;—National, [186] 2009; —Mr. Arnold's Report to the Schools Inquiry Commission, [189] 819
Education of the Poor, 2R. [188] 1317, 1346, 1348
Educational Grants, Res. [186] 1192, 1193
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1080
Factory Acts Extension, Leave, [185] 1280; Re-comm. 479; *cl.* 3, 482, 483
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 323
Hours of Labour Regulation, Re-comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 485
India—Famine in Orissa, Motion for an Address, [189] 788
Ireland—Trinity College, Dublin, Res. Motion for Adjournment, [188] 77; [189] 3
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1609
Metropolis—Hall of Arts and Sciences, [189] 597
Mines and Miners, [186] 406
Paris Exhibition, [185] 894
Parliament — Business of the House, [188] 1521
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 12, [187] 1988
Scotland—Education, [188] 348
Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1085
Supply—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1228, 1229, 1231, 1237
Public Education, [189] 367
Universal Art Catalogue, [187] 616
Vaccination, [185] 404; Comm. [187] 1874, 1875; 3R. [188] 650

Bruce, Sir H. H., *Coleraine*
Africa—West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2074, 2082
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 596
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1748
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [188] 564
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), Comm. [187] 212
Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 438, 439

Bruce, Mr. C. L. Cumming-, *Elgin & Nairnshire*
Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh), 2R. [185] 674
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 911
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 196
Scotland—Management of Scotch Business in Parliament, [186] 399
Representation of, [185] 1267

Bruen, Mr. H., *Carlow Co.*
Ireland—Fenian Disturbances, [185] 334, 469
Inspectors of Weights and Measures, [185] 1239; Motion for a Committee, [186] 413
Release of John Morris, Motion for Papers, [185] 1240, 1242
Taxation, Res. [188] 1314

Bryan, Mr. G. L., *Kilkenny Co.*
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 369
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), [186] 290; 2R. 1724

Buccleuch, Duke of
Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1651
New Forest, [189] 1306

Buckingham, Duke of (Secretary of State for the Colonies)
Adjutants of Volunteers, 3R. Amendt. [188] 1387
Agricultural Gangs, [189] 166; 2R. 596
British North America, Commons Amendts. [185] 1701
Burlington House—London University, [186] 1323
Canada Railway Loan, 3R. [186] 1454, 1463, 1465
Colonial Churches, [186] 388; [187] 761
Ireland—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1430
Jamaica—Case of Mr. Eyre, [189] 1443
  Charge of the Lord Chief Justice — Mr. Purcell, [188] 1718
Master and Servant, 2R. [189] 847
Metropolis—Hyde Park, [189] 76, 77
New Forest, [189] 1305
New Zealand—Withdrawal of Troops, Motion for a Return, [188] 1505, 1507, 1508
Postal—Communication with Australia, [189] 1330
Railway Traffic Protection, Comm. [186] 119
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [188] 1260, 1261
Representation of the People—Metropolitan Boroughs, Motion for Returns, [186] 1264
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 295; *cl.* 3, 302
Russian America—Cession of, to the United States, [186] 980
Sale of Land by Auction, Commons Amendts. [188] 4
State Offices—The New Buildings, Motion for a Return, [186] 1333

Buenos Ayres
Case of the "Cestus," Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 16, [189] 1610
War in the River Plate, Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 1, [185] 1233

Buller, Sir E. M., *Staffordshire, N.*
Army—The 98th Regiment, [187] 771
Boundary Commissioners, [188] 176, 266, 268
Corruption at Elections, [185] 405
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [188] 665
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1533, 1535; *cl.* 4, [187] 847; *cl.* 19, [188] 51; *cl.* 31, 534; *add. cl.* 669; Schedule D, Amendt. 1289
Special and Common Juries, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1587

Bunhill Fields Burial Ground Bill
(*Mr. Crawford, Mr. Goschen, Sir Morton Peto, Mr. Remington Mills*)
c. Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *April* 2, [186] 997 [Bill 107]
Read 2° * *May* 9
Committee *; Report *May* 14
Considered as amended * *May* 16
Read 3° * *May* 17
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *May* 20
Read 2ª, after debate *June* 3, [187] 1477
Report of Lords' Committee * *June* 18
Committee *; Report *June* 20 (No. 105)
Read 3ª * *June* 21
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 38]

Burials (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Monsell, Mr. Sullivan*)
c. Resolution; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 4
Bill withdrawn * *July* 25 [Bill 109]

Burlington House—The New Buildings
Observations, Mr. Layard; Reply, Lord John Manners *April* 5, [186] 1232; short debate thereon
(See title *University of London*)

Burrell, Sir P., *New Shoreham*
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 672

Butler, Mr. C. S., *Tower Hamlets*
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1617; *cl.* 79, 1695
Mexico—State of, [187] 1495
Representation of the People—Tower Hamlets, [187] 1129, 1130

Butler-Johnstone, Mr. H. A., *Canterbury*
Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 73, 125, 126; 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 458, 569; Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1427; *cl.* 15, [188] 36; Consid. Schedule C, 1480

Buxton, Sir T. F., *King's Lynn*
Africa — West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2079
African Slave Trade, [187] 614
Egypt—Slave Trade on the Nile, [188] 980
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [185] 1623; *cl.* 49, Amendt. 1680
Muscat—Imaum of, [186] 1478
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1013, 1109; Consid. Schedule C, 1480

Buxton, Mr. C., *Surrey, E.*
Army—Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1965
Jamaica—Alleged Excesses in, [186] 275
Libel, 2R. [185] 1732
Navy—Lieutenant Brand, [185] 1144
Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 76; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1144

Cabs and Hackney Carriage Trade (Metropolis)
Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 12, [185] 280

Cairns, Lord
Brown's Charity, 2R. [188] 499
County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [187] 1930; *cl.* 19, *ib.*; *cl.* 24, 1931, 1932
Court of Appeal Chancery (Despatch of Business), 2R. [188] 1434
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188] 494
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 844
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 243, 244
* Ireland—Established Church, Motion for an Address, [188] 368, 386
Jamaica—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice—Mr. Purcell, [188] 1719
Limerick Harbour (Composition of Debt), Comm. [188] 1184
Parliament—Construction of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 659
Railway Companies, Comm. [189] 158; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 162
Railway Traffic Protection, Comm. [186] 111
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [188] 1259
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1982, 1988, 1995; Comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 303; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 305, 306, 307, 308, 310, 313, 319, 321, 323, 324; *cl.* 7, 415; *add. cl.* 433; *cl.* 15, 553; *add. cl.* 714, 715, 717, 734; *cl.* 43, Amendt. 736; *cl.* 46, 737; *cl.* 47, 745; *cl.* 54, Amendt. 750; *add. cl.* 751; Report, *cl.* 4, 826

Cambridge, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
Army—Cavalry Barracks, Knightsbridge, [187] 1472, 1475
  Industrial Employment of Soldiers, [186] 899
  March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1493, 1495
  Recruiting Commission, Address for a Return, [185] 1788, 1799
  Transport and Supply Department, [188] 594
Canada Railway Loan, 3R. [186] 1461
Ireland—Constabulary, Motion for Returns, [186] 463, 464
  Military at Elections, Motion for Papers, [185] 1219
New Zealand—Withdrawal of Troops, Motion for a Return, [188] 1509
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 375, 377

Camoys, Lord
Representation of the People, Report, *cl.* 4, [189] 829

Campbell, Lord
Adjutants of Volunteers, 3R. [188] 1385, 1387
Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 147, 155, 156
Ireland — Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1430, 1431
[*cont.*

Campbell, Lord—*cont.*
Representation of the People, Report, *cl.* 5, Amendt. [189] 831, 836; 3R. *add. cl.* 944, 949

Camperdown, Earl of
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1830
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 65, 69

Canada—Extradition of M. Lamirande
Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 18, [185] 467; Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 5, 1339
  Parl. Paper— . . . . [3806]
  Correspondence . . . . [3808]
Mr. Stayner, late Deputy Postmaster General, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 18, [185] 479

Canada Railway Loan Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)
186] c. Resolution (*Mr. Adderley*) *Mar* 28, 736; after long debate, A. 247, N. 67; M. 180
Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 29 [Bill 99]
Read 2°, after short debate *April* 1, 972
Committee*; Report *April* 4
Considered as amended* *April* 5
Read 3°* *April* 5
Question, Mr. Whatman; Answer, Mr. Adderley *April* 9, 1338
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Buckingham*) *April* 8
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *April* 9
Read 3ª, after short debate, and passed *April* 11, 1453 (No. 73)
Royal Assent *April* 12 [30 *Vict.* c. 16]

Candia—see *Turkey*

Candlish, Mr. J., *Sunderland*
Army Estimates — Miscellaneous Services, Amendt. [187] 1720
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. [189] 756
Church Rates, Commutation of, Leave, [185] 295
Consecration of Churches and Churchyards, Consid. *add. cl.* [189] 1594
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1000; *cl.* 45, 1522
Dogs, Duty on, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [185] 1199; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [186] 452
Financial Statement, [186] 1124
Hours of Labour, 2R. [186] 452
Law Courts, New, [189] 1570
Master and Servant, Law of, [185] 1260
Mercantile Marine, [185] 83; [189] 1337
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1618; *cl.* 79, 1696
Missionaries, Grants for, [185] 726
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 630
  Greenwich Hospital, Res. [189] 866
  "Greenwich Sixpence," [187] 1739
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [186] 1386
Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1418; *cl.* 1, [189] 143
[*cont.*

Candlish, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Poor Laws, Consolidation of the, [189] 1448
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, [188] 426
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [187] 53, 56, 707; *cl.* 34, 1185, 1186, 1784; *cl.* 43, [188] 516, 520; *add. cl.* 674, 795, 796, 808, 1028, 1030, 1208; Preamble, 1290; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* 3, [189] 1117; *cl.* L, Amendt. 1198
Shipping Returns, [185] 1934
Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 590
Supply—Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 903; Amendt. 907
Quarantine Establishment, [187] 926, 928
Salaries, &c. in Offices of Houses of Parliament, [187] 853; Motion for Adjournment, 859, 860
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1159

Canning, Mr., Statue of
c. Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 2, [186] 1874; Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 6, [187] 2; Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 6, [189] 958; Observations, Mr. Beresford Hope *August* 10, 1291; debate thereon
l. Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to give Directions that the Statue of Mr. Canning may be restored to its original Position or to a Site not more remote from the Houses of Parliament than that on which it used to stand" (*The Lord Campbell*) *July* 26, [189] 147; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Canterbury, Archbishop of
Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [189] 41
Christ Church (Oxford) Ordinances, 2R. [188] 1425, 1427
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1089
Clerical Vestments, 1R. [185] 1625; [186] 559; [187] 72, 74
Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. Amendt. [187] 501, 506, 520; [189] 1632
Colonial Churches, [186] 375
Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1016, 1019; Comm. 1651
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1171, 1175, 1181
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [187] 82; Comm. *add. cl.* 384; *cl.* 11, 387, 762; *cl.* 13, 1194; *add. cl.* 1195; Report, *cl.* 2, 1479; *cl.* 13, 1485; 3R. [188] 258; Commons' Amendts. [189] 1542
Office of Judge in the Admiralty, Divorce, and Probate Courts, 2R. [185] 1008
Ritualism—The Royal Commission, [188] 125, 244, 586, 1171, 1181; Report, [189] 1630

Cape of Good Hope
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that Her Majesty's Forces be not withdrawn from the Cape of Good Hope" (*Mr. Vanderbyl*) *June* 4, [187] 1596; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
[*cont.*

Cape of Good Hope—cont.
Petition presented (*The Duke of Manchester*) *June* 18, [188] 5; after short debate, Petition to lie on the Table

Capital Punishment, Legislation on
Question Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 6, [185] 78

Capital Punishments within Prisons Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 24]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 26

Cardigan, Earl of
Army—March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1495
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 251
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 15, [189] 571
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [186] 458; [188] 759

Cardwell, Right Hon. E., *Oxford City*
British North America, 2R. [185] 1174; Comm. *cl.* 58, 1318; *cl.* 91, 1319
Burlington House Site, [186] 1241
Cape of Good Hope, Motion for an Address, [187] 1602
Colonial Bishops, [185] 337; [187] 256
Coolies, Exportation of (East Indies), [185] 1258
Martial Law—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Res. [188] 916
New Zealand—British Troops in, [185] 1934
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1339; *cl.* 9, 1508, 1513, 1783; *cl.* 15, 1992; [188] 34, 36, 42, 44; *cl.* 25, 177; *cl.* 36, 294; *cl.* 40, 303; Amendt. 479, 481, 485; *add. cl.* 690; Consid. *cl.* 21, 1460; *cl.* 46, 1467
Storm Warnings, Res. [188] 1739
Supply—Royal Palaces, [185] 506;—University of London, [187] 1466
Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1270

Carington, Hon. C. R., *Wycombe* (*Chepping*)
Army—March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1191

Carlisle, Bishop of
Clerical Vestments, [187] 74
Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 519
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1176, 1179
Increase of the Episcopate, Report, *cl.* 12, [187] 1482; *cl.* 13, 1486
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [188] 1376

Carnarvon, Earl of († Secretary of State for the Colonies)
† British North America, 2R. [185] 557, 582; 3R. 1017
Cape of Good Hope—Withdrawal of Troops, [188] 6
[*cont.*

Carnarvon, Earl of—*cont.*
Christ Church (Oxford) Ordinances, 2R. [188] 1426
† Church of England in the Colonies, Address for Papers, [185] 384, 388
Clerical Vestments, [187] 74, 76
Colonial Churches, [186] 377
Guildford Board of Guardians, [187] 860
Jamaica—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice—Mr. Purcell, [188] 1720
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. [186] 388
Ministerial Explanation, [185] 1289
New Zealand—Withdrawal of Troops, Motion for a Return, [188] 1496, 1507
Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for Returns, [188] 142; Motion for a Committee, Amendt. 263
Construction of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 653
Postal Communication with Australia, [189] 1329
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [188] 1258
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1833, 1846, 1916, 1988, 2024; Comm. [189] 274, 280, 281; *cl.* 4, 308, 316; *add. cl.* 459; *cl.* 15, 565; *add. cl.* 725, 728; *cl.* 33, 735
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 63

Carnegie, Hon. C., *Forfarshire*
Courts of Justice, The New, Res. [185] 824
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), Leave, [185] 1088; 2R. [187] 187; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 756, 757
Railways (Scotland), 2R. [187] 1012

Carriers Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Bazley, Mr. Cornwall Legh, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. William Edward Forster*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 9 [Bill 243]
Read 2° * *July* 12
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 15, [188] 1614
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day two months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Committee put off till this day two months
Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 25, [189] 82

Cattle Plague
The Orders in Council
Question, Sir G. Stucley; Answer, Lord R.
188] Montagu *June* 18, 16; Question, Viscount
Enfield; Answer, Lord R. Montagu *July* 12,
. 1436 :—Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; An-
189] swer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 25, 79;
Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Lord Robert
. Montagu *August* 8, 1105; Question, Mr.
. Read; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu
August 16, 1609
[*cont.*

Cattle Plague—cont.
Compensation
Compensation for Slaughtered Cattle, Question,
185] Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 15, 402;
Question, Mr. Fordyce; Answer, Mr. Corry
. *Feb* 21, 724; Question, Mr. Read; Answer,
. Mr. Hunt *Mar* 12, 1702 :—Question, Sir
J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Mr. Walpole
186] *Mar* 26, 562; Question Sir J. Clarke Jervoise;
. Answer, Lord Robert Montagu, 566; Ques-
tion, Mr. Fordyce; Answer, Lord Robert
. Montagu *April* 5, 1228
Cheshire, Question, Mr. Tollemache; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 19, [185] 586; Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 18, [188] 1668
Cornwall, Question, Mr. H. E. Surtees; Answer, Lord R. Montagu *Mar* 28, [186] 731
County of Aberdeen, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "this House is of opinion that the County of Aberdeen should receive the proportional amount of the Grant which the owners of cattle slaughtered under the compulsory Orders in Council would have received, in accordance with the Privy Council Regulations, had no Cattle Assurance Association been formed within the same" (*Mr. Fordyce*), [186] 2013; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Importation
Importation of Foreign Cattle, Question, Mr.
185] Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 18, 460;
Question, Major Jervis; Answer, Lord R.
186] Montagu *April* 4, 1106; Question, Lord
Dunkellin; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu
187] *May* 7, 92; Question, Mr. Evans; Answer,
. Lord Robert Montagu *May* 13, 391; Ques-
tion, Mr. Dent; Answer, Lord Robert
. Montagu *May* 20, 777; Question, Mr. Cor-
rance; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu
. *May* 21, 878; Question, Mr. Cheetham; An-
. swer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 27, 1129;
Question, Colonel Barttelot; Answer, Lord
. Robert Montagu *May* 30, 1295
Importation of Cattle (*Ireland*), Question, Sir Henry Winston-Barron; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 24, [188] 1022
The Order in Council 28th May, 1867, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 21, To leave out from "That," and add "the Order of the Privy Council of the 28th May, 1867, respecting the importation of Cattle is expedient" (*Mr. Ayrton*), [188] 349; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Sir George Stucley; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 28, 666
(*Liverpool*), Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 1, To leave out from "That," and add "Cattle arriving from Spain and Portugal may be removed by Rail from Liverpool to Manchester and Salford, under somewhat similar regulations to those in force at Harwich and Southampton for conveyance of Foreign Cattle to London" (*Mr. Graves*); [189] 629; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
[*cont.*

Cattle Plague—cont.
Cattle Trade, Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 19, [185] 584; Question, Mr. Dodson; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 16, [188] 1622
Chartered Cattle Markets, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord R. Montagu *July* 26, [189] 168
Gloucester, Cattle Market at, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Lord R. Montagu *Mar* 28, [186] 735
Live Stock, Exhibitions of, Question, Mr. Acland; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *April* 9, [186] 1337; Question, Colonel Leslie; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 11, [186] 1479
Reported Outbreaks in London, Question, Mr.
185] Dent; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 8, 146:—
Question, Viscount Galway; Answer, Lord R.
187] Montagu *May* 6, 6; Question, Mr. Mitford;
Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 17, 693;
Question, Sir William Bagge; Answer, Lord
Robert Montagu *May* 30, 1291
Trade in Animals, Report of Select Committee on, Question, Mr. M'Lagan; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 19, [185] 584
Parl Papers—
Returns 434
Orders of Council 284

Cave, Rt. Hon. S. (Paymaster of the Forces and Vice President of the Board of Trade), *New Shoreham*
Admiralty Jurisdiction, [187] 939
Agricultural Statistics, [187] 1667; [189] 1104
Army—Colour-Sergeant Connell, [186] 468
Board of Trade Returns, [185] 1806
Carriers Act Amendment, Comm. [188] 1614; [189] 82
Companies Act Amendment, [189] 87; 2R. 929
Engineers, Society of, [189] 851
Fisheries, Sea, [187] 263
France—Fishery Convention, [189] 83
Grey, Mr. H. D., Case of, [187] 89, 394
Inspection of Ships, [187] 1732
Ireland—Wrecks on the Coast, [187] 396
Limited Liability, [188] 171
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (No. 3), Suspension of Standing Orders, [186] 1170
Loss of Life at Sea, [188] 170
Mercantile Marine, [189] 1337
Merchant Seamen in Beaumaris Gaol, [188] 989
Merchant Shipping Laws, Res. [189] 1493
Nantlle Railway Company, [186] 563
Navy—Royal Naval Reserve, [187] 1021, 1022; —Greenwich Hospital, Res. [189] 867
"North," The Ship, [187] 1489
Oyster and Mussel Fisheries, 2R. [185] 1325
Private Bills, Board of Trade Report on, [185] 1800
Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1865
Public Houses, &c. Regulation, 2R. [186] 1852
Railway Accident at Warrington, [188] 1668
Railway and Joint Stock Companies' Accounts, Leave, [187] 1589
Railway Bills—Standing Orders, Res. [187] 1656
Railway Commission, [189] 1336
Railway Companies, Consid. *cl.* 4, [187] 1723, 1725, 1726; *cl.* 7, 1727; [188] 1626
Railway Companies' Arrangements, [185] 1704
[*cont.*

Cave, Right Hon. S.—*cont.*
Railway Companies—Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1040, 1043
Railway Debentures, [186] 816
Railways, Royal Commission on, [186] 1935
Railways Construction Facilities Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 758
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [186] 1831; Comm. [188] 555; *cl.* 4, 557; *add. cl.* 559
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, [188] 452; *cl.* A, 622, 624; *add. cl.* 802, 897
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1400; Comm. [186] 99
Scotland — Granton and Burntisland Steam Ferries, [188] 982
Southerness Lighthouse, [187] 774
Scurvy at Sea, [187] 1130
Shipping Returns, [185] 1935
Stalybridge Railway Station, [185] 1703
Standards of Weights and Measures, [185] 465
Storm Signals, [186] 1174; [187] 1731; [188] 426, 1188; Res. 1732
Sugar Duties, Comm. Res. [185] 353; Report, 450
Supply—Agricultural Statistics, [188] 1907
Coolie Emigration, [188] 1772
Quarantine Establishment, [187] 926
Superannuation, [188] 1489
Tramways (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 68
Vice President of the Board of Trade, 3R. [187] 67; Re-comm. 475

Cave, Mr. T., *Barnstaple*
Canada Railway Loan, Comm. [186] 747
Church Rates—Mr. Grant of Kettleburgh, [186] 1583
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1348
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 43, [185] 1676
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 658
Representation of the People—Special Franchises, [186] 730
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1412

Cavendish, Lord E., *Sussex, E.*
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 545

Cavendish, Lord F. C., *Yorkshire, W.R.—N.*
Greenland, Edward, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 871
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1003, 1232
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 820

Cavendish, Lord G. H., *Derbyshire, N.*
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. Amendt. [186] 1420
Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1418
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1845

Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G., *Essex, S.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1484;—Military Education, [187] 1715, 1716, 1718
Army—War Office, Motion for a Committee withdrawn, [186] 1175; [187] 397
Cattle Plague, [189] 79, 80
[*cont.*

Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.—*cont.*
Egypt—Viceroy of, Visit of the, [188] 665, 853
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1937
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1205, 1207, 1208; Consid. *add. cl.* 1447; Schedule C, 1481; 3R. 1595
Weights and Measures, Convictions, [186] 1337
False, [185] 213
Inspection of, [187] 371; [188] 774

Ceylon—Government of
Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 4, [188] 988

Chambers, Mr. M., *Devonport*
Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 932
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1315; *cl.* 10, [187] 1976; *cl.* 40, [188] 453, 463; *cl.* 31, 530; *cl.* A, 625; *add. cl.* 673, 808, 1016, 1027
Supply—Embassy House, Constantinople, [188] 1706
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1226

Chambers, Mr. T., *Marylebone*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 684
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 238
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 2, [185] 1759; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1760
India—Central India Prize Money, [188] 983
Libel, 2R. [185] 1733
Life Sentences, [185] 1925
Metropolis—Ornamental Water in the Regent's Park, [185] 1550
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 753; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1614; *cl.* 6, *ib.*; *cl.* 7, *ib.*; *cl.* 9. Amendt. 1615, 1620; *cl.* 29, 1623; *cl.* 55, 1684
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [187] 1842
Poor Law Board, &c. Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 143
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 743, 746; *cl.* 34, 1185; *add. cl.* [188] 824
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 114
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1223
Vaccination, 3R. [188] 651

Chancellor, The Lord (Lord Chelmsford)
Admiralty Court (Ireland), Comm. [189] 1212; *cl.* 4, 1213, 1216
Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [189] 42
County Courts Acts Amendment, 2R. [187] 1384, 1386; Comm. 1550; *cl.* 4, 1929; *cl.* 10, 1930; *cl.* 19, 1931; *cl.* 24, 1932, 1933
Court of Appeal Chancery (Despatch of Business), 2R. [188] 1432
Court of Chancery (Ireland), 2R. [188] 662
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188] 492, 495; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 764; *add. cl.* 765
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), 2R. [189] 167; Comm. *add. cl.* 843; Commons' Reasons, 1603
Criminal Law, 2R. [187] 934
Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 716, 718
France, Mr., Pamphlet of, Res. [185] 1631
[*cont.*

Chancellor, The Lord—*cont.*
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 233, 235
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), 2R. [185] 1141, 1142, 1222; Comm. 1428. 1432
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. [187] 765
Intestate Widows and Children, 1R. [187] 1367
Investment of Trust Funds, 2R. [189] 1546
Ireland—Pension to Mr. Young, [187] 256;—Established Church, Motion for an Address, [188] 421
Jamaica—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice—Mr. Purcell, [188] 1720, 1721
Judges Chambers (Despatch of Business), 1R. [186] 453; 2R. 974
Lis Pendens, 2R. [185] 698
Lord Chief Baron—Petition of R. Wason, Esquire, [185] 262, 272
Masters and Operatives, 2R. [185] 697
Office of Judge in the Admiralty, Probate, and Divorce Courts, 2R. [185] 1003, 1010; Comm. [187] 606, 612; 3R. 1105
Parliament—Opening of the Session, [185] 2;—Prorogation of, [189] 1635, 1639
Prorogation of Parliament, 2R. [188] 1660
Recovery of Certain Debts (Scotland), 2R. [185] 1699; Comm. [186] 704
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), 2R. [186] 1167
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1934; Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [189] 303; *cl.* 4, 305, 312, 324; *cl.* 5, 324; *cl.* 7, 408, 410, 412, 415; *add. cl.* 432; *cl.* 9, 469; *cl.* 10, 472; *cl.* 15, 561; *add. cl.* 732; *cl.* 33, 735; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 737; Report, *cl.* 29, 839; *cl.* 49, Amendt. 842, 844
Salmon Fishery Act (Ireland), [188] 261
Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [188] 763
Statute Law Revision, 2R. [187] 1198
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1440; Comm. *cl.* 2, [186] 269, 270; *cl.* 3, 271; *cl.* 4, 272
Trades Unions Demonstration, Proposed, [185] 143
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, [185] 1911; *cl.* 19, 1912
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Comm. [188] 1381, 1384
Vice Admiralty Courts Act Amendment, 2R. [186] 1328
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 924

Chancellor of the Exchequer (Right Hon. B. Disraeli), *Buckinghamshire*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [185] 74
Adjournment—Derby Day, [187] 882
Admiralty, Court of, [188] 2071
Army Estimates, [185] 1647
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Leave, [185] 1065; 2R. [186] 1062
Boundary Commissioners, [187] 1939, 1940, 1941; [188] 17, 176, 267, 268
Bribery Commissioners, Reports of the, [185] 1146
Church Rates, Imprisonment for, [189] 1340, 1560
Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 206
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [189] 475, 1224; Comm. *cl.* 45, 1430
[*cont.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer—*cont.*
- Corrupt Practices at Elections, [185] 405; [186] 123, 124; [189] 1606
  - Removal of Magistrates, [186] 127, 1486, 1879, 1913
- Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [187] 375
- Courts of Law and Equity, [189] 475
- Easter Holydays, [186] 911; Motion for Adjournment, 1587, 1592
- Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Motion for a Committee, [187] 688, 882, 1496, 1498; [188] 508
- Election Petitions Committees, [186] 1336
- Elective Franchise—Reduction of the Qualification, [185] 887
- Expiring Laws, [189] 78
- Explanation—Mr. Osborne and Mr. Dillwyn, [187] 12, 13
- Factory Acts Extension, [186] 1710
- Financial Statement, Res. [186] 1110, 1116, 1132
- Fire Insurance, Res. [186] 137
- Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1161
- Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1979
- Increase of the Episcopate, [189] 85
- Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 885
  - Fenian Convict Burke, [187] 1131
  - Fenian Convicts, [187] 395
  - Franchise, The, [187] 881
  - Irish Church Commission, [189] 1610
  - Land Bills, [187] 397
  - Lord Mayor's Banquet, [185] 934
  - National Gallery, [189] 1242
  - Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1903
  - Railways, Res. [185] 1949
  - Reform Bill, [187] 5
  - Representation of, Res. [188] 717, 718
  - Roman Catholic University, [189] 603
  - State of, [189] 201
- Jamaica—Legal Proceedings against Officers, [185] 336
- Lancaster, Yarmouth, &c. Commissions, [185] 1338, 1548; Res. [186] 995
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), [186] 1338
- London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1341
- Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 551
- Martial Law, [187] 3
- Meetings in Royal Parks, [189] 85
- Metropolitan Cabs, &c. [185] 282
- Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1309, 1324, 1339, 1354, 1361, 1574
- Monetary Laws, [185] 147
- National Debt Acts, [186] 1787; [187] 373; 2R. 664
- Naval Review, The, [188] 1397, 1626
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [185] 1854; —Steam Machinery, [187] 1858
- Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1401
- Paris Exhibition — Purchases at the, [188] 2074
  - Search of Passengers' Baggage, Res. [185] 1594
- Parks Regulation, Re-comm. [189] 396
- Parliament—Alteration of Notices of Questions, [188] 1067
  - Business of the House, [185] 149, 1370; [186] 1319, 1321; [187] 941, 942; [188] 1068, 1521, 1523, 1875, 1877; [189] 1225, 1226
  - Count out, The, [189] 605

[*cont.*

Chancellor of the Exchequer—*cont.*
  - Morning Sittings, [188] 664, 665
  - Privilege—Signatures to a Petition, [188] 1125
  - Public Business, [188] 774, 779; [189] 1339
  - Standing Orders, [187] 1133
- Parliamentary Elections, [189] 88
- Poor Law Board, New President of the, [187] 876
- Postal Conventions, Foreign, [188] 1186
- Princess of Wales—Address to Her Majesty, [185] 813
- Railway Debentures, [186] 289
- Representation of the People—Amendments, [187] 95
  - Area of the New Boroughs, [188] 774
  - Borough Franchise, [186] 397, 469
  - Boroughs, [185] 1646
  - Compound Householders, [186] 1480, 1875, 1876, 1939; [187] 6, 261, 262, 615
  - Disfranchised Boroughs, [186] 1104
  - Electoral Statistics, [185] 1813, 1816, 1819
  - Fees of Returning Officers, [186] 1481
  - Forty Shilling Freeholders, [186] 283, 285, 287
  - Franchises, [185] 467, 887, 1306
  - Hundreds of Offlow, [186] 1483
  - Joint Occupiers, [187] 90
  - Lindsey, Parts of, [186] 293
  - Polling Places, [187] 935
  - Ratepaying Clause, [188] 855
  - Re-distribution of Seats, [188] 1263
  - Reform Statistics, [185] 1648, 1649, 1702
  - Registration Clauses, [188] 18
  - Residence — Ministerial Statement, [186] 1939, 1942, 1943, 1944
  - Schedule D, [187] 618
  - Special Franchises, [186] 730
  - Statistics, [188] 609, 666
  - Suffrage to Women, [186] 467
  - Tower Hamlets, [187] 1129, 1130
  - Voting Papers, [186] 1174, 1481
  - Wednesbury and West Bromwich, [186] 394, 469
  - Working Classes—Borough Register, [186] 470

185] Representation of the People, Motion for Comm. 214, 937, 989, 1203, 1235, 1237;—The Resolutions, 337, 339, 465, 484, 1021

186] Representation of the People, Leave, 6, 14, 17, 36, 85, 89, 93, 124, 125, 126, 472; 2R. 479, 480, 484, 491, 558, 642, 663, 664, 665, 907, 1105; Comm. 1269, 1272, 1276, 1282, 1290, 1486, 1503; *cl.* 3, 1521, 1573, 1574, 1675, 1678, 1912

187] *cl.* 3, 15, 19, 21, 43, 46, 47, 52; Amendt. 53, 294, 330, 347; Amendt. 444, 452, 465, 472, 474, 525, 706, 720, 729, 733, 749, 755, 756, 779; *cl.* 4, 850; Motion for Adjournment, 851, 997, 998, 1006, 1009, 1011, 1135, 1163; *cl.* 34, Amendt. 1176, 1177, 1182; Proviso, 1188; *cl.* 35, Amendt. 1189, 1190, 1191; Amendt. 1201, 1202, 1206, 1207, 1222, 1224, 1225; *cl.* 5, 1232, 1239; *cl.* 6, 1240, 1242; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1296, 1299, 1323, 1340, 1342, 1362, 1363; *cl.* 9, 1416, 1429, 1517, 1532, 1541, 1544, 1546, 1547, 1776, 1784; *cl.* 10, 1955, 1968; Amendt. 1976, 1977, 1981; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1987; *cl.* 14, 1989, 1991, 1992; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1992, 2001, 2003, 2004

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*

188] *cl.* 15, 30 ; Amendt. 36, 42, 44, 48 ; *cl.* 19, Amendt. 51, 52, 53 ; *cl.* 23, Amendt. *ib.* 54 ; *cl.* 24, 177 ; *cl.* 29, 179, 220 ; *cl.* 31, 270, 281 ; Amendt. 522, 526, 528, 530, 531, 533, 534, 535, 536, 610, 612 ; *cl.* 33, 290 ; *cl.* 37, 301 ; *cl.* 40, Motion for Adjournment, 303 ; *cl.* 40, 430, 437, 448, 451, 454, 466, 485 ; *cl.* 42, Amendt. 486, 508 ; *cl.* 43, 521 ; *add. cl.* 612 ; *cl.* A, 616, 624, 645 ; *cl.* B, 647 ; *add. cl.* 681, 692, 696, 702, 703, 783, 791, 793, 807, 831, 843, 844, 868, 879, 885, 887, 890, 892 ; Motion for Adjournment, 990, 1006, 1017, 1022, 1029, 1033, 1036, 1109, 1197, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1208, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1221, 1228, 1243, 1272, 1273, 1274; Schedule A, 1280; Schedule B, 1281, 1282, 1283, 1284 ; Schedule C, 1286 ; Schedule D, 1285, 1289 ; Preamble, 1290; Consid. *add. cl.* 1447, 1451, 1452, 1453 ; *cl.* B, Amendt. 1454, 1457, 1458 ; *cl.* 21, 1460 ; *cl.* 27, 1461 ; *cl.* 42, 1462; Schedule F, 1475, 1476 ; Schedule B, 1479 ; Schedule C, 1480 ; Schedule D, 1481 ; 3R. 1599

189] 852 ; Lords' Amendts. 1002, 1003, 1106, 1108 ; *cl.* 3, 1118 ; *cl.* C, Amendt. 1185, 1192 ; *cl.* I, 1197 ; *cl.* 54, 1198

Representation of the People (Ireland), [186] 289, 818, 1785, 2024 ; [187] 778, 779, 1090, 1936 ; [188] 17
Representation of the People (Scotland), [185] 1268, 1802 ; [186] 288 ;—Members for, 396, 1785, 2022 ; [187] 266 ; Leave, 399, 431, 434, 621, 694, 1023, 1499 ; [188] 1068, 1897 ; [189] 331, 332
Royal Parks, [187] 371
Sugar Duties, Comm. Res. [185] 345
Supply—Blacas Collection, [185] 491
    British Museum, [189] 347
    Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1246, 1248, 1253
    Exchequer and Audit Department, [187] 856
    Inland Revenue Departments, [187] 1096
    National Gallery (Ireland), [189] 1242
    Public Education (Ireland), [189] 929
    Royal Palaces, [185] 508 ; [188] 1683, 1687
    Salaries, &c. in Offices of Houses of Parliament, [187] 854, 855
Telegraphic Communication, [188] 1512
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1161, 1586, 1783, 1934, 1935
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 3R. [188] 85
Volunteer Review, The, [188] 1518
Walpole, Mr., Resignation of, [187] 398, 399
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Res. [186] 1110, 1116, 1132
Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 444, 445

Charitable Donations and Bequests (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 22 [Bill 49]
Read 2° *Mar* 15, [185] 1996
Committee *May* 10, [187] 377
Committee * ; Report *June* 7
Considered as amended * *June* 21
Committee * ; Report *June* 21 [*cont.*

Charitable Donations and Bequests (Ireland) Bill —cont.

Considered * *June* 24
Read 3° * *June* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *June* 25
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Belmore*) *July* 5, [188] 1062 ; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 177)
Committee * ; Report *July* 8
Read 3ª * *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 54]

Chatham and Sheerness Stipendiary Magistrates Bill (*The Earl of Belmore*)

l. Presented ; read 1ª * *June* 6 (No. 142)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Belmore*) *June* 18, [188] 1 ; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee * *June* 21
Report * *June* 24
Read 3ª * *June* 25 (No. 170)
c. Read 1° * *June* 27 [Bill 211]
Read 2° * *July* 4
Resolution in Committee * *July* 5 ; Report *July* 8
Committee * ; Report *July* 8
Considered as amended * *July* 11
Read 3° * *July* 12
l. Royal Assent *July* 25 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 63]

CHATTERTON, Right Hon. H. E. († Solicitor General, afterwards Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*

† Charitable Donations and Bequests (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1996 ; Comm. [187] 377
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1522
† Court of Chancery (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1858 ; Comm. [186] 449 ; *cl.* 11, 450 ; *cl.* 40, Amendt. 1164 ; *cl.* 88, 1165, 1166 ; [187] 375, 376
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188] 1415
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Re-comm. *cl.* 35, [188] 1250 ; *add. cl.* 1251 ; 3R. 1911
Criminal Law, 3R. [186] 1416
† Dublin University Professorships, 2R. [185] 1131
Ecclesiastical Titles, [189] 1339
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 370
Ireland—Attack on a Wesleyan Missionary, [189] 1335
    Court of Exchequer, [186] 1787
    Established Church, Res. [187] 131
    Famine in the West, [189] 1333
    Fishermen on the Lower Shannon, [186] 427
    Flynn, Charles, Case of, [189] 1335
    Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 20, 23
    Waterford Election, [186] 4
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 578
† Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1125
Petit Juries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 95
Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 960
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1100
† Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 547 ; 2R. [186] 1772 ; [187] 373

CHEETHAM, Mr. J., *Salford*
Cattle, Foreign, [187] 1129
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 12, [187] 1987 ; *add. cl.* [188] 842, 884 ; Schedule B, Amendt. 1281 ; Consid. Schedule B, Amendt. 1479
Stalybridge Railway Station, [185] 1703

CHELMSFORD, Lord (see CHANCELLOR, the LORD)

Chester Courts Bill
(*Earl Grosvenor, Mr. William Henry Gladstone*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 7 [Bill 69]
Read 2° * *Mar* 15
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 19
Considered as amended * *April* 4 [Bill 108]
Read 3° * *April* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord de Tabley*) *April* 9
Read 2ª * *June* 4 (No. 77)
Committee * *June* 6 ; Report * *June* 7
Read 3ª * *June* 17 (No. 145)
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 36]

Chester, Disturbances at
Question, Lord Stanley of Alderley ; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 12, [185] 273 ; Question, Colonel French ; Answer, Mr. Walpole 284 ; Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 14, 344
Troops and Arms in Chester Castle, Question, Mr. Owen Stanley ; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 14, [185] 342
(See title *Ireland, Fenian Conspiracy*)

CHICHESTER, Earl of
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 1, [187] 380 ; Amendt. 382

CHILDERS, Mr. H. C. E., *Pontefract*
Africa—West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2082
Army Estimates — Barrack Establishment, [187] 1749, 1750
Hospital Establishment, [187] 1750
Increase of Pay (Marines), [189] 139
Land Forces, [185] 1507
Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1712, 1713
Army—Military Reserve Fund, Motion for a Committee, [187] 559
System of Retirement, Motion for a Committee, [187] 69
Bridges (Ireland), 2R. [186] 797
Canada—Mr. Stayner, late Deputy Postmaster General, [185] 479
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 16, [186] 450
Courts of Law, &c. (Salaries and Expenses), [187] 1667
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Re-comm. *cl.* 35, [188] 1250
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 5, [185] 1762, 1763, 1764 ; *add. cl.* [186] 700 ; 3R. 1415
Dogs, Duty on, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1200, 1201
Duchy of Lancaster (Prothonotaries Fees), [189] 1102
Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses), 2R. [186] 1259
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1160, 1161

[*cont.*

CHILDERS, Mr. H. C. E.—*cont.*
India, China, and Australian Mails, [185] 1807
Ireland—Railways, Res. [185] 1947, 1948 ; [189] 619, 624 ;—Galway Harbour, Comm. [187] 68
Middlesex Registration, [186] 1872, 1873
Middlesex Registry, Res. [188] 80, 82
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 637
Greenwich Hospital, Res. [189] 863
"Greenwich Sixpence," [187] 1737
Paddle-Wheel Steamers, Motion for Papers, [186] 209
Promotion in the, Res. [186] 307
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, &c. [187] 1836, 1838
Dockyards, &c. [187] 1843, 1845
Men and Boys, [185] 1846, 1855 ; Amendt. [186] 321, 360, 362, 448, 950, 970
Naval Stores, [187] 1857
Paris Exhibition—Search of Passengers' Baggage, [185] 1588
Postal — East India, China, and Australian Mails, [189] 1564
India and China Mails, [187] 1493, 1494
Printing—Sessional Committee, [185] 256
Railway Companies' Arrangements, [185] 1704
Railway Debenture Holders, 2R. [185] 784
Railways (Scotland), 2R. [187] 1012
Records (Ireland), Leave, [187] 564
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 726, 728, 743, 780 ; *cl.* 4, 1143 ; *cl.* 15, [188] 41 ; *cl.* 23, 54 ; *cl.* 31, 531 ; *cl.* A, Amendt. 621, 623 ; *add. cl.* 1203 ; Lords' Amendts. [189] 1199
Sale of Land by Auction, Comm. Preamble, [187] 924
South Australia—Mr. Justice Boothby, [187] 1494
Supply—Board of Trade, [187] 856
Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1773, 1898
Charity Commission, [187] 925
Coolie Emigration, [188] 1771, 1772
Exchequer and Audit Department, [187] 856
Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 900, 906, 907, 908
Lunacy Commission, [187] 924
Miscellaneous Expenses, [188] 1908
Mixed Commissions, Amendt. [188] 1900
Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1678
Office of Works, [187] 857
Poor Law Commissioners, [187] 858
Post Office Packet Service, [189] 681, 700, 701
Printing and Stationery, [187] 929
Prisons and Convict Establishment, [187] 1095
Quarantine Establishment, [187] 926
Royal Palaces, [185] 497, 502, 504
Salaries, &c. in Offices of Houses of Parliament, [187] 853, 854
Services in China, [188] 1902
Superannuation, [188] 1488, 1489
Transportation, [187] 1095
Telegraphic Communication, [188] 1512
Transportation to Western Australia, [186] 1173
Valuation of Property, Leave, [185] 254 ; 2R. 1660
Vice President of the Board of Trade, 2R. [185] 471 ; 3R. [187] 66 ; Re-comm. 475, 478

Cholerine, Physical Properties of
Questions, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answers, Mr. Walpole, Mr. Corry *Mar* 7, [185] 1446

Christ Church (Oxford) Ordinances Bill
(*Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. William Henry Gladstone*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 6 [Bill 190]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee *; Report *June* 18
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 27
Read 3° * *June* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Archbishop of Canterbury*) *June* 28 (No. 190)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Archbishop of Canterbury*) *July* 12, [188] 1425; after debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee * *July* 18
Report * *July* 19
Read 3ª * *July* 22
c. Question, Viscount Galway; Answer, Sir Roundell Palmer *July* 25, [189] 85
l. Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 76]

Church Discipline Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. Kennard*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 12 [Bill 124]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 20

Church of England

Book of Common Prayer—the Sealed Books, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to give Directions that Her Majesty's Printers and the Delegates of the University Press at Oxford and the Syndics of the University Press at Cambridge should return to this House: 1. A List of the Alterations from the Text of the sealed Books existing in the Books of Common Prayer as now issued; 2. The Dates of such Alterations; 3. The Authority under which they were severally made" (*The Bishop of Oxford*) *July* 12, [188] 1431; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Publication of the Banns of Matrimony, Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 14, [185] 1800; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Attorney General *April* 1, [186] 902; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 6, [187] 4

Royal Commission on Ritual, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 3, [187] 1489; Question, Mr. Foljambe; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 6, 1664—*Clerical Vestments*, Question, The Archbishop of Canterbury; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 7, [187] 72

Motion for "an Address for Copy of the Commission of Inquiry into the difference of Practise in the Conduct of Public Worship in Churches of the United Church of England and Ireland" (*The Earl of Derby*) *June* 20, [188] 121; Motion agreed to; Copy of Commission laid before the House

Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Archbishop of York *June* 21, [188] 243; Observations, The Archbishop of Canterbury *June* 27, 586

[*cont.*

Church of England—cont.

The Royal Commission on Ritual and Convocation, Questions, The Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Taunton; Answer, The Archbishop of Canterbury *July* 8, [188] 1168; debate thereon

Report of the Commissioners, Observations, The Archbishop of Canterbury *August* 19, [189] 1630; Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 21, 1639
Copy of Commission, Parl Paper 171
First Report . . . . . . [2255]

Clerical Vestments, Legislation respecting, Observations, The Archbishop of Canterbury *Mar* 26, [186] 559; Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury *Mar* 28, 703

Ritualistic Practices, Petitions presented (*The Marquess of Westmeath*) *April* 9, [186] 1328; after short debate, Petitions to lie on the table; Personal Explanation (*The Duke of Marlborough*) *April* 11, 1453

West Indies—Ecclesiastical Establishment in the, Resolution (*Mr. Remington Mills*); Motion not in Order *Mar* 29, [186] 887; Question, Mr. Remington Mills; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 26, [189] 171

Church of England in the Colonies—Colonial Bishops, Question, Mr. Cardwell; Answer,
185] Mr. Adderley *Feb* 14, 337; Address for Papers (*The Bishop of London*) *Feb* 15, 378; after debate, Motion agreed to:—Question, Mr. Cardwell; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 9,
187] 256:—Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr.
189] Adderley *August* 2, 769

Colonial Churches, Petition of Bishop, Clergy, and Laymen of the United Church of England and Ireland, in the Diocese of Sydney, Australia (*The Earl of Harrowby*) and of Victoria (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *Mar* 22, [186] 372, after long debate, Petitions ordered to lie on the table

Church in the Colonies, Question, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 21, [186] 290; Question, Lord Lyttelton; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *May* 20, [187] 761—(*Parl. P.* No. 307)

Cornwall, Bishopric in, Petition of Inhabitants of Cornwall presented (*The Earl of Devon*) *Mar* 4, [185] 1300; after debate, Petition ordered to lie on the table

(See *Established Church, Ireland—Ecclesiastical Commissioners*)

Church Rates

Imprisonment for — Mr. P. Foster, Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 12, [189] 1340; Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 15, 1560

Mr. Grant of Kettleburgh, Question, Mr. T. Cave; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 12, [186] 1583
Church Rate Bills—Return—
(*Parl. P.* No. 68)

Church Rates Abolition Bill
(*Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Baines, Mr. Trevelyan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 13]
186] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Hardcastle*) *Mar* 20, 215

[*cont.*

Church Rates Abolition Bill—cont.
186] Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*), 220; after long debate, Question, "That 'now' &c.," A. 263, N. 187; M. 76; main Question agreed to; Bill read 2°
Division List, Ayes and Noes, 247
187] Committee *May* 8, 207—R.P.
Committee*; Report *June* 25
189] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Hardcastle*) *July* 24, 34
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Gorst*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.," A. 129, N. 99; M. 30; main Question agreed to; Bill read 3°
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Morley*) *July* 25
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Morley*) *August* 8, 1080 (No. 256)
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Lord Delamere*); on Question, That ("now,") &c., Cont. 24, Not-Cont. 82; M. 58; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª on this Day Three Months; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1093

Church Rates Commutation Bill
(*Mr. Newdegate, Colonel Stuart*)
c. Motion for leave (*Mr. Newdegate*), [185] 294
Previous Question proposed (*Mr. Hadfield*); after short debate, previous Question withdrawn; main Question agreed to
Bill ordered; read 1° *Feb* 12 [Bill 15]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Newdegate*) *Mar* 20, [186] 250
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Serjeant Gaselee*), 264; Question, "That 'now,' &c.," A. 45, N. 177; M. 132; words added; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 265
Main Question, as amended, agreed to; second reading put off for six months

Church Rates Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Beresford Hope*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 21 [Bill 42]
Second Reading deferred, after short debate *Mar* 20, [186] 266
Bill withdrawn* *July* 24

Church Temporalities Orders (Ireland) Validation, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Lord Naas*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 19 [Bill 267]
Read 2°* *August* 5
Committee*; Report *August* 8
Considered as amended* *August* 9
Read 3°* *August* 9
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 9
Read 2ª* *August* 16 (No. 322)
Committee*; Report *August* 17
Read 3ª* *August* 19
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 137]

Churchward, Mr., Case of
185] Question, Mr. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 15, 1914
186] Observations, Major Dickson; Reply, Mr. Taylor *Mar* 18, 5; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Taylor *Mar* 19, 123
[*cont.*

Churchward, Mr., Case of—cont.
186] Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions for the removal of Mr. Churchward from the Commission of the Peace for the Borough of Dover" (*Mr. Taylor*), 167
After debate, Amendt. to leave out from "removal of," in order to add "all persons in the Commission of the Peace of any County, City, or Borough who have been found, either by Committees of this House or by Royal Commissions guilty of, or privy or assenting to, corrupt practices at Parliamentary Elections" (*Mr. Bentinck*), 180
After further debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 141, N. 161; M. 20; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 203
Question, "That those words be there added;" after further debate, words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to
Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 21, 280
Her Majesty's Answer to Address reported *Mar* 25, 466
Question Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 25, 471; Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, Mr. Speaker *April* 11, 1477:—Question, Mr. Taylor; Answer, Mr.
187] Gathorne Hardy *June* 14, 190
(See *Corrupt Practices at Elections—Removal of Magistrates*)

Civil Servants' Half-Holyday
Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 1, [188] 773

Civil Service Examination
Question, Mr. H. Lewis; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 8, [186] 1265

CLANCARTY, Earl of
Ireland—Railways, [188] 353;—Established Church, Motion for an Address, 396
Representation of the People, Commons Amendts. [189] 1320

CLANRICARDE, Marquess of
Adjutants of Volunteers, 3R. [188] 1387
Admiralty Court (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [189] 1214, 1216
Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 155
Court of Chancery (Ireland), 2R. [188] 663
Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 714
France, Mr., Pamphlet of, Res. [185] 1630
Galway Harbour (Composition of Debt), 2R. [188] 965; Comm. 1256
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 1119
Ireland—Disturbances in, [185] 330, 333, 1511
    Established Church, Motion for Returns, [185] 209; Motion for an Address, [188] 411
    Fenian Conspiracy, [187] 364
    Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1427
    Land Tenure, [185] 207
[*cont.*

Clanricarde, Marquess of—*cont.*
Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 264
Construction of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 658
Privilege—Mr. R. S. France, [185] 453
Railway Bills—Standing Orders, [187] 1928
Railway Traffic Protection, 2R. [185] 1766, 1767
Railways, Royal Commission on—Irish Lines, [185] 457, 458
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1969; Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 431
Salmon Fishery Act (Ireland), [188] 262
Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [188] 763
Tenure of Land (Ireland), 1R. [185] 793; 2R. [186] 1324
"Tornado," Case of the, [185] 1544, 1545; [186] 561, 1261, 1263, 1870; [187] 364, 1368; [188] 765, 768, 1714, 1717
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 377

Clarendon, Earl of
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 1, [187] 382
Ireland—Condemned Fenian Prisoners, [187] 1198
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [188] 151
Russian America—Cession of, to the United States, [186] 979
"Tornado," Case of the, [186] 1261, 1264

Clay, Mr. J., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
India Office, State Entertainment to the Sultan, Motion for an Address, [188] 1762
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 210
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1276, 1491; *cl.* 3, [187] 26, 743; *add. cl.* [188] 798; Amendt. 811, 894, 1004, 1014, 1029, 1030, 1032, 1036, 1202, 1208; Consid. *add. cl.* 1447
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1411

Clerical Vestments Bill
(*The Earl of Shaftesbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª *Mar* 11, [185] 1624
Bill withdrawn * *April* 5 (No. 39)

Clerical Vestments (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Shaftesbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *April* 5 (No. 72)
Moved "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 14, [187] 478
After short debate, Moved, "That the further debate on the said Motion be adjourned to this day two months" (*The Archbishop of Canterbury*); on Question? Cont. 61, Not-Cont. 46; M. 15; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 522
Adjourned debate [May 14] "That the Bill be now read 2ª" resumed *August* 19, [189] 1631
After short debate, further debate put off *sine die*

Clerks to Justices in Counties Bill
(*Mr. Colvile, Mr. Paull, Mr. Pease*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 26 [Bill 286]

Cleveland, Duke of
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Report, [187] 1370
Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 714
Increase of the Episcopate, Report, *cl.* 13, [187] 1485
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [188] 154
North British Railway (Carlisle Deviations), 3R. [189] 523
Parliament—Standing Orders—Railway Deposits, [187] 1554
Railway Companies, Comm. [189] 160
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 289; *add. cl.* 432, 724

Clifton-on-Dunsmore Plot Rents—Charity Commissioners
Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, Lord R. Montagu *May* 10, [187] 372; Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 20, 772
Accounts (*Parl. P.* No. 334)

Clinton, Lord
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Report, *cl.* 3, [189] 1328

Clinton, Lord E. Pelham-, *Nottinghamshire, N.*
Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [189] 134

Clive, Mr. G., *Hereford*
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1604
Mines and Miners, [186] 400
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1215
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1842

Cloncurry, Lord
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 722

Coal Mines
Accidents in, Address for Papers (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Feb* 7, [185] 81; after short debate, agreed to—(*Parl. P. l.* 16, *c.* 62)
Inspection of, Question, Mr. Edwards; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 19, 585—See (title *Mines*)
l. Reports of Inspectors, 1865 [2156] [2181]
c. " " [3811] [3843]

Cochin China
Question, Mr. Vanderbyl; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 24, [188] 427

Cochrane, Mr. A. D. R. W. Baillie, *Honiton*
Abyssinia—Captives in, [188] 1723
British North America, 2R. [185] 1191, 1192; Comm. *cl.* 58, 1317
Colonial Governors, Motion for an Address, [188] 1740, 1742
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. [189] 1526
Coolies, Exportation of (East Indies), [185] 1246, 1252, 125
Crete—English Vice Consul at Khanea, [189] 1222
Insurrection in, Address for Papers, [185] 421

[*cont.*

COCHRANE, Mr. A. D. R. W. Baillie—*cont.*
Fire Insurance, Res. [186] 133
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 194
Ireland—Fenianism, [186] 1929
Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1890, 1902
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [187] 1913
Navy—Coast Guard, [189] 82
Promotion in the, Res. [186] 307
Reserved Captains, [188] 165
Parks Regulation, Re-comm. [189] 1584, 1588
Parliament—Morning Sittings, [188] 664
Postal—East India, China, and Australian Mails, [189] 1563
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1490; *cl.* 3, 1575; [187] 808; *cl.* 9, 1400; *cl.* 31, [188] 287, 531
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 417
Supply—Coolie Emigration, [188] 1771
Department of Science and Art, [189] 1229
Scottish Universities, [189] 1241
Superannuations, [188] 1487
"Tornado," Case of the, [186] 1877; [188] 2056, 2060; [189] 1447
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1406

COGAN, Right Hon. W. H. F., *Kildare Co.*
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1681
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 370; 2R. [187] 573
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [185] 692
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 881
Carlow Lunatic Asylum, [188] 1189, 1190
National Education, [186] 1704
Representation of, Res. [188] 716
Salters' Company—Magherafelt Roman Catholic Church, Motion for an Address, [187] 892
Waterford Election, [186] 45
Offices and Oaths, Comm. [186] 210
Petit Juries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 95
Supply—Rewards to Irish Constabulary, [186] 894
Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 436, 439

COLEBROOKE, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire*
India—Maharajah of Mysore, [185] 833; [187] 1055
Public Health (Scotland), 2R. [186] 1926
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 847; Amendt. 999, 1002, 1010; Amendt. 1151; *cl.* 18, [188] 51; *cl.* 31, 279
Representation of the People (Scotland), [185] 1264; Leave, [187] 421
Scotland—Education, [185] 725; [188] 342

COLERIDGE, Mr. J. D., *Exeter*
Counsel for the Secretary of State for India, Comm. [185] 1329
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 1072; *cl.* 7, 1073, 1075
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 209
Representation of the People, Comm. Instruction, [186] 1270, 1271; *cl.* 3, 1551; Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1208

[*cont.*

COLERIDGE, Mr. J. D.—*cont.*
Supply—National Gallery, [189] 1243
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Leave, [185] 296; 2R. 1419; Comm. [186] 1441, 1446; *cl.* 1, 1447; [187] 213; 3R. [188] 84, 86

COLLIER, Sir R. P., *Plymouth*
Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. Amendt. [187] 56
Law, Administration of the, [185] 875
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3,
187] 22, 50, 700, 736; *cl.* 4, 998; *cl.* 34, 1179
188] *cl.* 17, 48, 49; *cl.* 36, 296; *cl.* 40, 452, 460; *cl.* 43, 522; *add. cl.* 802, 807, 897, 1009, 1010, 1015, 1027, 1029, 1080; Amendt. 1206; Consid. *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1460
189] Lords Amendts. *cl.* L, 1198
Summary Convictions—The Whortleberry Case, Res. [189] 657
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 703
Toomer, John, Case of, [186] 904, 907; Motion for Papers, 1203, 1207, 1218, 1225, 1226
"Tornado," Case of the, [186] 281; [188] 2061
"Victoria," Case of the, [186] 469

Colonial Bishops Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 7 (No. 153)
Order for 2ª read and discharged *August* 2

Colonial Governors
Instructions to, in Cases of Insurrection, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 21, [188] 268; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 19, 1723—(See *Martial Law*)
Return of Services, Pensions, &c., Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Return of the names of all the Colonial Governors, the dates of their appointments, the amount of their salaries, and the number of years' service of each" (*Mr. Baillie Cochrane*), [188] 1740; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn—(*Parl. P.* No. 575)

Columbian States and British Commerce
Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 28, [188] 667

COLVILE, Mr. C. R., *Derbyshire, S.*
Clerks to Justices, [187] 1021
Mines, &c. Assessment, Leave, [185] 651; 2R. [186] 1422
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [187] 845, 1174; *cl.* 40, Amendt. [188] 457; Lords Amendts. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [189] 1123

Common Law Courts (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Feb* 22 Bill 48]
Read 2º* *June* 20
Bill withdrawn* *July* 15

Commons Inclosure Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Neate, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 14 [Bill 151]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Neate*) *July* 31, [189] 521
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Leeman*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for three months

Companies Act (1862) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Hunt*)

c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 2 [Bill 221]
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 25, [189] 87
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Stephen Cave*) *August* 5, 929; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *August* 6 [Bill 301]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 12
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 13
Considered as amended * *August* 13
Read 3° * *August* 13
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *August* 13
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Duke of Richmond*) *August* 15, 1544; after short debate, on Question? agreed to; Bill read 2ª (No. 333)
Committee *; Report *August* 16
Read 3ª * *August* 17
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 131]

Conolly, Mr. T., *Donegal Co.*
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 989
Ireland — Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 857, 858, 879, 890
Morris, John, Release of, Motion for Papers, [185] 1242
Representation of, Res. [188] 710
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* A, [188] 646
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1780

Consecration and Ordination Fees Bill
[H.L.] (*The Archbishop of Canterbury*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 7 (No. 148)
Read 2ª * *June* 25
Committee * *July* 1 (No. 193)
Report * *July* 2
Read 3ª * *July* 5
c. Read 1° * *July* 15 [Bill 256]
Read 2° * *July* 22
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Considered as amended * *August* 2
Read 3° * *August* 5
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 135]

Consecration of Churchyards Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Redesdale*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 15 (No. 15)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 24, [187] 1016
After short debate; on Question? Cont. 53, Not-Cont. 12; M. 41; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1019; Bill read 2ª
After short debate, Order for Committee discharged *June* 6, 1649

Consecration of Churchyards (No. 2) Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord Bishop of Oxford*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 6 (No. 144)
Read 2ª * *June* 25
Committee *July* 8, [188] 1163 (No. 208)
Report *July* 12, 1427 (No. 222)
Read 3ª * *July* 22
c. Read 1° * *July* 24 [Bill 276]
Read 2° * *August* 5
Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 8, [189] 1106
Committee * *August* 13—R.P.
Committee *; Report *August* 14
Considered as amended *August* 15, 1592; after short debate, Bill read 3°
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 133]

Consolidated Fund (£369,118 5s. 6d.) Bill

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 7
Read 2° * *Mar* 8
Commitee *; Report *Mar* 11
Read 3 * *Mar* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 14
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *Mar* 15
Read 3ª * *Mar* 18
Royal Assent *Mar* 29 [30 *Vict.* c. 4]

Consolidated Fund (£7,924,000) Bill

c. Read 1° * *Mar* 20
Read 2° * *Mar* 21
Committee *; Report *Mar* 22
Read 3° * *Mar* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 26
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *Mar* 28
Read 3ª * *Mar* 29
Royal Assent *April* 5 [30 *Vict.* c. 7]

Consolidated Fund (£14,000,000) Bill

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 28
Read 2° * *May* 30
Committee *; Report *June* 3
Read 3° * *June* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 4
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *June* 6
Read 3ª * *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 17 [30 *Vict.* c. 30]

Consolidated Fund Appropriation Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *August* 10
Read 2° * *August* 12
Committee *; Report *August* 13
Read 3° *August* 14, [189] 1526
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Derby*) *August* 15
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *August* 16
Read 3ª * *August* 17
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 120]

Constabulary, Reports of Inspectors of
Question, Mr. Whitworth; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 4, [186] 1109

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 14 (No. 98)
187] Read 2ª, after short debate, and referred to a Select Committee; List of the Committee *May* 21, 873
Report from Select Comm. *May* 31, 1368 (No. 121)
Committee *June* 4, 1549 (No. 139)
Report * *June* 6
Read 3ª* *June* 7
c. Read 1º* *June* 7 [Bill 196]
Read 2º * *June* 27
Committee *; Report *July* 4 [Bill 228]
188] Question, Sir Massey Lopes; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 19, 1727
189] Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 25, 86
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *August* 6, 991—R.P.
Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 9, 1224
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *August* 12, 1417—R.P.
Committee; Report; Read 3º *August* 14, 1516
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 125]

Convict Prisons, Clerks of
Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 1, [185] 1132; Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 22, [186] 391

CORK, Earl of
Education—Revised Code—Certificated Teachers, [188] 1045
Ireland—Constabulary, Motion for Returns, [186] 462

Cornwall, Bishopric in
Petition of Inhabitants of Cornwall presented (*The Earl of Devon*) *Mar* 4, [185] 1300; after debate, Petition ordered to lie on the table

CORRANCE, Mr. F. S., *Suffolk, E.*
Cattle Plague—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [187] 878, 879
* Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 45, Amendt. [189] 1417, 1431, 1518
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 545
* Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1168; *add. cl.* [188] 1014, 1275; Schedule B, Amendt. 1281
Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1656

Corrupt Practices at Elections, *afterwards* **Parliamentary Elections Bill**
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Hunt*)
186] *c.* Ordered, after short debate; read 1º *April* 9, 1382 [Bill 119]
Question, Sir George Grey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, 1485; Question, Mr. Adair; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 2, 1879
Read 2º, after short debate *May* 2, 1912
187] Committee; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 6, 56
[*cont.*

Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill—cont.
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Sir Robert Collier*)
187] After short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," negatived; Bill committed to a Select Committee; List of the Committee, 66
Report * *July* 11 [Bill 247]
189] Question, Sir George Grey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, 84
Bill withdrawn * *July* 29
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 16, 1606
(*Parl. P.* No. 325, 436)

Corrupt Practices at Elections—Removal of Magistrates
186] Question, Lord Henry Thynne; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 19, 121; Question, Sir Rainald Knightley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 123
Certain Members of this House, Question, Mr. Bagge; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 19, 126; Personal Explanation, Mr. W. H. Leatham *Mar* 20, 212; Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 28, 730
(See *Churchward, Mr., Case of*)

Corrupt Practices at Elections [*Salaries and Expenses*]
c. Considered in Committee *May* 6, [187] 71; Resolution

CORRY, Right Hon. H. T. L. († Vice President of the Committee of Privy Council for Education, afterwards First Lord of the Admiralty), *Tyrone Co.*
African Slave Trade, [187] 614
† Animals, Trade in, [185] 585
Army Estimates—Increase of Pay (Marines), [189] 138, 139
† Cattle, Importation of, [185] 460
† Cattle Plague in the Metropolis, [185] 146, 403, 404, 724, 725
† Cholerine, Physical Properties of, [185] 1446
Education, [185] 1147, 1164
† Educational Grants, Res. [186] 1185, 1186
"Ethiopian," Wreck of the, [188] 168
Lime and Bude Lights, [189] 602
Loss of Life at Sea, [187] 1128
Marine Mutiny, [186] 1175; 2R. 1258
Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 984
Naval Review, The, [188] 1520, 1521, 1724
Navy—Chief Admiralty Chemist, Portsmouth Dockyard, [189] 1560
  Claim of Assistant-Commissary-General Swan, [186] 1873
  Clare, Mr., Claims of, [186] 563
  Coast Guard, [189] 82
  Constitution of the Board of Admiralty, [188] 980
  Contract for Gunboats, [188] 1512
  Corporal Punishment of Naval Cadets, [187] 1490
  Dockyard Accounts, [188] 1190
  Greenwich Hospital, [186] 736, 1584; [187] 255; Res. [189] 860
  "Greenwich Sixpence," [187] 1738
[*cont.*

Corry, Right Hon. H. T. L.—*cont.*
Increase of Pay—Dockyards and the Marines, [187] 94
Marine Depôt at Deal, [189] 1569, 1570
Marine Engines, Ordered and Re-sold, [189] 1516, 1568, 1569
Naval Officers' Leave, [187] 1934
Naval Reserve at the late Review, [189] 599
Naval Savings Banks, [187] 878
Punishment of Cadets, [189] 83
Reserved Captains, [188] 165
Royal Marines, [186] 1103
Tenders for Engines, [189] 1516
Twin Screw, [189] 848
Navy Estimates — Coast Guard Service, &c. [187] 1826, 1838
Dockyards, &c. [187] 1846, 1848
Men and Boys, [186] 340, 362, 448, 967, 971
Naval Stores, [187] 1849, 1853, 1855, 1858; Report, 1862, 1863
Scientific Departments, [187] 1839, 1840
† Paris Exhibition, [185] 898;—English Jurors, 1143
† Scotland—Education, [185] 725
Supply—Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 903, 907
Printing and Stationery, [187] 929
Quarantine Establishment, [187] 926
† Royal Palaces, [185] 505, 506
† Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 687
Totnes Elections, Res. [186] 1372
† Vaccination, [185] 404
† Wales—Sanitary Condition of, [185] 809

Counsel to the Secretary of State for India Bill
(*Mr. Selwyn, Mr. Buxton, Mr. Coleridge*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 22 [Bill 51]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Selwyn*) *Feb* 28, [185] 1203
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Serjeant Gaselee*); Question, "That 'now,' &c."
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. White*); A. 34, N. 58; M. 24; Question, "That 'now' &c." agreed to; Bill read 2°
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Selwyn*) *Mar* 4, 1326
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Serjeant Gaselee*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

County Courts Acts Amendment Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *May* 21 (No. 108)
Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 31, [187] 1384
Committee; Report *June* 4, 1550 (No. 140)
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *June* 17, 1929 (No. 156)
Report* *June* 21 (No. 169)
Read 3ª* *June* 24
c. Read 1°* *June* 27 [Bill 212]
Read 2°* *July* 11
Committee *July* 22, [188] 1911—R.P. [*cont.*

County Courts Acts Amendment Bill—cont.
Committee* *August* 5—R.P.
Committee* *August* 8—R.P.
Committee*; Report *August* 13
Considered as amended* *August* 14
Read 3°* *August* 15
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 142]

County Courts Proceedings Bill
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Read 1ª* *August* 17 (No. 348)

County General Assessment (Scotland) Bill (*Sir G. Montgomery, Mr. Sec. G. Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 2 [Bill 225]
Read 2°* *July* 11
Committee*; Report *July* 22 [Bill 270]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 12

County Rates
Question, Mr. Wyld; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 29, [186] 815

County Treasurers (Ireland) Bill
(*The O'Conor Don, Colonel Greville-Nugent, Mr. Synan*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 26 [Bill 91]
Read 2°* *May* 15
Committee*; Report *May* 16
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 4
Considered as amended* *June* 5 [Bill 159]
Read 3°* *June* 6
l. Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *June* 7 (No. 149)
Read 2ª* *June* 25
Committee*; Report *July* 1
Read 3ª* *July* 2
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 46]

Court of Appeal Chancery (Despatch of Business) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 11 (No. 215)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 12, [188] 1432; Bill read 2ª, after short debate; Committee negatived
Read 3ª* *July* 15
c. Read 1°* *July* 15 [Bill 254]
Read 2°* *July* 18
Committee*; Report *July* 19
Read 3°* *July* 19
l. Royal Assent *July* 25 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 64]

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 22 [Bill 47]
185] Read 2° *Mar* 14, 1858
186] Committee *Mar* 22, 448—R.P.
. Committee *April* 4, 1164—R.P.
187] Committee *May* 10, 374—R.P.
Committee* *May* 16—R.P.
Committee* *May* 30—R.P.
Committee*; Report *June* 3
Considered as amended* *June* 7 [Bill 180]
Read 3°* *June* 21
[*cont.*

Court of Chancery (Ireland) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 24
188] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 28, 662; Bill read 2ª, after short debate (No. 172)
Committee*; Report *July* 1
Read 3ª* *July* 2
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 44]

Court of Chancery Officers Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 17 (No. 154)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord Chancellor*) *June* 25, [188] 493; Bill read 2ª, after short debate
Committee *July* 1, 764
Amendments made (No. 194)
Report * *July* 2
Read 3ª* *July* 4
c. Read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 235]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Attorney General*) *July* 11, 1414; Bill read 2°, after short debate
Committee* *July* 25—R.P.
Committee* *July* 26—R.P.
Committee*; Report *August* 1
Considered as amended* *August* 2
Read 3°* *August* 2
l. Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 87]

COURTOWN, Earl of
Offices and Oaths, 2R. Amendt. [187] 1375, 1380; Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1372, 1376

Courts of Justice Concentration Act
Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 21, [185] 725

Courts of Justice, The New
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 22, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that all arrangements respecting the building of the new Courts of Justice should be effected under the sole responsibility of Her Majesty's Government" (*Mr. Bentinck*), [185] 814; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Lanyon; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 28, [186] 728; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer Mr. Hunt *June* 25, [188] 507; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 27, 606
Designs for, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that two professional architects should be added to the Committee appointed for the purpose of selecting a Design for the New Courts of Justice" (*Mr. Lanyon*), [186] 2018; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 25, [188] 507; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 27, 606; Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 9, [189] 1221; Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 15, 1570
Parl. Papers—
Advances 1867-8 228
Correspondence 235

Courts of Law and Equity
Question, Sir Roundell Palmer; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, [189] 474

Courts of Law, &c. (Salaries and Expenses) Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Childers*)
c. Considered in Committee* *June* 4—R.P.
Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, Mr. Childers *June* 6, [187] 1666
Considered in Committee*; Resolution *June* 7
Resolution reported; Bill ordered* *June* 13
Read 1°* *July* 25 [Bill 282]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 5

Courts of Law [Fees] Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Resolution in Committee *July* 25
Resolution reported and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *July* 26 [Bill 287]
Committee*; Report *August* 1
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 2
Considered as amended* *August* 2
Read 3°* *August* 2
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *August* 2
Read 2ª* *August* 9 (No. 286)
Committee*; Report *August* 12
Read 3ª* *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 122]

Courts of Law Officers (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Lord Naas*)
c. Ordered* *May* 10
Read 1°* *May* 13 [Bill 145]
Read 2°* *May* 16
Committee*; Report *June* 3 [Bill 178]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*) *June* 27—R.P.
188] Committee *July* 8, 1250—R.P.
Re-comm.*; Report *July* 11
Considered* *July* 15 [Bill 248]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 22, 1911; Bill read 3°, after short debate
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 23
189] Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 26, 167; Bill read 2ª (No. 254)
Committee *August* 5, 842
Report* *August* 6 (No. 294)
Read 3ª* *August* 8
Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by the Lords considered *August* 16, 1602
Moved, to insist on the Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed (*The Lord Cranworth*), 1602; after short debate, on Question, whether to insist? Cont. 7, Not-Cont. 11; M. 4; resolved in the negative; List of Cont. and Not. Cont. 1604
Protest of Lord Cranworth, 1604
A consequential Amendment made, and a Message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 129]

Courts of Referees Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Colonel Wilson Patten, Mr. Woodd*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *August* 10 [Bill 311]
Read 2°* *August* 12
Committee*; Report *August* 13
Read 3°* *August* 14

[*cont.*

Courts of Referees Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Redesdale*) *August* 15
Read 2ª * *August* 16 (No. 340)
Committee *; Report *August* 17
Read 3ª * *August* 19
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 136]

Cowen, Mr. J., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, [187] 1761
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [189] 482, 483
Liverpool, Importation of Cattle into, [189] 631
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1429
Parks Regulation, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1487
Poor Law Board, &c. Comm. [188] 1419; Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 144
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1639; [187] 55, 702; *cl.* 40, [188] 450; 3R. 1559

Cowper, Earl
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 214, 222, 252
Militia, The, [185] 1545
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 458
Volunteers—Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 375; [187] 72; [188] 756

Cowper, Right Hon. W. F., *Hertford*
Burlington House Site, [186] 1246
Courts of Justice, The New, Res. [185] 825; [186] 2019
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 923
National Art Collections, Motion for an Address, [189] 634
National Gallery, The New, Motion for Papers, [186] 826, 836
Parks Regulation, Re-comm. [189] 388
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1272
Supply — Houses of Parliament, [188] 1702 1703
Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1694
Thames Embankment (Sheilds' Petition), Motion for a Committee, [186] 803

Cranborne, Right Hon. Viscount († Secretary of State for India), *Stamford*
† Army (India and the Colonies), Motion for a Committee, [185] 1060
British North America, Comm. [185] 1312
† Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1207
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [189] 1378
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm *cl.* 5, [189] 1071, 1072; *add. cl.* 1079
† India—Contract Law, [185] 1144
Coolie Trade in Assam, [185] 936
Famine in Orissa, [185] 82; Motion for an Address, [189] 808
Prize Money, [185] 146
Rights of the Ryots, [185] 145
The Budget, [185] 87
The Maharajah of Mysore, [185] 835; [187] 1071
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1342
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1347

Cranborne, Right Hon. Viscount—*cont.*
185] Representation of the People—Reform Statistics, 1649
186] Representation of the People, Leave, 83, 93; 2R. 663, 908; Comm. 1285; *cl.* 3, 1568
187] *cl.* 3, Motion for Adjournment, 756; *cl.* 4, Motion for Adjournment, 1005; *cl.* 35, 1190, 1191, 1208, 1213; *cl.* 8, 1320, 1329, 1330, 1342, 1357, 1363; *cl.* 9, 1545; *cl.* 10, 1966, 1968
188] Comm. *cl.* 29, 180, 190; *cl.* 36, 297; *cl.* 40, 438; *cl.* 42, 486; *cl.* 43, 515; *cl.* 31, 533; *add. cl.* 614; *cl.* A, 617, 620, 638; *cl.* D, 648; *add. cl.* 673; Amendt. 675, 677, 844, 999, 1027, 1028; Amendt. 1029, 1097; Preamble, 1291; Consid. *add. cl.* 1448; 3R. 1526;
189] Lords Amendts. *cl.* C, 1186

Cranworth, Lord
Admiralty Court (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 1212, 1215
Banns of Matrimony, Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 1095
Charitable Donations and Bequests (Ireland), [188] 1062
Church of England in the Colonies, Address for Papers, [185] 392
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1176
County Courts Acts Amendment, 2R. [187] 1385; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1930; *cl.* 24, 1932, 1933
Court of Chancery (Ireland), 2R. [188] 663
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188] 493
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 842; Commons Reasons, Amendt. 1602
Criminal Law, 2R. [187] 932
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 1, [187] 380; Report, *cl.* 13, 1485
Ireland—Established Church, Motion for Returns, [185] 210;—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1429
Jamaica—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice—Mr. Purcell, [188] 1721
Judges Chambers (Despatch of Business), 1R. [186] 454
Masters and Operatives, 2R. [185] 697; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 930
Office of Judge in the Admiralty, Divorce, and Probate Courts, 2R. [185] 1008; [187] 610; 3R. Amendt. 1102
Prorogation of Parliament, 2R. [188] 1661
Railway Traffic Protection, Comm. [186] 118
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), 2R. [186] 1167
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 305; *cl.* 10, 472; *add. cl.* 740; *cl.* 54, 750; Report, *cl.* 4, 830
Sale of Land by Auction, Commons Amendts. [188] 4
Salmon Fishery Act (Ireland), [188] 260
Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [188] 761; 3R. 1063
Statute Law Revision, 2R. [187] 1199
Trades Unions 2R. [185] 1434; Comm. *cl.* 2, [186] 269; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 271, 272; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 273

Craufurd, Mr. E. H. J., *Ayr, &c.*
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, 2R. [186] 1063
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 199; Comm. *cl.* 4, 757
Kingston Assizes, [186] 1202
Metropolis Gas, 2R. Amendt. [186] 1576

[*cont.*

CRAUFURD, Mr. E. H. J.—*cont.*

- Newspapers, Registration of, [187] 1492
- Postal—Indian Mail Service, [187] 371
- Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 556
- Railways (Scotland), 2R. Amendt. [187] 1011
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 34, [187] 1187
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 441
- Sale and Purchase of Shares, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 100
- Scotland—Collectors of Taxes, [185] 1028

CRAWFORD, Mr. R. W., *London*

- Army—Captain Jervis and the Simla Court Martial, [188] 608
- Bunhill Fields Burial Ground, Leave, [186] 997
- Business of the House, [187] 942
- Canada Railway Loan, 2R. [186] 972
- Cattle, Importation of, Res. [188] 349
- East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [189] 1403, 1408
- Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 322
- India—Postage to, [185] 1807 ;—Indian Loan, [189] 1613
- London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1343
- Metropolis — Bunhill Fields Burial Ground, [185] 211
- Paris Universal Exhibition, [185] 1801
- Parks Regulation, Re-comm. [189] 1584
- Parliament—Access of Members to the House, [185] 83
    - Business of the House, [188] 1523, 1877
    - Public Business, Amendt. [188] 775, 782
- Postal Communication with the East, [185] 212 ;—India, China, and Australian Mails, 1809
- Railway and Joint Stock Companies Accounts, Leave, [187] 1591
- * Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1025, 1043, 1058
- Railway Traffic Returns, [185] 212
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 6, [187] 1242 ; *cl.* 10, 1977 ; *cl.* 24, [188] 55 ; *cl.* A, 622 ; *add. cl.* 799, 806, 808, 848, 993, 1020, 1023, 1193, 1196, 1200, 1201 ; Lords Amendts. *cl.* B, Amendt. [189] 1183
- Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1403 ; Comm. [186] 99
- Sugar Duties, Comm. Res. [185] 349
- * Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 658, 700
- Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [189] 1530
- Weights and Measures, False, [187] 1934

CRIMINAL LAW

- *Andersen, Carl, Case of*, Question, Mr. Blake ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 16, [187] 622
- *Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum*, Question, Mr. Floyer; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 8, [188] 1186
- *Capital Punishment—Legislation on*, Question, Mr. Hibbert ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 6, [185] 78—*The Prerogative of Mercy*, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 28, [186] 734

[*cont.*

CRIMINAL LAW—*cont.*

- *Convict Prisons, Clerks of*, Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 1, [185] 1132 ; *Mar* 22, [186] 391
- *Cuncanon, Martin, Case of*, Question, Major Anson ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 16, [189] 1628
- *Depositions of Witnesses in Summary Convictions — The Cornish Magistrates*, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor ; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Kendall *July* 15, [188] 1513
- *Forfeiture, Law of*, Question, Mr. Charles Forster ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 8, [185] 148
- *Fulford and Wellstead for Poaching, Case of*, Question, Sir Roundell Palmer ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 24, [187] 1025 ; Question, Mr. Taylor ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 20, [188] 166
    - Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a Copy of the Depositions on which the conviction of two men for poaching by the Salisbury Bench of County Magistrates in March last was based" (*Mr. Taylor*), 1147 ; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c. ;" A. 70, N. 31 ; M. 39 ; Question, Mr. Taylor ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 9, [188] 1263
- *Greenland, Edward, Case of*, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Correspondence on the subject of the recent grant of a free pardon to Edward Greenland (late manager of the Leeds Banking Company), who was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for perjury" (*Lord Frederick Cavendish*), [189] 871 ; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
- *Gurney, George Edward, Case of—The Licensing Magistrates, Middlesex*, Question, Mr. Morrison ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 24, [188] 425
- *Hayes and Barry, Case of Police Constables, accused of Perjury*, Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 13, [189] 1449
- *Kingston Assizes, Increase of Sentences*, Question, Mr. Gilpin ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 1, [186] 903 ; Observations, Mr. Gilpin ; Reply, Mr. Craufurd *April* 5, 1201
- *Life Sentences*, Question, Mr. Hibbert ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 15, [185] 1918 ; long debate thereon
- *Memorials of Political Prisoners*, Question, Mr. Maguire ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 9, [189] 1217
- *Political Prisoners*, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be pleased to extend Her most gracious pardon to all persons now in prison in the United Kingdom and the Colonies for political offences" (*Mr. Rearden*) *August* 13, [189] 1514 ; after short debate, Motion put, and negatived

[*cont.*

Criminal Law—*cont.*
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 24, [188] 426
Reports of Inspectors of Constabulary, Question, Mr. Whitworth; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 4, [186] 1109
Scott, James, Case of, Motion for an Address (*Mr. Newdegate*) *August* 13, [189] 1509; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Toomer, John, Case of, Question, Sir Robert Collier; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 1, [186] 904; Observations, Sir Robert Collier *April* 5, 1203; long debate thereon
Wager, The Convict, Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 26, [186] 567
Western Australia, Transportation to, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 5, [186] 1173

Criminal Law Bill
(*Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Coleridge*)

185] *c.* Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 8, 205 [Bill 8]
. Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 20, 678
. Committee *Mar* 13, 1759—R.P.
186] Committee; Report *Mar* 27, 699
Considered as amended * *April* 5
. Read 3°, after short debate *April* 9, 1415
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Cranworth*) *April* 11
187] Read 2ª *May* 23, 932 (No. 81)
Committee * *May* 27; Report * *May* 28
Read 3ª * *May* 31
Royal Assent *June* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 35]

Criminal Lunatics Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Attorney General*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 20 [Bill 41]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 25, [185] 993
Committee *; Report *Mar* 7 [Bill 67]
Comm. (*re-comm.*) *; Report *Mar* 18
Read 3° * *Mar* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 21
Read 2ª, after debate *April* 2, [186] 975
Committee; Report *April* 4, 1101 (No. 55)
Read 3ª * *April* 5
Royal Assent *April* 12 [30 *Vict.* c. 12]

Crossley, Sir F., *Yorkshire, W.R.—N.*
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1078
Financial Statement, [186] 1147
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1612
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 663
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 556
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 603; Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1534
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1677
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 196

Crown Lands, Commissioners for
Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 2, [189] 765

Crown Officers, Disqualification of—Draughtsman to the Treasury
Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee *Mar* 1, [185] 1239

Cubitt, Mr. G., *Surrey, W.*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1333
Speer, Captain, Alleged Murder of, [189] 1220

Curzon, Viscount, *Leicestershire, S.*
Army—March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1191, 1391

Customs and Inland Revenue Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)

c. Ordered * *April* 5
Read 1° * *April* 8 [Bill 113]
Read 2° * *April* 29
Committee *; Report *May* 6
Considered as amended * *May* 7
Read 3° * *May* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *May* 9
Read 2ª * *May* 16 (No. 93)
Committee *; Report *May* 20
Read 3ª * *May* 23
Royal Assent *May* 31 [30 *Vict.* c. 23]

Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *July* 15
Read 2° * *July* 22 [Bill 253]
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Considered as amended * *July* 26
Read 3° * *July* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 30
Read 2ª * *August* 2 (No. 270)
Committee *; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª * *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 86]

Customs Revenue Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 9 [Bill 238]
Read 2° * *July* 22
Committee *; Report *July* 29
Considered as amended * *July* 31
Read 3° * *August* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 2
Read 2ª * *August* 6 (No. 284)
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 82]

"Cyclone," The Owners of the
Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 28, [186] 731

Dalglish, Mr. R., *Glasgow*
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 642
Navy Estimates—Naval Stores, [187] 1856, 1857
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1641

Dalhousie, Earl of
Army — Artillery—Converted Enfield Rifle, [185] 1213
Recruiting Commission, Address for a Return, [185] 1768, 1799
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), 2R. [185] 1141, 1226

Danubian Principalities—Persecution of Jews—see *Moldavia*

Dawson, Mr. R. Peel, *Londonderry Co.*
Grand Juries (Ireland), Leave, [185] 1867; 2R. [187] 592, 600
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [185] 1741
Ireland—Escape of John Kirwan, [186] 1583
Fenianism, [186] 1931
Representation of, Res. [188] 715
Salters' Company — Magherafelt Roman Catholic Church, Motion for an Address, [187] 892
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1647
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1674
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1748

De Grey, Hon. T., *Norfolk, W.*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [185] 43

De Grey and Ripon, Earl
Address in Answer to the Speech, [184] 43
Army — Artillery—Converted Enfield Rifle, [185] 1211
Cavalry Barracks, Knightsbridge, [187] 1472, 1476
Industrial Employment of Soldiers, [186] 901
March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1492
Recruiting Commission, Address for a Return, [185] 1781, 1785
Transport and Supply Departments, [188] 586
Ireland—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1429
Militia, Address for a Return, [186] 810
New Zealand—Withdrawal of Troops, Motion for a Return, [188] 1507, 1508
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 285, 286; *add. cl.* 709, 717, 734, 737
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1441; Comm. *cl.* 2, [186] 268, 270
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, [185] 1912; Report, [186] 111
Volunteers—Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 372, 926; [188] 751, 761
War Department Stores Protection, 2R. [188] 1062

Delamere, Lord
Address in Answer to the Speech, [185] 18
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. Amendt. [189] 1083

De Mauley, Lord
Metropolis—London Water Supply, [188] 1496

Denbigh, Earl of
Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 708
Ireland—Established Church, Motion for an Address, [188] 409
Moldavia—Persecution of Jews, Motion for an Address, [188] 750
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1370
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 428
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 74
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Res. Amendt. [186] 110
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Comm. [188] 1384
Turkey and Crete, [186] 718, 723, 725
Turkey—Treatment of Christians, [188] 353
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [188] 758

Denison, Right Hon. J. E., *see* **Speaker**, The

Denman, Lord
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 1R. [187] 1097
Ireland—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1429
Jamaica—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice—Mr. Purcell, [188] 1718
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of—The Collective Guarantee, [188] 978
Master and Servant, 2R. [189] 847
Moldavia—Persecution of Jews, [188] 848
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [188] 1260
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1856; Comm. [189] 300; *cl.* 4, 321; *add. cl.* 430, 448; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 595; *add. cl.* 740; 3R. 939, 951
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 74
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Report, *cl.* 3, [189] 1327

Denman, Hon. G., *Tiverton*
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, Leave, [185] 1064; 2R. [186] 1060, 1062; Comm. [188] 549, 551; 3R. 923
Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [186] 1382
Criminal Law, 2R. [185] 680
Financial Statement, [186] 1126
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1982
India—Banda and Kirwee Booty, [186] 1871; [189] 764
Life Sentences, [185] 1924
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1896; Recomm. Motion for Adjournment, [189] 1517, 1583, 1588, 1591
Parliament—Public Business, Standing Orders, [187] 1133
Representation of the People — Suffrage to Women, [186] 467; — Ratepaying Clause, [188] 854
186] Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, 1907

[*cont.*

Denman, Hon. G.—*cont.*
187] *cl.* 3, 27, 56; Amendt. 442, 444, 448, 449,
. 451, 453, 454, 740, 741; *cl.* 4, 833, 1175;
. *cl.* 34, 1177, 1178, 1187; *cl.* 35, 1201, 1202;
. *cl.* 5, 1232; *cl.* 9, 1545; *cl.* 15, 2004,
. 2005
188] *cl.* 15, 40; *cl.* 17, 48; *cl.* 29, 211; *cl.* 31,
. 276, 281; *cl.* 33, Amendt. 289, 290; *cl.* 36,
. 292, 295; Amendt. 300; *cl.* 40, Amendt,
. 451; *cl.* 43, 519; *add. cl.* 668, 670, 679,
. 684, 686, 688, 696, 699, 782, 783, 1230,
. 1241, 1266
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1218

Dent, Mr. J. D., *Scarborough*
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1004, 1025
Cattle Plague, [187] 777
Cattle Plague in the Metropolis, [185] 146
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [188] 1728
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 880
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 14, [187] 1989
Tancred's Charities, [189] 86
Women and Children, Employment of, in Agriculture, [187] 258

Derby, Earl of (First Lord of the Treasury)
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, [188] 240, 242
Address in Answer to the Speech, [185] 35
Army—Recruiting Commission, Address for a Return, [185] 1785
Banns of Matrimony, Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 1098; *cl.* 2, 1099
Chester, Apprehended Disturbances at, [185] 273
Christ Church (Oxford) Ordinances, 2R. [188] 1426
Clerical Vestments, [187] 72, 76
Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 520
Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1019; Comm. 1650; *add. cl.* [188] 1167
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 31, [187] 1550
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1178, 1180
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for Papers, [185] 1527, 1531; [188] 159; Motion for an Address, [189] 1553
Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 710
Glossop Convent, [187] 378, 932
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Notice, 808; 2R. [185] 908, 917
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), [187] 1020; 1R. 1097; 2R. 1114, 1123, 1124, 1127
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 217, 223, 232, 233, 250
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [187] 86; Comm. *cl.* 1, 380, 382, 763; *add. cl.* 1195, 1196; Report, *cl.* 2, 1479; 3R. 1552; [188] 248; Commons Amendts. [189] 1540, 1542, 1543

Derby, Earl of—*cont.*
Ireland—Condemned Fenian Prisoners, [187] 1099, 1101
  Constabulary, Motion for Returns, [186] 461
  Disturbances in, [185] 331, 333, 371, 1427, 1511
  Established Church, Motion for Returns, [185] 209, 210; Motion for an Address, [188] 396, 412, 421, 489
  Fenian Conspiracy, [187] 367
  Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1430
  Jennings, Sub-Constable, Address for Papers, [188] 1620
  Railways, [188] 353
  Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, [185] 455
Lord Chief Baron—Petition of R. Wason, Esq., [185] 272
Luxemburg, Duchy of, [186] 1869; [187] 214, 378, 379; [188] 148, 153, 157, 238;—The Collective Guarantee, 968, 975
Meetings in Royal Parks, 1R. [187] 1014; 2R. [188] 1424
Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 979, 1253, 1709
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1284, 1298
Navy—Motion for Returns, Amendt. [185] 129, 134
New Palace Yard and the Houses of Parliament, [187] 766, 1012
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [187] 1378; Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1379
Parliament—Arrangement for Reporting, Motion for a Committee, [189] 1203
  Business of the House, Motion for Returns, [188] 133, 136; Motion for a Committee, 263; [189] 525
  Standing Orders—Railway Deposits, [187] 1554
Postal—Communication with Australia, [189] 1329
Princess of Wales—Address to Her Majesty, [185] 791
Public Schools, 1R. [185] 80; 2R. 333; Comm. 1003; Report, 1428; 3R. 1546
Railway Traffic Protection, 2R. [185] 1767
Railways—Royal Commission on, [185] 457, 458
Representation of the People—Borough Qualification, Res. [185] 714, 717
  Electors in Cities and Boroughs, Motion for Papers, [185] 1638, 1641, 1643
  Statistics, [185] 1626; [186] 372
188] Representation of the People, 1R. 1615, 1616;
. 2R. 1774, 1823, 1862, 1923, 1959, 2020,
. 2023, 2033; Comm. *cl.* 15, 539, 541, 550,
189] 582; *add. cl.* 707, 732, 733; *cl.* 33, 735;
. *cl.* 38, 736; *cl.* 46, 737; *add. cl.* 739; *cl.* 47,
. 743; *cl.* 54, 750; Report, *cl.* 4, 822, 829,
. 831; *cl.* 17, 838; *cl.* 29, 839; 3R. 942;
. *add. cl.* 948, 950, 951; Commons Amendts.
. 1199, 1306
Ritualism—The Royal Commission, [188] 121, 123, 125, 1178
"Tornado," Case of the, [185] 1545; [186] 560; [187] 364, 1368; [188] 1715
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1438
Trades Unions Demonstration, Proposed, [185] 139
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, 2R. [187] 1382

[*cont.*

Derby, Earl of—*cont.*
Turkey and Crete, [186] 721, 723
Turkey—Treatment of Christians, [188] 353
Turkish Provinces in Servia, [185] 1888, 1890
United States—The "Alabama" Claims, [187] 862
Vice President of the Board of Trade, 2R. [187] 874
Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 455

Dering, Sir E. C., *Kent, E.*
Navy—Naval Engineers, [186] 311
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 14, [187] 1989; *cl.* 31, [188] 276; *add. cl.* 1274

De Ros, Lord
Army — Cavalry Barracks, Knightsbridge, [187] 1474
Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [189] 43
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 721
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [188] 760

Deslandes, Captain, of the "Anne"
Question, Mr. Guinness; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 19, [185] 583
Paper relating to—(*Parl. P.* No. 127)

Devon, Earl of († Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, afterwards Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law Board)
† Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 510
† Cornwall, Bishopric in, [185] 1300
† District Prothonotaries, Court of Common Pleas, County Palatine of Lancaster, 2R. [187] 934
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [189] 1205; 3R. 1433, 1435
Friendly Societies, [189] 1602
† Galway Harbour (Composition of Debt), 2R. [188] 964, 965; Comm. 1255
† Guildford Board of Guardians, [187] 861
Hours of Labour Regulation, 2R. [189] 1594, 1597
† Industrial Schools, 2R. Amendt. [188] 1712
† Limerick Harbour (Composition of Debt), 2R. [188] 4; Comm. 1182
† Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [186] 102; Comm. 390; 3R. 465
Poor Law Board, &c. 2R. [189] 752
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 50; Amendt. 749; *cl.* 52, Amendt. *ib.*

Devonshire, Duke of
Railway Traffic Protection, 2R. [185] 1768
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 52

Dick, Mr. W. W. Fitzwilliam, *Wicklow Co.*
Ireland—Fenian Drilling in Wicklow, [188] 988;—Vartry Waterworks, [185] 1146
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1784

Dickson, Major A. G., *Dover*
Army—Cavalry Half Pay, [187] 263
India and the Colonies, Motion for a Committee, [185] 1045
Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [189] 133
Churchward, Mr., Case of, [186] 5; Motion for an Address, 173, 188, 193

Dilke, Sir W., *Wallingford*
Libel, Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 543

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
Carriers Act Amendment, Comm. Amendt. [188] 1614
Courts of Justice, The New, Res. [185] 824
Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1589, 1596
Exhibition of 1851, [187] 1387
Explanation—Mr. Osborne and Mr. Dillwyn, [187] 10
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 452
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 912
National Gallery Pictures (South Kensington Museum), Motion for an Address, [188] 539
Navy Estimates—Scientific Departments, [187] 1840
Paris Exhibition, [185] 897;—Expenses of the, [187] 622
Private Communications, Explanation, [186] 1706
Railway Companies, [188] 1626
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. [188] 554; *cl.* 1, 556; *cl.* 4, Motion for an Adjournment, 557; *add. cl.* 559; 3R. 847
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1275, 1503; *cl.* 34, [187] 1184; *cl.* 8, 1335; *cl.* 9, 1541; *cl.* 10, 1974; *cl.* 12, 1987; Amendt. 1988; [188] 863; *add. cl.* 1212; Consid. 1450
Schools Inquiry Commission, [186] 1102
Supply — Paris Exhibition, Department of Science and Art, [189] 1261
Poor Law Commissioners, [187] 858
Quarantine Establishment, [187] 927
Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 689
Volunteers, Report, [188] 845
Swansea Vale Railway, 2R. [186] 1089
Universal Catalogue of Art Books, [187] 391

Dimsdale, Mr. R., *Hertford*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1529; *add. cl.* [188] 1272

Disraeli, Right Hon. B., *see* Chancellor of the Exchequer

District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland) Bill (*Lord Naas, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Lord Naas*) *July* 9, [188] 1314; after short debate, Bill ordered; read 1° [Bill 242]
Read 2° * *July* 15
Committee; Report *July* 22, 1914
Read 3° * *July* 29 [Bill 269]

[*cont.*

District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 30
Read 2ª * *August* 5 (No. 272)
Committee * *August* 6
Report * *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 118]

District Prothonotaries, Court of Common Pleas, County Palatine of Lancaster Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Devon*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 21 (No. 107)
Read 2ª *May* 23, [187] 934
Committee * *June* 3
Report * *June* 6
Read 3ª * *June* 7
c. Read 1º * *July* 9 [Bill 241]
Read 2º * *July* 22
Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Colonel Wilson Patten *July* 25, [189] 81
Order for Committee discharged *August* 8

Divorce Bills
Select Committee nominated *Mar* 12, as follows:—The Judge Advocate (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Dunlop, Colonel French, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Moncreiff, and Colonel Packe

Dockyards
Resolution "That, in the opinion of this House, the control and management of the Dockyards is inefficient, and that the inefficiency may be attributed to the following causes:—1st. The constitution of the Board of Admiralty; 2nd. The defective organization of the subordinate departments; 3rd. The want of clear and well-defined responsibility" (*Mr. Seely*) *Feb* 19, [185] 588
After long debate, Previous Question proposed (*Sir John Pakington*), 604; after further long debate, Previous Question and Motion withdrawn

Dodson, Mr. J. G. (Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means), *Sussex, E.*
Cattle Trade, [188] 1622, 1623
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1000
Financial Statement, [186] 1159
Great North of Scotland Railway, Consid. [187] 1245
Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1900
Liverpool, Importation of Cattle into, Res. [189] 633
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 554
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1487
Metropolis Gas, Consid. [187] 362
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 768, 775, 913; *add. cl.* 931
North British Railway (Carlisle Deviation), Consid. [187] 1287
Offices and Oaths, Comm. Preamble, [186] 1385
Parliamentary Deposits, Motion for a Committee, [188] 424
Railway Bills—Standing Orders, Res. [187] 1658 [*cont.*

Dodson, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Railway Companies, Consid. *cl.* 7; Amendt. [187] 1726
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1535, 1698; *cl.* 4, [187] 1147; *cl.* 34, 1179, 1180, 1189; *cl.* 35, 1204, 1207; *cl.* 8, 1243, 1297, 1303, 1363; *cl.* 9, 1547; *cl.* 10, 1953; *cl.* 14, 1990; *cl.* 29, [188] 179, 180; *cl.* 40, 436, 437; *cl.* A, 619; *add. cl.* 694, 874, 884, 1237; Consid. *cl.* 27, Amendt. 1460; Lords Amendts. *cl.* C, [189] 1187
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [188] 1698
National Education (Ireland), [189] 1281, 1282
Public Record Office, [187] 858
Quarantine Establishment, [187] 927
University of London, [187] 1469
Swansea Vale Railway, 2R. [185] 1090
Turnpike Acts Continuance, [188] 1910
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for Papers, [186] 1380

Dogs, Duty on
Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 28, [185] 1143; Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 15, [188] 1516

Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act (1865) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Stacpoole, Mr. Lawson, Mr. O'Beirne*)
c. Ordered; read 1º * *June* 3 [Bill 184]
Read 2º * *June* 27
Committee * *July* 9—R.P.
Committee *; Report *July* 15
Considered as amended * *July* 18
Read 3º * *July* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *July* 19 (No. 247)
Read 2ª * *August* 1
Committee * *August* 9
Report * *August* 12
Read 3ª * *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 116]

Dominica Loan Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Adderley*)
c. Ordered; read 1º * *July* 29 [Bill 291]
Read 2º * *July* 31
Committee *; Report *August* 1
Read 3º * *August* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 2
Read 2ª * *August* 6 (No. 288)
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 91]

Doulton, Mr. F., *Lambeth*
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1616
Representation of the People, 3R. [188] 1590

Down and Connor, Bishop of
Brown's Charity, 2R. [188] 498
Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 709
Ireland—Established Church, Motion for Returns, [185] 207, 209; Motion for an Address, [188] 393
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1372

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Lord Naas*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 14 [Bill 109]
Read 2° * *June* 17
Committee *; Report *June* 18
Read 3° * *June* 19
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 20
Read 2ª * *June* 25 (No. 165)
Committee *; Report *June* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 1
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 43]

Dublin, Archbishop of
Ireland—Established Church, Motion for Returns, [185] 208

Dublin Metropolitan Police Bill
(*Lord Naas, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 10 [Bill 246]
Read 2° * *July* 24
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Read 3° * *July* 26
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 29
Read 2ª * *August* 5 (No. 267)
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Read 3ª * *August* 8
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 95]

Dublin University Professorships Bill
(*Mr. Lawson, Mr. Sullivan*)
c. Considered in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 8 [Bill 10]
Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 27, [185] 1130
Committee *; Report *Feb* 28
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *Mar* 7
Considered as amended * *Mar* 12 [Bill 59]
Read 3° * *Mar* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *Mar* 18
Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 28, [186] 705
Committee *; Report *April* 1 (No. 48)
Read 3ª * *April* 2
Royal Assent *April* 5 [30 *Vict.* c. 9]

Du Cane, Mr. C. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Essex, N.*
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [185] 1803; Res. [189] 868
Supply — Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 905

Duchy of Lancaster
Questions, Mr. Gorst, Mr. F. Stanley, Mr. Childers; Answer, Colonel Wilson Patten *August* 8, [189] 1102

Dudley, Earl of
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 248
Trades Unions Demonstration, Proposed, [185] 136

Duff, Mr. M. E. Grant, *Elgin, &c.*
Cattle Plague, Res. [186] 2017
Education—Mr. Arnold's Report to the Schools Inquiry Commission, [189] 818
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1162

[*cont.*

Duff, Mr. M. E. Grant—*cont.*
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 912
India — Covenanted Educational Service in Bombay, Motion for an Address, [188] 1482
Navy—Promotion in the, Res. [186] 305
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1361; *cl.* 15, 2000, 2003; [188] 40
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 415
Scotland—Education, [188] 303
Supply—Public Education, [189] 361
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 3R. [188] 84

Duff, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Cattle Plague, Res. [186] 2016

Dufferin, Lord
Young, Mr., Pension to, Explanation, [186] 454, 457

Duncombe, Vice-Admiral Hon. A., *Yorkshire, E.R.*
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 208
Parliament—Members' Seats in the House, [188] 163
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 674, 1202

Dundee Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill (*Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 15 [Bill 257]
Read 2° * *July* 19
Committee *; Report *July* 22
Considered as amended * *July* 23
Read 3° * *July* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl Graham*) *July* 25
Read 2ª * *July* 30 (No. 257)
Committee *; Report *August* 1
Read 3ª * *August* 2
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 79]

Dunkellin, Lord, *Galway Co.*
Army—March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1391
Cattle Plague—Foreign Cattle, [187] 92
Ireland — Court of Exchequer, [186] 1786; —Taxation, Res. [188] 1309
Parliament—Public Business, [188] 778
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 783

Dunlop, Mr. A. C. S. M., *Greenock*
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1745
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 418
Scotland—Management of Scotch Business in Parliament, [186] 399

Dunne, Major-Gen. F. P., *Queen's Co.*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 517
Army—Enlistment, [189] 1451
  Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1676
  Organization of the, [187] 374
  Promotion in the, Res. [189] 334

[*cont.*

DUNNE, Major-General F. P.—*cont.*
  Recruiting, Res. [187] 681
  Transport and Supply Departments, [187] 1688
  War Department, [186] 1582
 Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [189] 130
  Military Store Establishment, [187] 1703
  Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1712
 Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [186] 449 ; *cl.* 41, Amendt. 1164
 Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Re-comm. *cl.* 37, Amendt. [188] 1251
 Ireland—Charity Commission and Trinity College, Dublin, [188] 169
  Constabulary Superannuation, [186] 893
  Disturbances in—Rewards to Constabulary, [186] 419
  Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Motion for a Committee, [186] 415
  Petty Sessions Clerks, [189] 103
  Registration of Deeds, Motion for a Committee, [188] 1670
  Registry of Deeds, [187] 852
  Taxation, Res. [188] 1301, 1306
 Irish Peerage—The Royal Prerogative, Motion for an Address, [188] 1134
 Naval Knights of Windsor, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1302
 Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1862
 Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1099
 Supply—Civil Departments, [186] 934
  Department of Science and Art, [189] 1226, 1241
  Hospitals (Dublin), [188] 1490
  Public Education, [189] 381
  Royal Parks, &c. Amendt. [188] 1690
  Superannuation, [188] 1488

DUNSANY, Lord
 Tenure of Land (Ireland), 1R. [185] 800
 Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 377

DURHAM, Bishop of
 Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 517

DUTTON, Hon. R. H., *Cirencester*
 India—Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1018

Duty on Dogs Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

185] *c.* Considered in Committee *Feb* 15, 451
 . Resolution reported *Feb* 18, 474
 . Bill ordered ; read 1° *Feb* 20, 695 [Bill 36]
 . Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 21, 780
 . Committee ; Report *Feb* 28, 1196
 . Considered as amended *Mar* 4, 1324
 . Read 3° * *Mar* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 12
 Read 2ª * *Mar* 18 (No. 42)
 Committee * ; Report *Mar* 19
 Read 3ª * *Mar* 21
 Royal Assent *Mar* 29 [30 *Vict.* c. 5]

DYOTT, Colonel R., *Lichfield*
 Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1535 ; *cl.* 31, [188] 278, 532 ; *add. cl.* 700, 782, 784, 1227 ; Schedule A, Amendt. 1279 ; Schedule D, 1289

EARLE, Mr. R. A. († Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners), *Maldon*
† Poor Law—Rating of Charitable Unions, [185] 811
 Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1574

East India Revenue Accounts
 Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 12, [189] 1340 ; Amendt. (*Mr. Ayrton*) ; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
 Revenue Accounts considered in Committee *August* 12, 1389 ; Resolution moved (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) ; after long debate, Amendt. in line 1, after the word "That," to insert the words "it appears by the Accounts laid before this House that" ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" put, and agreed to ; main Question, as amended, agreed to
  Parl Papers—
   Annual Accounts 251
   Home Accounts 252

EBURY, Lord
 Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1176
 Metropolis—Hyde Park, [189] 76, 77

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
 Capitular Estates Management Act, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 29, [189] 330
 Dean and Chapter of Westminster, Question, Mr. Bentinck ; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *April* 8, [186] 1266 ; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *May* 7, [187] 93
 Dean and Chapter of Windsor, Question, Sir Massey Lopes ; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *May* 24, [187] 1024
 Non-Capitular Stipends—Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, Question, Mr. Bentinck ; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *Mar* 18, [186] 3 ; Motion for Papers (*Mr. Bentinck*) *May* 21, [187] 895 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to—(*Parl. P.* No. 536)
 St. Edmund's, Dudley, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan ; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *August* 15, [189] 1591
 Whitby Rectory, Question, Mr. Bagnall ; Answer, Mr. Howes *Mar* 26, [186] 565
 (See *Church of England*)

Ecclesiastical Courts
 Notice withdrawn (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *August* 15, [189] 1558

Ecclesiastical Titles Act
 Moved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Return of any Actions brought or penalties recovered under the Second Clause of Cap. 60, 14th and 15th Vict., commonly called "The Ecclesiastical Titles Act" (*The Lord Lyveden*) *Mar* 28, [186] 706 ; after debate, Motion agreed to

Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal Bill (*Mr. MacEvoy, Mr. M'Kenna, Mr. Leader*)

186] *c.* Ordered, after short debate *Mar* 21, 364
Read 1° * *Mar* 22 [Bill 84]

187] Second Reading deferred, after debate *May* 14, 564

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into and report upon the operation of the Act 14 and 15 Vict. c. 60 (the Ecclesiastical Titles Act) 10 Geo. 4, c. 7 (the Roman Catholic Relief Act), as is contained in s. 24" (*Mr. MacEvoy*) *May* 16, 687; Motion agreed to

Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 21, 882

Nomination of Select Committee, Moved, "That Mr. MacEvoy be one Member of the Select Committee" *May* 24, 1096; House adjourned

Moved, "That Mr. MacEvoy be one Member of the Select Committee" *May* 30, 1363

Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "The nomination of the Select Committee be postponed until this day six months" (*Colonel Gilpin*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 69, N. 42; M. 27

After further short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Brook Bridges*); A. 39, N. 70; M. 31

Motion, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Henry Edwards*) put, and agreed to

Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 3, 1495; Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1498

188] Moved, "That Mr. MacEvoy be one of the Members of the Select Committee on the Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Act" *June* 24, 486

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Newdegate*); A. 17, N. 25; M. 8; previous Question again put, and agreed to

Mr. Walpole, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Howes, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, nominated other Members of the said Committee

Moved, "That Mr. M'Kenna be one other Member of the said Committee; [House counted out]

Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 25, 507

And, on *June* 27, Select Commitee nominated as follows:—Mr. MacEvoy (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Brett, Mr. Henry Austin Bruce, Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. W. Edward Forster, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Howes, The Judge Advocate, Mr. M'Kenna, Mr. Paull, and Mr. Walpole

Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

189] Observations, Mr. Speaker *August* 1, 604; Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Speaker *August* 9, 1223; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 12, 1339; Observations, Mr. Newdegate *August* 16, 1614

Edinburgh Provisional Order Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir Graham Montgomery*)

c. Ordered * *June* 19; read 1° * *June* 21 [Bill 205]
Read 2° * *June* 27
Committee *; Report *June* 28
Read 3° * *July* 1
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *July* 2
Read 2ª * *July* 8 (No. 198)
Committee *; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª * *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 58]

Education

America and Canada, Education in, Rev. J. Fraser's Report, Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 21, [187] 879; Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 24, 1024

Art Catalogue, Universal, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 13, [187] 391; Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 16, 615—(*Parl. P.* No. 362)

Compulsory Education, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 29, [186] 818

Educational Building Grants, Question, Mr. Acland; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 6, [187] 1659; Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 8, [188] 1187

Exhibition of 1851, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 31, [187] 1387—Fifth Report—*Parl. P.* [3933]

Inspection of Schools in Whitsun Week, Question, Mr. Bagnall; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 20, [188] 169

National Education (*Ireland*)

Education Commissioners (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Lanyon; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 21, [185] 720

Education Estimate, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 16, [187] 620

Education—The National Education Society (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 20, [186] 1704

Roman Catholic University (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 1, [189] 603

Paris Universal Exhibition, 1867—*Expenditure and Purchases*, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 16, [187] 619; Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu, 622; Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 17, 692—*Passengers' Luggage*—(*Parl. P.* No. 98, 189)

Select Committee appointed, "to consider and report on the advisability of making purchases from the Paris Exhibition for the benefit of the Schools of Science and Art in the United Kingdom, and any other means of making that Exhibition useful to the manufacturing industry of Great Britain and Ireland" (*Mr. Layard*) *June* 20, [188] 238

And, on *June* 21, Committee nominated as follows: — Mr. Layard (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. A. Bruce, Mr.

[*cont.*

Education—cont.
Childers, Mr. W. Cowper, Sir Philip Egerton, Lord Elcho, Mr. Gregory, Colonel Hogg, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Locke, Mr. Marsh, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Otway, Mr. Potter, and Mr. Seymour

Parl. Papers—

Report	433
Correspondence	379

Revised Code of Regulations
Minute of Council presented *Feb* 28, [185] 1147; debate thereon
Educational Grants, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *April* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "this House dissents from so much of the Minute of the Committee of Council on Education as provides for an increase of the Grants now made to Primary Schools" (*Mr. Lowe*), [186] 1176; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 203, N. 40; M. 163
Revised Code, The—Elementary Education, Question, Mr. Hubbard; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 3, [186] 1995; long discussion thereon; Question, Mr. Hubbard, 1995; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu, 2000; long discussion thereon
Certificated Teachers, Observations, The Earl of Cork *July* 5, [188] 1045; short debate thereon

Roman Catholic School Children—Removal of, Question, Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 9, [189] 1224
Schools Inquiry Commission Report, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 4, [186] 1102; Question, Sir Edmund Lacon; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 30, [187] 1294—*Mr. Arnold's Report*, Question, Mr. Grant Duff; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 2, [189] 818
Scotland—Report of Commissioners, Question, Sir E. Colebrooke; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 21, [185] 725; Second Report, [3845-I to V], [3858]; Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 21, [188] 303
South Kensington, Art and Science Department, Question, Mr. Bentinck; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 23, [187] 935
Technical Education in Foreign Countries, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 19, [188] 1723; Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *August* 1, [189] 598

Parl. Papers—

Revised Code of Regulations . .	[3778]
Minute of Committee	[3789]
Grants for Elementary Schools, 1859-1866	[3832]
Returns, Elementary Schools . .	[3840]
Report of Rev. J. Fraser . . .	[3857]
Report of Committee	[3882]
Report, Technical Education . .	[3898]

Education of the Poor Bill
(*Mr. Bruce, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. A. Egerton*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 5 [Bill 111]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Bruce*) *July* 10, [188] 1317; after long debate, Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn * *July* 15

EDWARDS, Sir H., *Beverley*
Army Estimates—Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1714
Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1590
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [187] 1365
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 883, 884, 886
Parliament—Members' Seats in the House, [188] 162
Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1821
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1697, 1698; *cl.* 14, [187] 1990; *cl.* 40, [188] 450, 454; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1172
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, [187] 1740
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1557

EDWARDS, Mr. C., *Windsor*
Collieries, Inspection of, [185] 585
Railway Debentures, [186] 289
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 31, [188] 281

EGERTON, Lord
Limerick Harbour (Composition of Debt), 2R. [188] 5

EGERTON, Hon. A. F., *Lancashire, S.*
Education of the Poor, 2R. [188] 1342
Printworks, Juvenile Labour in, [186] 1478
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1161; *add. cl.* [188] 1009, 1218, 1236

EGERTON, Hon. W., *Cheshire, N.*
Bleaching, Dyeing, and Printworks Acts, [189] 81
Carriers' Act, [189] 82
Representation of the People, Comm. Schedule B, [188] 1282
Waterworks, [185] 466

EGERTON, Mr. E. C. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Macclesfield*
"Mermaid," Destruction of the Ship, Motion for an Address, [188] 1757
Supply—Royal Palaces, [185] 500;—Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1897

Egypt
English Workmen, Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 12, [189] 1337
Suez Canal, Question, Sir Henry Rawlinson; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 8, [185] 1549

[*cont.*

Egypt—cont.
  Visit of the Viceroy, Question, Lord Wharncliffe; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *June* 28, [188] 663; Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Lord Stanley, 665; Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 2, 853

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
  Army—Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot, Res. [189] 87, 92
    Artillery—Rifled Cannon, Res. [189] 1503
    Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1678
    Ordnance Department, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1799, 1802, 1807, 1808, 1809
  Army Estimates—Administration of the Army, [187] 1721
    Hospital Establishment, [187] 1751
    Increase of Pay, [189] 135
    Military Store Establishment, [187] 1702, 1705, 1706, 1707, 1708
    Volunteer Corps, [187] 1754, 1764
    Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1715
  Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, 3R. [188] 923
  Burlington House Site, [186] 1246
  Chester, Apprehended Disturbances at, [185] 288
  Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1594
  Fortifications and Works, Comm. Res. [189] 140
  Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2), Comm. Amendt. [189] 1289; 3R. 1300
  Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1160
  Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 905
  Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1905
  Master and Servant, Law of, [185] 1259
  Master and Servant, Leave, [186] 1059; 2R. [187] 1611
  Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1460, 1468, 1481
  Metropolis—Reform Meeting, [186] 1978;—Hyde Park Review, [188] 772;—Statue of Canning, [189] 1294
  Mines and Miners, [186] 412
  National Gallery, The New, Motion for Papers, [186] 834
  Navy—Naval Arsenals and Dockyards, [189] 1567
  Parliament—Public Business, [186] 1319
  Public Health (Scotland), 2R. [186] 1317
  Railways (Scotland), 2R. [187] 1012
  Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1495; *cl.* 15, [187] 2003, 2005; *cl.* 29, [188] 219; 3R. 1574, 1581
  Scotland—Management of Scotch Business in Parliament, [186] 412
  Supply—British Museum, [189] 351
    Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1249
    National Gallery, [189] 1243, 1245
    Superannuation, [188] 1487
    Volunteers, Report, [188] 845
  Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 528
  Vagrancy in the Metropolis, [189] 1640
  Volunteer Review, The, [188] 1518
  Volunteers—Capitation Grant, [189] 1334
    Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1580; Res. [188] 739

Elections, Controverted—Chairmen's Panel
  Chairmen's Panel *Feb* 19, [185] reported:—Mr. Adair, Mr. Baxter, Admiral Duncombe (York, E. R.), Sir Philip G. Egerton (Cheshire, S.), Mr. Evans, Mr. Howes

Elections — Elective Franchise, &c., see *Representation of the People*

Eliot, Lord, *Devonport*
  Supply—Embassy House, Constantinople, [188] 1706

Ellenborough, Earl of
  Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1016, 1018
  Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 13, [187] 1194; *add. cl.* 1197; Report, *cl.* 12, 1483, 1484; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1485; 3R. 1552; [188] 258
  Ireland—Condemned Fenian Prisoners, [187] 1101
    Constabulary, Motion for Returns, [186] 462
  Offices and Oaths, 2R. [187] 1376
  Public Schools, Comm. [185] 1002
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 302; *cl.* 4, 317
  Trades Unions Demonstration, Proposed, [185] 143
  Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [185] 278
  Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 374; [188] 759

Ellice, Mr. E., *St. Andrews, &c.*
  Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 757
  North British Railway (Carlisle Deviation), Consid. [187] 1286
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [187] 999

Ely, Bishop of
  Cornwall, Bishopric in, [185] 1301
  Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 11, [187] 386

Enfield, Viscount, *Middlesex*
  Cattle Plague, [188] 1436
  Metropolis—Victoria Park, [187] 1293
  Metropolitan Poor, Leave, [185] 177; 2R. 746
  Metropolitan Poor Relief Act — Nominees, [188] 425
  Navy—Twin Screw, [189] 848
  Poplar, Distress in, [186] 1266
  Public Schools, [189] 330
  Special and Common Juries, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1582

Engine Drivers' Strike
  Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 14, [185] 1807

Erskine, Vice-Admiral J. E., *Stirlingshire*
  Bermuda—Yellow Fever at, [189] 1560
  Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, &c. [187] 1813, 1828
  Navy—Promotion in the, Res. [186] 303

Esmonde, Mr. J., *Waterford Co.*
- Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1680
- Bridges (Ireland), [186] 1483
- Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 88, Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1166; Motion for Adjournment, [187] 374, 376
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 369
- Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 884, 887
  - Fenianism, [186] 1932
  - Reform Bill, [187] 5
  - Representation of the People, [186] 818, 2024
  - Tipperary and Waterford Elections, Res. [189] 109
- Offices and Oaths, Comm. Preamble, [186] 1385
- Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1274; *cl.* 9, [187] 1546; *add. cl.* [188] 1026
- Representation of the People (Ireland), [187] 1091
- Supply—Miscellaneous Expenses, [188] 1909

Essex, Earl of
- Ireland — Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, [185] 453

Established Church (Ireland)

185] Address for Returns from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Ireland (*The Bishop of Down*) *Feb* 11, 207; after short debate, on Question, resolved in the negative

187] Question, Mr. Lefroy; Answer Sir John Gray *May* 6, 6

Moved, "That this House will, on Wednesday the 29th day of this instant May, resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Temporalities and Privileges of the Established Church in Ireland" (*Sir John Gray*) *May* 7, 96; after long debate, previous Question (*Sir Frederick Heygate*) put; A. 183, N. 195; M. 12; Division List, 182

188] Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying that Her Majesty will be pleased to give Directions that by the Operation of a Royal Commission or otherwise full and accurate Information be procured as to the Nature and Amount of the Property and Revenues of the Established Church in Ireland, with a view to their more productive Management, and to their more equitable application for the Benefit of the Irish People" (*The Earl Russell*) *June* 24, 354; Amendt. to leave out after "Management," and insert "And also as to the means by which they may be made best to promote the Efficiency of the Established Church in Ireland" (*The Bishop of Ossory, &c.*); on Question, "That the words, &c.;" Cont. 38, Not-Cont. 20; M. 52; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 422; Then the said Amendt. withdrawn; Motion, as amended, agreed to—*The Address*, Explanation, The Duke of Argyll *June* 25, 489; Personal Explanation, Earl Russell 506—*Her Majesty's Answer June* 28, 653—*The Commission*, Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 4, 983; *August* 1,

189] 602; Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 16, 1610

"Ethiopian," Wreck of the
- Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. Corry *June* 20, [188] 167

Etwall Hospital and Repton School
- Return ordered (*Sir Robert Peel*) *May* 16, [187] 688—(*Parl. P.* No. 369)

Evans, Mr. T. W., *Derbyshire, S.*
- Cattle Plague, [187] 391
- Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1628
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* A, [188] 631
- Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 585

Eversley, Viscount
- Increase of the Episcopate, 3R. [188] 247
- New Forest, [189] 1304
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 417

Ewart, Mr. W., *Dumfries, &c.*
- Brazil—British Claims on, [187] 1128
- Hume, Mr., Bust of the late, [186] 816
- Metropolis—Public Parks, [187] 1387;—Hyde Park Gravel Pits, [188] 1437
- Money Orders, International System of, [187] 774
- Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 366
- Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, Leave, [185] 1704, 1707; 2R. [187] 1613
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 847

Ewing, Mr. H. E. **Crum**.- *Paisley*
- Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh), 2R. [185] 673
- Colonial Governors, Motion for an Address, [188] 1742
- North British Railway (Carlisle Deviation), Consid. [187] 1288
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 440
- Scotland—Management of Scotch Business in Parliament, [186] 400
- Sugar, Drawback on, [185] 812
- Sugar Duties, Comm. Res. [185] 352, 355, 904; Consid. 1203
- "Tornado," Case of the, [185] 586

Exchequer Bonds (£1,700,000) Bill

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)

c. Read 1° * *May* 28
Read 2° * *May* 30
Committee *; Report *June* 3
Read 3° * *June* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 4
Read 2ª * *June* 6
Read 3ª * *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 17 [30 *Vict.* c. 31]

Exchequer, Chancellor of the, *see* **Chancellor** of the **Exchequer**

Execution of Deeds Bill
(*Mr. Goldney, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Powell*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 26]
185] Read 2° *Feb* 27, 1133
Committee; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 5, 1416
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" *(Mr. Attorney General)*, 1417; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Committee deferred
187] Committee *; Report *May* 8, 138
Bill withdrawn * *July* 15 [Bill 138]

Exhibition of 1851
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 31, [187] 1387
Fifth Report—*Parl. P.* . . [3933]

Expiring Laws
Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, [189] 78

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 26 [Bill 288]
Read 2° * *July* 29
Committee; Report *August* 6, [189] 961
Considered as amended * *August* 7
Read 3° * *August* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 9
Read 2ª * *August* 12 (No. 321)
Committee *; Report *August* 16
Read 3ª * *August* 17
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 143]

Eykyn, Mr. R., *Windsor*
Army—Military Knights at Windsor, [189] 474
Cattle, Importation of, [185] 460

Factory Acts
Bleaching, Dyeing, and Printworks Acts, Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 25, [189] 81
Educational Clauses, Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to extend the Educational Clauses of the Factory Acts to children who are employed in Agriculture" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *Feb* 26, [185] 1066; after long debate, Motion withdrawn
Glass Manufactures, Question, Mr. Hartley; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 22, [186] 98
Printworks, Juvenile Labour in, Question, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 11, [186] 1478
(See *Agriculture—Agricultural Gangs*)

Factory Acts Extension Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Sir John Pakington*)
185] *c.* Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 1, 1271 [Bill 62]
186] Read 2°, after debate *Mar* 22, 450
Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Question, Mr. Bright *April* 29, 1710; Question, Mr. Bright; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 30, 1787
[*cont.*

Factory Acts Extension Bill—cont.
Bill, together with *Hours of Labour Regulation Bill*, committed to a Select Committee *May* 2
And, on *May* 10, Select Committee nominated as follows:—Lord J. Manners (Chairman), Mr. Adderley, Mr. Akroyd, Mr. Bagnall, Mr. Bright, Mr. Austin Bruce, Mr. Dalglish, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Hartley, Mr. Lanyon, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Potter, Mr. Powell, Mr. Samuelson, Mr. J. B. Smith, Mr. Stanley, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, and Mr. Whitbread
Report of Select Committee *July* 9 [No. 430]
Report * *July* 9 [Bill 236]
189] Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 30, 476
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "this House is not prepared, without further evidence, to interfere with the free exercise of labour to so great an extent as is contemplated by the present measure" (*Mr. Moffatt*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Bill considered in Committee, and reported
Considered as amended * *August* 2
Read 3° * *August* 5
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 5
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 9, 1205; Read 2ª, after short debate (No. 296)
Committee *; Report *August* 12
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 13, 1433; Read 3ª, after short debate
Royal Assent *August* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 103]

Fane, Lieut.-Col. H. H., *Hampshire, S.*
Army—Camps at Aldershot and Colchester, [188] 987
Recruiting, [187] 1489
Army Estimates—Disembodied Militia, [187] 1751
New Forest—Licenses to Shoot, [186] 1335

Fawcett, Mr. H., *Brighton*
Agricultural Children's Education, Leave, [187] 559; 2R. [189] 487, 505, 508, 517
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1011
Army—Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1983
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, 3R. [188] 923
Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1885
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [189] 1413
Education, Compulsory, [186] 818
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1066, 1087
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [186] 451, 452; Re-comm. [189] 481; *cl.* 3, 483; Schedules, Amendt. 484
Financial Statement, [186] 1148
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. [189] 1069
India Office—State Entertainment to the Sultan, [188] 1624; Motion for an Address, 1763
Ireland—Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 55, 56; [189] 33;—Roman Catholic University, 603
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1610
[*cont.*

Fawcett, Mr. H.—*cont.*
- Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1485
- Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1630
- Parliament—Business of the House, [189] 1225, 1226;—Public Business, 1338, 1339
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 317; *cl.* 4, 835; *cl.* 5, 1235; *cl.* 40, [188] 481, 486; *cl.* A, Amendt. 625, 646; *add. cl.* 803, 1085, 1110
- Tests Abolition (Oxford), Leave, [185] 296; Comm. Instruction, [186] 1431, 1443; *cl.* 1, 1447
- Uniformity Act Amendment, Leave, [185] 1510; 2R. [187] 1248, 1261, 1262, 1279; Comm. [188] 963; 3R. [189] 1048

Fergusson, Sir J. (Under Secretary of State for India), *Ayrshire*
- Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh), 2R. Amendt. [185] 662
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. [189] 759
- Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1208; Comm. 1334
- Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 198; Comm. *cl.* 4, 757
- India—English Resident at Leh, [185] 1549
  - Famine in Orissa, [185] 1646; [186] 1582; Motion for an Address, [189] 799
  - Straits Settlements, [185] 1647
- London Coal and Wine Duties, 2R. [189] 1534
- Railways (Scotland), 2R. [187] 1012
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 412; [189] 333
- Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [189] 1531
- Turnpike Trusts, [189] 1332

Feversham, Lord
- Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1971

Fildes, Mr. J., *Great Grimsby*
- Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. Amendt. [185] 1138; Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 267; Amendt. 1063

Finlay, Mr. A. S., *Argyllshire*
- Army—Volunteer Corps Capitation Money, [187] 1294
- India—Indian Railways, [188] 1192
- Supply—Superannuation, [188] 1489

Finsbury Estate Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Locke*)

c. Ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 6 [Bill 1]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *Feb* 13, [185] 301
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Howes*); after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 53, N. 87; M. 34; words added; main Question agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Fire Arms, Proof of
- Question, Earl Spencer; Answer, The Earl of Longford *June* 7, [187] 1728

Fire Insurance
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, a further reduction of the duty on Fire Insurances would have a tendency to bring within the protection of Insurance a large amount of the present uninsured property of the Country, and that a further reduction of the Duty should therefore be made at the earliest opportunity" (*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan*) *Mar* 19, [186] 128; after debate, previous Question put (*Mr. Hunt*); A. 156, N. 215; M. 59

Fire Protection
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed 'to inquire into the existing legislative provisions for the protection of Life and Property against Fires in the United Kingdom, and as to the best means to be adopted for ascertaining the causes and preventing the Frequency of fires'" (*Mr. M'Lagan*) *Mar* 12, [185] 1708; after debate, Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed
Order for nominating Select Committee on Protection from Fire, read; after Observations (*Mr. Hunt*), Select Committee nominated *Mar* 27 as follows:—Mr. M'Lagan (Chairman), Mr. Agar-Ellis, Mr. Beach, Mr. Gorst, Lord Richard Grosvenor, Mr. Horsfall, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Laird, Mr. Lanyon, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Lusk, Mr. Miller, Mr. Read, Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Tite, Mr. Turner, Mr. Whitmore
Report *brought up, July* 25 (*Parl. P.* No. 471)
(See *Witnesses—House of Commons*)

Fitzgerald, Lord O. A., *Kildare Co.*
- Ireland—Curragh of Kildare, [187] 1491

Flogging in the Army
185] *Corporal Punishment*, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 18, 463
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 15, To leave out from "That," and add "this House, reserving for future consideration when requisite the question of the exigencies of a state of war, is of opinion that it is unnecessary that the punishment of flogging should be awarded during the time of peace to Soldiers of the Army or Corps of Royal Marines serving on Shore" (*Mr. Otway*), 1951; after long debate, A. 107, N. 108; M. 1; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1989
186] *Mutiny Bill*, Observations, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 18, 2; Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 21, 290; discussion thereon; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 22, 393; Notice, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 25, 466; Question, Major Jervis; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 28, 729; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 1, 903
(See title *Mutiny Bill*)

Floyer, Mr. J., *Dorsetshire*
- Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [188] 1186

Foley, Mr. H. J. W., *Staffordshire, S.*
Representation of the People—Hundreds of Offlow, [186] 1482

Foljambe, Mr. F. J. S., *Retford (East)*
Ritualism—Royal Commission, [187] 1664

Fordyce, Mr. W. D., *Aberdeenshire*
Cattle Plague, [185] 724, 725;—Compensation for Slaughtered Cattle, [186] 1228; Res. 2013, 2016, 2017
Game Laws, [185] 1145
Game Preservation (Scotland), Leave, [185] 1396; 2R. [187] 910
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 585
Public Health (Scotland), 2R. [186] 1927

Foreign Decorations
Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 23, [188] 2070

Forester, Rt.Hon.Gen. G. C. W., *Wenlock*
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1015; Amendt. 1016; Consid. *cl.* 29, 1461

Forfeiture, Law of
Question, Mr. Charles Forster; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 8, [185] 148

Forster, Mr. C., *Walsall*
Forfeiture, Law of, [185] 148
Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1893
Parliament—Privilege—Signatures to a Petition, [188] 1124

Forster, Mr. W. E., *Bradford*
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1021
Army—Volunteers, [187] 1936, 1937
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. [189] 759; *cl.* 8, 761; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 762
Boundary Commissioners, [188] 17, 267
Colonial Governors, Instructions to, [188] 1723
Education of the Poor, 2R. [188] 1350, 1359
Education, Technical, Abroad, [188] 1723; [189] 598
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 483
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1158
International Currency Conference, [186] 1478
Ireland—Fenian Prisoners, [186] 733;—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1891
Licensing System, [186] 1874
Martial Law in the Colonies, [188] 268;—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Res. 903, 909
Meetings in Royal Parks, [189] 85; Re-comm. Preamble, 1485
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 925
Public Houses, &c. Leave, [186] 165; 2R. 1851
Representation of the People—Compound Householders, [186] 1875, 1876, 1939, 1942, 1945; [187] 6, 262, 525

[*cont.*

Forster, Mr. W. E.—*cont.*
186] Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, 1608, 1629, 1898
187] 733, 753; *cl.* 35, 1202; *cl.* 9, 1546; *cl.* 14, 1991
188] *cl.* 15, 43; *cl.* 19, 53; *cl.* 24, Motion for Adjournment, 55; *cl.* 31, 279, 524, 533, 534, 535; *cl.* A, 624; *add. cl.* 674, 697, 698, 1005, 1208, 1267; Schedule B, 1284; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1453
189] 1106; Lords Amendts. Amendt. *cl.* 3, 1115
Supply—Polish Refugees, [188] 1489
Public Education, [189] 375
Volunteers, Report, [188] 845
Telegraph Lines, Government Superintendence of, [185] 813
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1399; *cl.* 1, 1410
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 200; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 996; *cl.* 5, 998, 999
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1550; [186] 727, 728; Res. [188] 734
West Indies—Grants for Religious Purposes, [186] 393

Fort, Mr. R., *Clitheroe*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1334, 1362

Fortescue, Earl
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 298; *cl.* 3, 303; *cl.* 5, 325; *add. cl.* 432; *cl.* 15, 579; *add. cl.* 730; 3R. 937

Fortescue, Right Hon. Chichester S., *Louth Co.*
British Columbia, &c.—Church in the Colonies, [186] 290
British North America, 2R. [185] 1193; Comm. *cl.* 53, 1317
Chester, Apprehended Disturbances at, [185] 287
Dublin University Professorships, 2R. [185] 1132
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 368; Motion for a Committee, 688, 1364
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 975
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1754
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 879
Disturbances in, [185] 400, 401, 1448
Established Church, Res. [187] 165, 166
Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Motion for a Committee, [186] 415
Queen's University, [187] 3, 4, 1431, 1445
Rewards to Constabulary, [186] 417
Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 17, 20, 25
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 566
Representation of the People (Ireland), [186] 289; [187] 1087; Res. [188] 703, 710, 717, 718
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1100
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 109
Supply—Labuan, [188] 1770
Public Education (Ireland), [189] 920
Rewards to Irish Constabulary, [186] 894
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 544, 555; [186] 1586, 1778, 1783, 1784

Fortifications, Grants for
Address for a Return (*Colonel Sykes*) *Feb* 12, [185] 288; after short debate, Motion agreed to—(*Parl. P.* No. 345)

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) Bill (*Sir John Pakington, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 2 [Bill 104]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir John Pakington*) *April* 5, [186] 1258
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Sir Morton Peto*); after short debate, Debate adjourned
Adjourned debate *April* 8, 1265; Read 2°, after short debate
Committee; Report *April* 9, 1416
Read 3° * *April* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *May* 2
Read 2ª * *May* 17 (No. 84)
Committee; Report *May* 20, [187] 767
Read 3ª * *May* 21
Royal Assent *May* 31 [30 *Vict.* c. 24]

Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolutions agreed to *July* 25, [189] 140
Ordered; read 1° * *July* 26 [Bill 285]
Read 2° * *July* 29
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *August* 9, [189] 1285
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient to proceed further with the construction of the Fortifications for the defence of the Dockyards and Naval Arsenals of the United Kingdom until a Select Committee shall have reported upon the plans upon which such works are being erected" (*Mr. O'Beirne*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient to proceed further with the construction of the Fortifications for the defence of the Dockyards and Naval Arsenals of the United Kingdom until the strength and sufficiency of the proposed Fortifications and Iron Shields has been tested by actual experiment, by submitting them to the fire of the most powerful known guns" (*Lord Elcho*), 1289; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; Bill considered in Committee, and reported
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *August* 10, 1300; Read 3°, after short debate
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *August* 12
Read 2ª * *August* 16 (No. 330)
Committee *; Report *August* 17
Read 3ª * *August* 20
Royal Assent *August* 21 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 145]

Foster, Mr. W. O., *Staffordshire, S.*
Trades Unions, Comm. *cl.* 2, [185] 996

France
Declaration of Paris, 1856—*Goods in Neutral Vessels*, Observations, Mr. J. Stuart Mill *August* 5, [189] 876; short debate thereon
Salt, English, Admission of, into France, Question, Mr. Tollemache; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 7, [185] 1443
Sea Fisheries—Convention with France, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 9, [187] 762
The Fishery Convention, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 25, [189] 83
(See titles *Education* and *Paris Universal Exhibition*, 1867)

France, Prussia, and Denmark
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 29, [189] 331

French, Rt. Hon. Colonel F., *Roscommon Co.*
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1674
  Supply of Barrack Stores, [186] 1598
  Troops in Huts, [187] 618
Chester, Apprehended Disturbances at, [185] 281
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 41, [186] 1165; [187] 374
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 593
Ireland—Disturbances in, [185] 401
  Fenianism, [187] 13
  Limerick Harbour, Comm. [186] 1318
  Militia, [186] 727
  Salters' Company — Magherafelt Roman Catholic Church, Motion for an Address, [187] 892
Irish Peerage—The Royal Prerogative, Motion for an Address, [188] 1131
Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 995
Libel, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [188] 546
London University, [186] 982
Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 984
Parliament — Public Business, [188] 774; Standing Order, [187] 1133
Parliamentary Deposits, Motion for a Committee, [188] 424
Poor Law Board, New President of the, [187] 876
Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [186] 1858
Public Works Commissioners, [186] 1784
Representation of the People, [186] 1105; Comm. *cl.* 35, [187] 1206; *add. cl.* [188] 1017
Representation of the People (Ireland), Leave, [186] 1349; Res. [188] 709
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 433; [189] 332
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1647
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1099
Statute Law Consolidation, Motion for an Address, [187] 1594, 1595
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1162, 1715
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1844
Writs for re-election, [186] 1201

FRESHFIELD, Mr. C. K., *Dover*
Bankruptcy Acts Amendment, Comm. [187] 1579
Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 200
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1346
Sunday Trading, 2R. Amendt. [187] 581, 586

Friendly Societies
Motion for Returns of number of Paupers who have been Members; also number of Societies in each county of England and Wales (*The Earl of Lichfield*) *June* 20, [188] 125 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to—(*Parl. P.* No. 212)
Observations, The Earl of Lichfield ; Reply, The Earl of Devon *August* 16, [189] 1597

Friendly Societies Bill
(*The Earl of Lichfield*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª* *August* 17 (No. 349)

Fulford and Wellstead (*Poaching*), *Case of*
Question, Sir Roundell Palmer ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 24, [187] 1025 ; Question, Mr. Taylor ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 20, [188] 166
(See *Criminal Law*)

Galashiels Jurisdiction Bill (*Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *July* 8 [Bill 234]
Read 2°* *July* 11
Committee* ; Report *July* 23
Considered as amended* *July* 24
Read 3°* *July* 25
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Montrose*) *July* 26
Read 2ª* *July* 30 (No. 260)
Committee* ; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª* *August* 6
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 85]

GALLWEY, Sir W. P., *Thirsk*
Naval Review, The, [188] 1397

Galway Harbour Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Lord Naas, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Considered in Committee *May* 6, [187] 67 ; Resolution
Resolution reported ; Bill ordered ; read 1°* *May* 7 [Bill 137]
Read 2°* *June* 3
And, on *June* 4, Select Committee nominated as follows :—Lord Dunkellin (Chairman), Major Gavin, Mr. Graves, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Monsell, Mr. Read, Mr. Gilpin, Mr. Hartopp, Mr. Howard, Sir John Ogilvy, and Mr. Pugh
Report of Select Committee *June* 18 (No. 378)
Report* *June* 18 [Bill 200]
Re-comm* ; Report *June* 20
Considered as amended* *June* 21
Read 3°* *June* 24
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 25
Moved, "That the Order of the 3rd of May last be dispensed with in respect of the said Bill, on the Ground of the Delay occasioned by lengthened negotiations with a Creditor and Necessity of obtaining the Consent to the Measure of a Committee of the Grand Jury of the County of Galway (*The Earl of Devon*), [188] 964; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Devon*) *July* 4 ; after further short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 176)
Committee ; Report *July* 9, 1255
Read 3ª* *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 56]

GALWAY, Viscount, *Retford* (*East*)
Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot, Res. [189] 102
Cattle Plague, [187] 6
Christ Church Ordinances, [189] 85
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. Amendt. [187] 208, 209, 210
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 841, 1161 ; *cl.* 9, 1539, 1547 ; *cl.* A, [188] 619, 623 ; *add. cl.* 897, 1015

Game Laws Amendment (Ireland) Bill
(*The O'Donoghue, Mr. Cogan, Mr. Serjeant Barry*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *July* 2 [Bill 226]
Read 2°* *July* 11
Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 12, [188] 1491
Whereupon Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Vance*) put, and agreed to
Bill withdrawn* *July* 26

Game Laws (Scotland) Bill (*Lord Elcho,* (*Mr. Henry Baillie, Sir Robert Anstruther*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *April* 9 [Bill 116]
Read 2°, and committed to the Select Committee on *Game Preservation* (*Scotland*) *Bill* *May* 21
Report of Select Committee* *July* 8 (No. 426)
Report* *July* 8 [Bill 231]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 6

Game Preservation (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Lagan, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, Mr. Fordyce*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° *Mar* 5, [185] 1388 [Bill 65]
Read 2°, after debate, and committed to a Select Committee *May* 21, [187] 902
And, on *June* 4, Select Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Finlay (Chairman), Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Henry Baillie, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Lord Elcho, Colonel Hamlyn Fane, Mr. Fordyce, Mr. Lamont, Mr. M'Lagan, Mr. Moncreiff, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Read, Mr. Robertson (Berwickshire), Captain Speirs, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, and Major Walker
Report of Select Committee* *July* 8 (No. 426)
Report* *July* 8

Gas and Water Bills
Instruction to the Committee of Selection (*Colonel Wilson Patten*) *Mar* 1, [185] 1228

Gaselee, Mr. Serjeant S., *Portsmouth*
- Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, [187] 1759
- Army — Forts at Portsmouth and Spithead, [189] 1104
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. [189] 754, 755
- Canada Railway Loan, 2R. [186] 973
- Church Rates Commutation, 2R. Amendt. [186] 264
- Churchward, Mr.—Appointment of, [185] 1915; —Case of, [186] 5, 280, 471, 1477, 1478
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1000
- Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. Amendt. [185] 1205; Comm. Amendt. 1326
- Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 2, [185] 1759; *cl.* 3, 1760; *cl.* 5, 1763
- Disqualification of Crown Officers, [185] 1239
- Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 1075
- Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. Preamble, [186] 1064; *cl.* 1, 1065, 1068
- Lancaster, Reigate, Totnes, &c. [185] 1548
- London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1349
- Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 389
- Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1924
- Navy—Corporal Punishment of Naval Cadets, [187] 1490
  - Promotion in the, Res. [186] 311
- Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing, [186] 971, 972
- Private Executions, [189] 86
- Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 3R. Amendt. [188] 847
- Representation of the People, Comm. [185] 993; *cl.* 3, [187] 27, 452, 468, 706; *cl.* 4, 1002; *cl.* 34, 1188, 1189; *cl.* 8, 1360; *cl.* 9, 1401; Amendt. 1500, 1504, 1517; *cl.* 10, 1973, 1980; *cl.* 31, [188] 524; *add. cl.* 615, 676, 806, 842; Amendt. 884, 885, 1024, 1207, 1237; Consid. *add. cl.* 1449
- Sunday Trading, Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 38; *cl.* 2, 39
- Supply—Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 688
- Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1262; 3R. [189] 1049
- Vice President of the Board of Trade, Re-comm. [187] 477

Gavin, Major G., *Limerick City*
- Ireland—Holyhead Mail Packets, [187] 1021

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act (1862) Provisional Order Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
- c. Ordered * *June* 19

Gibson, Rt. Hon. T. M., *Ashton-under-Lyne*
- Libel, 2R. [185] 1738
- "Mermaid," Destruction of the Ship, Motion for an Address, [188] 1758
- Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1917
- Newspaper Proprietors, Securities given by, [187] 1076, 1082, 1084

[cont.

Gibson, Rt. Hon. T. M.—*cont.*
- Parliament—Railway Bills—Standing Orders, Res. [187] 1652
- Railway Companies Arrangements, Leave, [185] 102; Consid. *cl.* 4, [187] 1725
- Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 669
- Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1411
- Storm Warnings, Res. [188] 1736
- Vice President of the Board of Trade, Leave, [185] 358

Gilpin, Colonel R. T., *Bedfordshire*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1490
  - Military Education, [187] 1717
  - Military Store Establishment, [187] 1706
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1714
- Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1680
- Cattle Plague in the Metropolis, [187] 1292
- Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. Amendt. [187] 1363
- Naval Review, The, [188] 1626
- Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 690, 700, 843, 998, 1228, 1248
- Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1672

Gilpin, Mr. C., *Northampton*
- Army—Reserve, [187] 255
- Consecration of Burial Grounds, [189] 1107
- Consecration of Churches and Churchyards, Consid. *add. cl.* [189] 1592
- Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1642
- Ireland—Death Sentence on Fenian Convicts, [187] 89
  - Fenianism, [187] 13
- Jamaica—Major General O'Connor, [185] 214; —Courts Martial in, 933
- Kingston Assizes, [186] 903, 1201, 1202
- Life Sentences, [185] 1923
- Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 1577, 1579
- Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 752; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1614; *cl.* 43, 1676; *cl.* 55, 1684; *cl.* 59, 1686
- Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 366
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1632; *cl.* 8, [187] 1335; *cl.* D, [188] 648; *add. cl.* 787
- Scott, James, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 1512
- Slave Trade, The, [189] 1106
- Supply—Royal Palaces, [185] 499
- Watson, William, Case of, [188] 427

Gladstone, Mr., and the Reform League
- Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Gladstone *April* 1, [186] 911

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., *Lancashire, S.*
- Address in Answer to the Speech, [185] 67
- Army Estimates, [185] 1308;—Land Forces, 1485
- British North America, Comm. [185] 1312
- Canada Railway Loan, Comm. [186] 749
- Cattle Plague, [185] 403
- Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 245

[cont.

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 181, 183, 184, 206
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1210
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [187] 375
Crete—Insurrection in, Address for Papers, [185] 441
Dogs, Duty on, Leave, [185] 474
Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1597
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 365
Education of the Poor, 2R. [188] 1361
Election Petitions Committees, [186] 1336
Financial Statement, [186] 1116, 1130
Fire Insurance, Res. [186] 134
Gladstone, Mr., and the Reform League, [186] 912
Hyde Park — Reform Meeting, [186] 1972, 1975, 1976
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 1074; *cl.* 9, 1076; *add. cl.* 1078
Ireland—Established Church, Res. [187] 121, 126
 Queen's University, [187] 1456, 1461, 1462
 Railways, [189] 624
 Representation of, Res. [188] 723
 Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 77
Libel, Re-comm. *cl.* 4, [188] 544
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1343
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 535
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 392
Middlesex Registry, Res. [188] 82
Millwall Ironworks Company, [185] 1918
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1352, 1355, 1360
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 645, 655
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [185] 1852
Navy—Promotion in the, Res. [186] 310
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1117, 1120; Comm. [186] 210; *cl.* 1, 1405
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1637
Paris Exhibition—Search of Passengers' Baggage, Res. [185] 1592
Parliament—Business of the House, [185] 149; [188] 1522;—Public Business, 781
Princess of Wales — Address to Her Majesty, [185] 814
Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1056
Representation of the People—Area of the New Boroughs, [188] 774
 Compound Householders, [187] 261
 Electoral Statistics, [185] 1813, 1819
 Explanation, [185] 1309
 Lodger Franchise, [188] 667
 Motion for a Committee, [185] 243, 981
 Resolutions, The, [185] 486, 1022, 1236
 Statistics, [188] 608
 Voting in Boroughs, [186] 284, 287
186] Representation of the People, Leave, 17, 19,
. 26, 36, 47, 52, 63, 124, 125; 2R. 472, 479,
. 480, 483, 484, 486, 491, 508, 510, 660, 661,
. 664, 819, 907; Comm. 1274, 1338, 1416,
. 1490; *cl.* 3, 1509, 1521, 1576, 1641, 1688,
. 1912
187] *cl.* 3, 17, 19, 24, 38, 46, 94, 286, 344,
. 352, 356, 450, 712, 754; *cl.* 4, 840,
. 851, 998, 1007, 1145, 1164; *cl.* 34, 1183;
. *cl.* 35, 1191; Amendt. 1202, 1205, 1207,
[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E.—*cont.*
187] 1225; *cl.* 8, 1303, 1329; *cl.* 9, 1422, 1429,
. 1521; *cl.* 10, 1960; *cl.* 14, 1990; *cl.* 15, 2003
188] *cl.* 15, 38; *cl.* 17, 49; *cl.* 18, 50; *cl.* 31, 269,
. 271, 273, 288, 525, 529, 531, 533, 535, 536;
. *cl.* 36, 293, 298; *cl.* 37, 301; *cl.* 40, 444,
. 451, 456, 469, 475; *cl.* 43, 511; *add. cl.*
. 614; *cl.* A, 622, 640; *cl.* D, Amendt. 648;
. *add. cl.* 670, 672, 676, 682; Motion for
. Adjournment, 684, 699, 703, 789, 794, 799,
. 839, 843, 857, 863, 874, 877, 888, 890, 896,
. 1000, 1012, 1034, 1205, 1207, 1213, 1246,
. 1269; Schedule B, 1283; Preamble, 1290,
. 1291; Consid. *add. cl.* 1448, 1452, 1457
189] 852, 853; Lords Amendts. 1113; *cl.* 3, 1117;
. *cl.* A, 1161, 1176; *cl.* C, 1186
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 428
Servia, Fortresses in, Address for Papers, [185] 441
Sugar Duties, Comm. Res. [185] 350, 1237, 1238
Supply—Blacas Collection, [185] 495
 Post Office Packet Service, [189] 701, 702
 Royal Palaces, [185] 499, 504, 510; [188] 1688
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [186] 1437
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1402
Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1263
Universal Catalogue of Art Books, [187] 393
Vice President of the Board of Trade, 2R. [185] 471

Glossop Convent
187] Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer,
The Earl of Derby *May* 13, 377; Question,
Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 14,
. 524; Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury;
. Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 23, 931;
Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Ga-
. thorne Hardy, 937

Gloucester and Bristol, Bishop of
Banns of Matrimony, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [189] 1094
Cornwall, Bishopric in, [185] 1303
Education—Revised Code—Certificated Teachers, [188] 1053

Goldney, Mr. G., *Chippenham*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 515
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. [189] 759; *cl.* 14, 762
Execution of Deeds, 2R. [185] 1133; Comm. 1416, 1417
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1073
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 320
Light and Air to Ancient Windows, [185] 1243
Masters and Workmen, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 519; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 520; *cl.* 14, 521
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 208, 209
Railway Debenture Holders, 2R. [185] 783
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 22, 55, 319, 451, 455; Amendt. 456, 459, 464, 467; *cl.* 4, 992, 994, 998, 1009; *cl.* 34, 1187; *cl.* 35, 1204; *cl.* 9, 1404;
[*cont.*

Goldney, Mr. G.—*cont.*
  cl. 18, [188] 49, 50; *cl.* 19, 52; *cl.* 29, 209; *cl.* 31, 275, 534; *cl.* 33, 290; *cl.* 40, 474; *add. cl.* 1024, 1025, 1027, 1266; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1458
  Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1140
  Supply—Charity Commission, [187] 925
    Copyhold, Inclosure and Tithe Commission, [187] 924
    Department of Science and Art, [189] 1230, 1231, 1237
    Miscellaneous Expenses, [188] 1908
    Poor Law Commissioners, [187] 858, 859
    Printing and Stationery, [187] 929
  Turnpike Acts Continuance, 2R. [188] 1909
  Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1840
  Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1661

Goldsmid, Sir F. H., *Reading*
  Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [187] 57
  Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 3, [185] 1761
  Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 980, 991
  Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1065, 1067; *cl.* 2, 1068
  Moldavia—Treatment of Jews, Motion for an Address, [188] 1136
  Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 209
  Newspaper Proprietors, Securities given by, [187] 1087
  Representation of the People—Joint Occupiers, [187] 90
  Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 524; Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 444, 449; Amendt. 706, 707; *cl.* 35, 1190; Amendt. 1201, 1783; Comm. *cl.* 36, [188] 291; Amendt. 299; *cl.* 40, 448; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1453, 1454
  Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1140
  Servia, Jews in, Motion for Papers, [186] 838
  Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1216, 1222

Goldsmid, Mr. J., *Honiton*
  Libel, 3R. [188] 1659
  Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1914, 1920, 1924
  Metropolis—The Canning Statue, [186] 1874; —University of London, [187] 265, 1290, 1661
  National Gallery, The New, [185] 1644; Motion for Papers, [186] 819, 834
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 5, [187] 1238; *cl.* 9, 1504; *cl.* 10, 1975; *cl.* 14, 1991; *cl.* 15, 1993, 1995, 1996, 2003, 2005; *add. cl.* Amendt. [188] 1018, 1026, 1027; Consid. *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1460; 3R. 1557
  Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 955
  Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 588
  Weights and Measures, False, [187] 1934; [188] 987
  Wellington, Duke of, Monument to the, [186] 1267

Gore, Mr. J. R. Ormsby, *Shropshire, N.*
  Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1000

Gore, Mr. W. R. Ormsby, *Leitrim Co.*
  Ireland—Railways, [185] 459;—River Shannon, [186] 1581, 1704

Gorst, Mr. J. E., *Cambridge Bo.*
  Cape of Good Hope, Motion for an Address, [187] 1598
  Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 225; 3R. Amendt. [189] 35
  National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 660
  New Zealand—British Troops in, [185] 282, 1932
  Prothonotaries Fee Fund (Duchy of Lancaster), [189] 81, 172, 1101
  Representation of the People, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1290; *add. cl.* [188] 674, 1073; 3R. 1557
  Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1258

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J., *London*
  Admiralty Jurisdiction, Leave, [185] 530
  Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [189] 760
  Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1880; [186] 1110
  Bankruptcy Acts Amendment, Comm. [187] 1575
  Board of Trade Returns, [185] 1806
  British Honduras—Colony of, [185] 1805
  Church Rates Abolition 2R. [186] 241
  Ireland—Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 26
  Labourers' Dwellings—Applications for Loans, [185] 341
  Limited Liability, [188] 171
  Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [187] 1923
  Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 55, [185] 1683, 1684; *cl.* 65, 1689; *cl.* 69, 1691, 1692
  Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1399
  Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1858, 1859
  Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1317; *cl.* 3, [187] 459, 467, 473; *cl.* 10, 1978, 1987; *cl.* 43, [188] 516; *cl.* A, Amendt. 621; *add. cl.* 821, 1197; Lords Amendts. *cl.* 5, [189] 1158
  Supply—Royal Palaces, [185] 508
  Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 193, 194; 2R. 515; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 995; *cl.* 5, 998
  Uniformity Act Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 963
  Venezuela—Government of, [187] 396

Gower, Hon. F. Leveson, *Bodmin*
  Ireland—Railways, [189] 615, 616
  Representation of the People, Consid. *add. cl.* [188] 1450

Graham, Mr. W., *Glasgow*
  Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 198
  Public Health (Scotland), 2R. [186] 1927
  Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 590

Grand Juries (Ireland) Bill
  (*Mr. Peel Dawson, Mr. Leader, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Lanyon*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 14, [185] 1867 [Bill 73]
  Bill withdrawn, after short debate *May* 15, [187] 592

Grant, Mr. A., *Kidderminster*
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1025
Sale and Purchase of Shares, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 101

Granville, Earl
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, [188] 242
Brown's Charity, 2R. [188] 498
Burlington House—London University, [186] 1323
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [187] 871
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1176, 1179
Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 716
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 1122
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 244, 249, 250
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 1, [187] 380 ; *add. cl.* 1196
Ireland—Disturbances in, [185] 1427
Limerick Harbour (Composition of Debt), Comm. [188] 1185
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, [188] 1424
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [188] 153
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1425
Metropolis—Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 155
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1291
Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for Returns, [188] 137 ; [189] 525
Parliamentary Reform—Borough Qualification, Res. [185] 718 ;—Statistics, 1626
Public Schools, 3R. [185] 1547
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 3R. [189] 956
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1791, 1854, 1856, 1864, 1995, 2030 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 303 ; *cl.* 4, 304, 305, 306, 307, 311, 318 ; *cl.* 5, 324 ; *cl.* 7, 414 ; *add. cl.* 429, 433 ; *cl.* 15, 579 ; *add. cl.* 715, 716, 728, 732, 734 ; *cl.* 54, 750 ; Report, *cl.* 4, Amendt. 828, 831
Ritualism—The Royal Commission, [188] 124, 243, 1176
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1439, 1442 ; Comm. 1766 ; *cl.* 2, [186] 270
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Report, [186] 111
Vice President of the Board of Trade, 2R. [187] 874
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 377

Graves, Mr. S. R., *Liverpool*
Address in Answer to the Speech, [185] 58
Admiralty Court, Appointment of Judge of the, [189] 1568
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 689
Columbian States—British Commerce with the, [188] 667
Ireland—Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 14
Liverpool—Importation of Foreign Cattle into, Res. [189] 629, 634
[*cont.*

Graves, Mr. S. R.—*cont.*
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, &c. [187] 1833
  Men and Boys, [186] 946
  Naval Stores, [187] 1857
Navy—Marine Engines ordered and re-sold, [189] 1516, 1568, 1569
  Naval Reserve at the late Review, [189] 599
  Tenders for Engines, [189] 1516
Postal—Conveyance of Mails to Nassau, &c. [188] 603 ;—American Mails, [189] 960
Public Houses, &c. Leave, [186] 160, 165 ; 2R. Amendt. 1849
Representation of the People, 3R. [188] 1554
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1778, 1779, 1781

Gray, Sir J., *Kilkenny Bo.*
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 366
Egypt—English Workmen, [189] 1337
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 846, 858, 860, 864, 867, 871, 887
  Distress in, [187] 395, 1740
  Established Church, [187] 7 ; Res. 96
  Fenian Convicts, [187] 395
  Fenian Prisoners, [186] 1951
  State of, [189] 209
  Tyrone Magistrates, [186] 392, 393
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 572
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1487
Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1860
Sierra Leone—Law Courts, [189] 1042
Supply—Public Education (Ireland), Motion for Adjournment, [189] 929; Amendt. 1262, 1285
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Comm. [186] 1414
Walpole, Mr., Resignation of, [187] 399

Greene, Mr. E., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1022
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 678 ; Comm. [189] 756
Financial Statement, [186] 1151
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 568
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 550
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 483 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 310
Turnpike Trusts, Leave, [186] 156

Greenland, Edward, Case of
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Correspondence on the subject of the recent grant of a free pardon to Edward Greenland (late manager of the Leeds Banking Company), who was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for perjury" (*Lord Frederick Cavendish*), [189] 871 ; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Greenwich Hospital, see *Navy—Greenwich Hospital*

Gregory, Mr. W. H., *Galway Co.*
- Crete—Insurrection in, [185] 214 ; Address for Papers, 406 ; [187] 1499
- "Cyclone," Owners of the, [186] 731
- Education, Technical, in Foreign Countries, [189] 598
- Ireland—Distress in Connemara, [187] 692, 1662 ;—in West Galway, [186] 1786 ; [188] 605
  - Museum of Irish Industry, [188] 1517
  - Pawnbroking System in Dublin, [187] 370
  - Royal Irish Academy, [185] 1596
- Landlord and Tenant (Ireland), [186] 1338
- Metropolis—Statue of Canning, [189] 1297
- National Gallery, The New, Motion for Papers, [186] 823, 826
- Offices and Oaths, Comm. [186] 211
- Paris Exhibition, [187] 619, 620
- Patagonia—Welsh Colony in, [189] 599
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 35, Amendt. [187] 1216, 1231
- Servia—Fortresses of, Address for Papers, [185] 406
  - Jews in, Motion for Papers, [186] 843
- Supply—Blacas Collection, [185] 496 ;—British Museum, [189] 346, 350
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 551 ; 2R. [186] 1163 ; Amendt. 1710, 1780
- "Tornado," Case of the, [187] 1662 ; [188] 2034, 2060
- Turkey—Christian Subjects of the Porte, [186] 284
- Universal Catalogue of Art Books, [187] 394, 615

Grenfell, Mr. H. R., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
- British North America, Comm. *cl.* 58, [185] 1318
- Sale and Purchase of Shares, Comm. Amendt. [186] 96
- Vice President of the Board of Trade, 2R. [185] 470

Greville-Nugent, Colonel F. S., *Longford Co.*
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 367, 370
- Ireland—Constabulary Superannuation, [186] 887
  - Established Church, Res. [187] 111
  - Fenian Disturbances in Kerry, [185] 469
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 549

Greville-Nugent, Mr. A. W. F., *Westmeath Co.*
- Army—Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1810

Grey, Case of Mr. H. D.
- Question, Mr. O'Beirne ; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 7, [187] 89

Grey, Earl
- Army Enlistment, 2R. [187] 1383
- Army — Industrial Employment of Soldiers, [186] 901
  - Recruiting Commission, Address for a Return, [185] 1793
- Cape of Good Hope—Withdrawal of Troops, [188] 11
- Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1018 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1165
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Report, [187] 1370
- Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for Papers, [185] 1542
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 712, 717
- Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [187] 767
- Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 240
- Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 1, [187] 381, 382, 764 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1193, 1194 ; Report, *cl.* 2, 1479, 1480 ; 3R. 1551, 1552 ; Amendt. [188] 250
- Ireland—Established Church, Motion for an Address, [188] 418 ; Previous Question moved, 421
  - Military at Elections, Motion for Papers, [185] 1221
- London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, [188] 1423
- Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of—The Collective Guarantee, [188] 978
- Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1294, 1300
- Navy—Motion for Returns, [185] 134
- Parliament — Standing Orders—Railway Deposits, [187] 1554
- Parliamentary Reform—Borough Qualification, Res. [185] 710, 718 ; Petition, 1890
- Railway Traffic Protection, Comm. [186] 120
- Representation of the People, 1R. [188] 1616 ; 2R. Amendt. 1803, 2031 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 303 ; *cl.* 4, 305, 307, 319, 324 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 405, 415, 418 ; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 526, 541, 586 ; *add. cl.* 732 ; *cl.* 47, 740, 746 ; *add. cl.* 747
- Tenure of Land (Ireland), 1R. [185] 801
- Trades Unions, Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [186] 272
- Vice President of the Board of Trade, 2R. [187] 874
- Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 373, 929

Grey, Right Hon. Sir G., *Morpeth*
- Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [188] 938
- Boundary Commissioners, [187] 1940
- Business, Public, [186] 1320
- Cattle Plague, [185] 403
- Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 226, 232
- Church Rates, Commutation of, Leave, [185] 295
- Corrupt Practices at Elections, [186] 1485 ; 2R. 1912 ; Comm. [187] 58
- Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1594
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 738
- Hyde Park – Reform Meeting, [186] 1979
- Ireland — Fenianism, [187] 14 ;—Dietary in County Prisons, Res. [189] 180

[cont.

GREY, Right Hon. Sir G.—*cont.*
Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 995
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1896
Metropolitan Poor, Leave, [185] 171
Mines and Miners, [186] 404
Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 367
Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 793, 794, 796, 916, 928
Naval Review, The, [188] 1726
Navy — Paddle-wheel Steamers, Motion for Papers, [186] 209
Parliament — Morning Sittings, [188] 665 ;—Alteration of Notices of Questions, 1067
Parliamentary Elections, [189] 84
Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1818
Representation of the People, Comm. [185] 992 ; [186] 1272, 1502 ; *cl.* 3, [187] 53, 704 ; *cl.* 4, 1006 ; *cl.* 34, 1189 ; *cl.* 8, 1296, 1299 ; *cl.* 9, 1413, 1545 ; *cl.* 14, 1989, 1992 ; *cl.* 31, [188] 274 ; Amendt. 532, 533, 534; *cl.* 36, 291 ; *cl.* 37, 302 ; *add. cl.* 1115, 1242, 1273 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1449 ; *cl.* 21, 1460
Scotland—Management of Scotch business in Parliament, [186] 410
Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1090
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 111
Supply—Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 689
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1404
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 191
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1560 ; Res. [188] 743

GRIDLEY, Captain H. G., *Weymouth*
Army Estimates, [185] 213
Bribery Commissioners, Reports of the, [185] 1145
National Gallery, The New, Motion for Papers, [186] 836
Supply—Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 689

GRIFFITH, Mr. C. Darby, *Devizes*
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, [185] 1336
Appropriation, [189] 1340
Army—Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot, Res. [189] 101
  Articles of War, Res. [187] 1669
  Chatham Garrison, Late Inspection of, [189] 1565
  Flogging in the, [186] 291, 393, 903, 904
Army Estimates, [187] 370 ;—Volunteer Corps, 1760
Boundary Commissioners, [187] 1941
Civil Service Estimates, [185] 1995
Companies Act Amendment, [189] 87
Corrupt Practices at Elections, [186] 1879 ; [189] 1606
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [187] 376
Crete—Insurrection in, Address for Papers, [185] 439 ; [188] 429;—Affairs of, 172
Declaration of Paris 1856, [189] 894
Elective Franchise—Reduction of the Qualification, [185] 886, 887
Fortifications and Works, Comm. Res. [189] 140
France, Prussia, and Denmark, [189] 331
[*cont.*

GRIFFITH, Mr. C. Darby—*cont.*
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 757
India—Simla Court Martial, [189] 1100
Ireland—Fenianism, [186] 1930 ; [187] 13
  Franchise, The, [187] 881
  Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1897
Italy—The Ministry, [186] 1175
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1065, 1067, 1068
Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 994
Luxemburg—Neutrality of, [186] 1785 ;—Grand Duchy of, [187] 1915
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1896 ; Recomm. [189] 1583
Metropolis—Statue of Canning, [189] 1298, 1299
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1351
Moldavia—Treatment of Jews, Motion for an Address, [188] 1139 ; [189] 173, 1101
Mutiny, Comm. [186] 764; Preamble, 766, 933
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, Res. [189] 869
Parliament — Business of the House, [188] 1877
  Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1598
  Librarian of the House of Commons, [187] 1092
  Members' Seats in the House, [188] 160
Prerogative of Mercy, [186] 734
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 3R. [188] 847
Representation of the People—Boroughs, [185] 1646
Representation of the People, Comm. Preamble, [186] 1506
188] *cl.* 31, 288, 522 ; Amendt. 609, 610 ; *cl.* 36, 297, 299 ; *cl.* 37, 302 ; *cl.* 40, 437, 486 ; *cl.* 42, 508 ; *add. cl.* 616, 675, 676, 788, 791 ; Amendt. 811, 873 ; Amendt. 1018; Motion for Adjournment, 1036, 1227 ; Schedule A, 1280 ; Schedule F, Amendt. 1476
Representation of the People (Ireland), [187] 779 ; [188] 17
Representation of the People (Scotland), [187] 620
Ritual Commission, [187] 1489
Sale of Land by Auction, Comm. *add. cl.* [187] 923 ; Preamble, 924
Servia—Fortresses in, Address for Papers, [185] 439, 932 ; [186] 288
  Jews in, Motion for Papers, [186] 842
Spain—Relations with, [186] 1267
Supply—Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1897, 1898
  Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 908
  Public Education, [189] 382
  Salaries, &c. in Offices of Houses of Parliament, Amendt. [187] 855
Volunteers at Shoeburyness, [189] 1101
Wager, The Convict, [186] 568

GROSVENOR, Earl, *Chester*
Metropolis—Halkin Street, [185] 465
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1621 ; *cl.* 31, Amendt. 1673 ; *cl.* 40, Amendt. 1674 ; *cl.* 69, Amendt. 1689, 1694
Representation of the People, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1487, 1505 ; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1879
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1557, 1571

Grosvenor, Hon. Capt. R. W., *Westminster*
Army—Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1978

Guarantee of Government Officers Bill
(*Mr. John Abel Smith, Mr. Hankey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 2 [Bill 223]
Read 2° * *July* 15
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 1
Considered as amended * *August* 2 [Bill 283]
Read 3° * *August* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Redesdale*) *August* 5
Read 2ª * *August* 8 (No. 297)
Committee *; Report *August* 9 (No. 327)
Read 3ª * *August* 12
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 108]

Guinness, Sir B. L., *Dublin City*
Army—Royal Engineers, [187] 875
Deslandes, Captain, of the "Anne," [185] 583

Gurney, Case of George Edward—The Licensing Magistrates, Middlesex
Question, Mr. Morrison; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 24, [188] 425

Gurney, Rt. Hon. Russell, *Southampton*
Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, [187] 1759
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1524
Criminal Law, Leave, [185] 205; 2R. 678, 681; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1756, 1759; *cl.* 3, 1760, 1761; *cl.* 5, 1762; Amendt. *ib.* 1764; Amendt. [186] 699, 700; *add. cl.* 701
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, Amendt. [186] 926
Representation of the People—Disfranchised Boroughs, [186] 1104
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1150; *cl.* 8, 1336; *cl.* 43, [188] 522; *cl.* D, 647, 648; *add. cl.* 680, 1205; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* 3, [189] 1118; *cl.* 46, 1197
Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 588; Comm. *cl.* 2, [189] 39
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 704

Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance Bill
(*Lord Naas, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 20, [185] 690 [Bill 35]
Read 2° *Feb* 21, 727
Committee; Report; Considered as amended; Read 3°, and passed *Feb* 22, 898
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Derby*) *Feb* 23
Read 2ª; Committee negatived; Standing Orders Nos. 37 and 38 considered and dispensed with; Read 3ª, and passed *Feb* 25, 908 (No. 24)
Royal Assent *Feb* 26 [30 *Vict.* c. 1]

Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2) Bill
(*Lord Naas, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
187] *c.* Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *May* 21, 897 [Bill 165]
. Read 2°, after long debate *May* 23, 942
Committee *; Report *May* 24
Read 3° * *May* 24
[*cont.*

Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2) Bill—cont.
187] *l.* Notice (*The Earl of Derby*) *May* 24, 1020
. Read 1ª (*The Earl of Derby*) *May* 25, 1097
. Read 2ª, after long debate *May* 27, 1114; Committee negatived (No. 114)
Read 3ª * *May* 28
Royal Assent *May* 31 [30 *Vict.* c. 25]

Hadfield, Mr. G., *Sheffield*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [185] 76, 77
Africa—West Coast — Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2082
Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh), 2R. [185] 674
British North America, [185] 1090; 2R. 1195
Capital Punishment, [185] 78
Church Rates, Commutation of, Leave, Amendt. [185] 294, 295
Church Rates, Imprisonment for, [189] 1340
Colonial Bishops, [189] 770
Commissioners for Crown Lands, [189] 765
Educational Grants, [186] 1199
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 326
Fire Insurance, Res. [186] 137
Forfeiture, Law of, [185] 149
Great North of Scotland Railway, Consid. [187] 1247
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1645; Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1077
Indemnity, [189] 86
Investment of Trust Funds, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1654
Mortmain, Law of, [185] 583
Mutiny, Comm. [186] 765
North British Railway (Carlisle Deviation), Consid. Amendt. [187] 1285
Oaths and Declarations, [187] 255
Offices and Oaths, Leave, [185] 117
Postal Conventions, Foreign, [188] 1186
Public Houses, &c. Regulation, 2R. [186] 1852
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), Leave, [185] 1283
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 795, 870; Amendt. 872, 882; Schedule B, 1284
Scotland, Representation of, [185] 1267, 1268
Statute Law, Revision of the, [187] 89
Supply— Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), Amendt. [188] 1672, 1680, 1681
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1403; *cl.* 1, 1411
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 526; Comm. 993; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 996; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 997
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Leave, [185] 111
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for Papers, [186] 138

Halifax, Viscount
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 235
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 11, [187] 387; *add. cl.* 1197; Report, *cl.* 2, 1480
Representation of the People, Comm. Amendt. [189] 256, 277, 279; *cl.* 4, 321; *cl.* 5, 325; *add. cl.* 421, 424, 732
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [188] 758

Hall, Mr. J. M., and the Royal Bounty Fund
Question, Sir John Simeon; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 22, [186] 392

HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord C. (Vice Chamberlain of the Household), *Tyrone Co.*
District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland), Leave, [188] 1316
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1743, 1746; Comm. [188] 117, 118
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 860, 870, 871
Established Church, Res. [187] 172
State of, [189] 214
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 575
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1647
Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 585, 586
Supply—National Education (Ireland), [189] 1282
Rewards to Irish Constabulary, [186] 896
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1761

HAMILTON, Mr. E. W. T., *Salisbury*
British North America, Comm. *cl.* 41, [185] 1316; *cl.* 53, *ib.*; *cl.* 56, 1317; *cl.* 91, 1319; *cl.* 145, 1322

HANKEY, Mr. T., *Peterborough*
Brown's Charity, [189] 169
Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Non-Capitular Stipends, Motion for Papers, [187] 896
Engine Drivers' Strike, [185] 1807
Fire Insurance, Res. [186] 137
Ireland—Taxation, Res. [188] 1313
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 1580
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1622
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 637
Parliament—Meeting in the Tea-Room, [189] 766
Poor Law Board, &c., Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 145
Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1864
Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1047
Representation of the People — Compound Householders, [187] 614; Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1198
Sugar Duties, Comm. Res. [185] 353
Supply—British Museum, [189] 352
Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1252
Houses of Parliament, [188] 1696
Learned Societies, Great Britain, [189] 1246
National Gallery (Ireland), [189] 1242
Prisons and Convict Establishments, [187] 1095
Royal Palaces, [188] 1686
Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1691
Salaries, &c. in Offices of Houses of Parliament, [187] 853, 854
Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 689

HARDCASTLE, Mr. J. A., *Bury St. Edmunds*
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 215; Comm. [187] 207
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, Amendt. [188] 438, 450
Turnpike Trusts, [186] 1268

HARDINGE, Viscount
Army Enlistment, Comm. *cl.* 2, [187] 1477
Army—Transport and Supply Department, [188] 596
Metropolis—Hyde Park, [189] 77
Militia, Address for a Return, [186] 813
Representation of the People, Report, *cl.* 4, [189] 825
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 927

HARDWICKE, Earl of
Army — Industrial Employment of Soldiers, [186] 896
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 312; *cl.* 9, 468
Trades Unions, Comm. *cl.* 4, [186] 273
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [186] 458

HARDY, Right Hon. G. († Chief Commissioner of the Poor Law Board, afterwards Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Oxford University*
Admiralty Court, Appointment of Judge of the, [189] 1568
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 511
American Schools—Rev. J. Fraser's Report, [187] 1025
Ancient Monuments, Preservation of, [189] 486
Army — Military Knights at Windsor, [189] 474
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. [189] 754, *cl.* 9, 761, 762; *cl.* 15, 763
Birmingham Riots, [188] 17, 88, 174;—Mr. Murphy's Discourses, 925, 1262
Bleaching, Dyeing, and Printworks Acts, [189] 82
Board of Works, [188] 667
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, [188] 1186
Charities and Schools, Rating of, [188] 266
Churchward, Mr., Case of, [187] 1907
Clerks to Justices, [187] 1021
Consecration of Burial Grounds, [189] 1107
Consecration of Churches and Churchyards, Consid. *add. cl.* [189] 1593
Cuneanon, Martin, Case of, [189] 1629
Ecclesiastical Commission, &c. [189] 330
Education—Mr. Arnold's Report to the Schools Inquiry Commission, [189] 819
Education of the Poor, 2R. [188] 1356, 1359
† Execution of Deeds, Comm. [185] 1416
Exhibition of 1851, [187] 1387
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. [189] 480; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 482, 483
Fees to the Legal and Medical Professions, [187] 940

[*cont.*

HARDY, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, [187] 1026; [188] 166; Motion for an Address, 1153, 1156, 1158, 1159, 1161, 1263
Glossop Convent, [187] 937, 938
Greenland, Edward, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 871, 876
Hayes and Barry, Case of, [189] 1449
Hours of Labour Regulation, Re-comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 484, 485
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1646, 1648; Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1077
Indemnity, [189] 87
Infection—Case of Emanuel Cook, [188] 852
Marriage Law Commission Report, [187] 939
Martial Law—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Res. [188] 908, 909
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1612
Meetings in Royal Parks, [187] 778; [188] 1626; 2R. 1878, 1882, 1895, 1896; Re-comm. [189] 390; Preamble, 1471, 1485, 1536; 1582, 1583, 1586, 1590
Metropolis—Stray Dogs, [189] 1452
  Street Outrages, [187] 1665, 1860
  Threatened Meeting in Hyde Park, [189] 769
Metropolitan Municipal Government, Leave, [189] 1041
Metropolitan Police Force, [189] 1447, 1448
† Metropolitan Poor, Leave, [185] 150; 2R. 771; Comm. 1510; *cl.* 5, 1610, 1613; *cl.* 6, 1614; *cl.* 7, 1615; *cl.* 9, 1619, 1622; *cl.* 20, 1623; *cl.* 31, 1674; *cl.* 38, *ib.*; *cl.* 41, *ib.*; *cl.* 43, 1676; *cl.* 44, 1677; Amendt. 1678; *cl.* 45, 1679; *cl.* 55, 1683, 1684; *cl.* 59, 1685, 1686, 1687; *cl.* 63, Amendt. 1688; *cl.* 65, 1689, 1690, 1691, 1693, 1694; *cl.* 79, 1696, 1697; *add. cl.* 1698; 3R. 1864
† Metropolitan Poor Law Rating, [186] 726
Middlesex Registry, Res. [188] 81
† Mines, &c. Assessment, Leave, [185] 651; 2R. [186] 1424
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [187] 890
Oaths Commissioners, [189] 78
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1641
Police—Constabulary Reports, [189] 1222;—Superannuation Funds, 1564
Political Prisoners, Memorials of, [189] 1217, 1218; Motion for an Address, 1515
Poor Law Board, &c. Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 143
† Poplar, Distress in, [186] 1266
Postal—East India, China, and Australian Mails, [189] 1561, 1564
Prison Ministers' Act, [188] 1766
Private Executions, [189] 86
Queen Anne's Bounty Office, [188] 1623
† Rating and Rentals, [185] 284
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, [188] 426
Registration of Voters, 2R. [187] 917
† Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1813
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 504, 510, 511, 512; Comm. 1317; *cl.* 3, 1646; [187] 443, 444, 458; *cl.* 4, 998; Amendt. 1006; *cl.* 34, 1182, 1184, 1186, 1187, 1188; *cl.* 35, 1190, 1191, 1201, 1205, 1206; *cl.* 9, 1540; *cl.* 14, 1989, 1990; *cl.* 36, [188] 295; *cl.* 40, 453, 456, 485; *cl.* 31, Amendt. 528, 531, 536; *cl.* A, 621, 623, 624; *add. cl.* 680, 689, 1025, 1207, 1227, 1268; Preamble,

[*cont.*

HARDY, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
1290; Consid. *add. cl.* 1447, 1450; *cl.* 46, 1469, 1481; Lords Amendts. *cl.* 3, [189] 1116; *cl.* C, 1189; *cl.* 46, 1197
Ritual Commission, [187] 1489, 1664; Report, [189] 1640
Scotland—Secretary of State for, [188] 167;—Education, 347
Scott, James, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 1513, 1514
† Small Tenements Rating Act, [185] 404
Special and Common Juries, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1587
Summary Convictions—The Whortleberry Case, [188] 1513; Res. [189] 648, 655, 658
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 109
Theatres, Regulation of, [187] 1938
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1398; *cl.* 1, 1408, 1411
Trades Unions Commission — Mr. Conolly, [188] 1437
Traffic of the Metropolis, [189] 1608
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [189] 1527
Traffic Regulations—Waggons and Drays, [188] 428
Turnpike Acts Continuance, 2R. [188] 1910; [189] 604; *cl.* 1, 819; Schedule, 820
Turnpike Trusts, [189] 1103, 1224
Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1272
Vagrancy in the Metropolis, [189] 1640
Veal, Cruelties in the Preparation of, [188] 770
† Wales—Holyhead Union, [185] 810
Weights and Measures, False, [187] 1934; [188] 987; [189] 172, 765;—Inspection of, [188] 773, 774

HARDY, Mr. J., *Dartmouth*
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1966
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1894, 1895
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 336, 344; *cl.* 9, 1511; *cl.* 10, 1981; [188] 862; *add. cl.* 996, 1005

HARROWBY, Earl of
Agricultural Gangs, [189] 167
Church of England in the Colonies, Address for Papers, [185] 399
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1088
Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 511
Colonial Churches, [186] 372, 388
Companies Act (1862) Amendment, 2R. [189] 1546
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [189] 1211
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [187] 86; Comm. *cl.* 13, 1194; *add. cl.* 1197; 3R. [188] 248
Metropolis—Hyde Park, [189] 77
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1979; Comm. [189] 294; *cl.* 4, 317; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 324; Amendt. 325; *cl.* 7, 414; *add. cl.* 432; *cl.* 15, 546; *cl.* 47, 746; Report, *cl.* 17, Amendt. 837; 3R. 950, 951; Commons Amendts. 1322

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of, *Lancashire, N.*
Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [187] 687; [189] 124
  Land Forces, [185] 1469, 1504

[*cont.*

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of—*cont.*
    Military Store Establishment, [187] 1707, 1709
    Supplementary Estimate, [187] 264
    Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1711
  Army (India and the Colonies), Motion for a Committee, [185] 1062
    Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1821
    Recruiting, Res. [187] 684
    Transport and Supply Departments, [187] 1694, 1700
    Whitworth's Ordnance, [187] 1295
  Fortifications and Works, Comm. Res. [189] 140
  India — Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1031
  Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 989
  Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 790
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1331 ; *cl.* 14, 1991 ; *cl.* 40, [188] 464 ; *add. cl.* 1219 ; Consid. *cl.* 10, 1459
  Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1578

HARTLEY, Mr. J., *Sunderland*
  Factory Acts and Glass Manufactures, [186] 982

HARVEY, Mr. R. B., *Buckinghamshire*
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1538

HARVEY, Mr. R. J. H., *Thetford*
  Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1936
  Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 528

HAY, Lord J., *Ripon*
  Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 645

HAY, Lord W. M., *Taunton*
  India—English Resident at Leh, [185] 1549
    Famine in Orissa, Motion for an Address, [189] 793
    Maharajah of Mysore, [187] 1027, 1063
    Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1020

HAY, Sir J. C. D. (Lord of the Admiralty), *Stamford*
  Africa—West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2080
  Army — Ordnance Department, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1796, 1802
  Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), 3R. [189] 1300
  Naval Knights of Windsor, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1302
  Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [185] 1855, 1856, 1857
  Navy — Paddle-wheel Steamers, Motion for Papers, [186] 210 ;—Promotion in the, Res. 308, 309
  Supply—Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1899

Hayes and Barry, Case of Police Constables—Perjury
  Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 13, [189] 1449

HAYTER, Captain A. D., *Wells*
  Army—Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1986
    Promotion in the 96th Regiment, [189] 1450
    Sale of Commissions, [187] 1938
  Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1980
  Parliament — Business of the House, [188] 1523
  Representation of the People, Comm. Amendt. [186] 1278, 1282, 1285 ; *cl.* 9, [187] 1512 ; Amendt. 1523, 1539 ; *add. cl.* [188] 1273

HEADLAM, Right Hon. T. E., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne*
  Martial Law, [187] 3 ;—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Res. [188] 914
  "Mermaid," Destruction of the Ship, Motion for an Address, [188] 1743
  Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 778, 795
  Parliament — House of Commons (Arrangements), Motion for a Committee, [188] 536
  Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), Leave, [185] 1283
  Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 518 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 24, 345, 705, 707 ; *cl.* 34, 1187, 1188 ; *cl.* 15, 1999 ; *cl.* 36, [188] 292 ; *cl.* 40, 442 ; *cl.* 43, 511 ; *add. cl.* 895, 1198, 1203
  Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 590

HEATHCOTE, Sir W., *Oxford University*
  Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [188] 939
  Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 228
  Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 5, [185] 1764
  Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1077
  Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, Leave, [185] 1707 ; 2R. [187] 1627
  Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 46 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1542 ; *cl.* 40, [188] 483 ; *cl.* 43, 517 ; *add. cl.* 671 ; Consid. *cl.* 46, 1472
  Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1090
  Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 107
  Tests Abolition (Oxford), 2R. [185] 1426 ; Comm. [186] 1441 ; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1447
  Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1260, 1261, 1262 ; Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 963

HENDERSON, Mr. J., *Durham City*
  Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 322
  Houses of Parliament, Leave, [186] 166
  Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1423
  Navy—Tenders for Gunboats, [185] 1231
  Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 675 ; Schedule B, 1477

HENEAGE, Mr. E., *Lincoln*
  Representation of the People, Schedule D, [187] 618

HENLEY, Lord, *Northampton*
  Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 3, [185] 1759 ; *cl.* 5, 1762
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* A, [188] 620 ; *add. cl.* 1008, 1227
  Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1838
  Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1655

HENLEY, Right Hon. J. W., *Oxfordshire*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 503, 506, 508
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 681; Comm. [189] 759; *cl.* 9, 762; *cl.* 15, 763
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1772
Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [188] 940
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 999; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.*, 1000; *cl.* 12, 1001, 1002; *cl.* 45, 1427, 1519; *add. cl.* 1523
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Re-comm *cl.* 35, [188] 1250
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 3, [185] 1760, 1761; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1762, 1763; [186] 699; *add. cl.* 701
Educational Grants, Res. [186] 1196
Education of the Poor, 2R. [188] 1344, 1346, 1347, 1354
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 990
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. [189] 480
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 325
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1159
Hours of Labour Regulation, Re-comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 485
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1652; Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1077, 1078
Ireland—Railways, [189] 623
Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 991
Libel, 2R. [185] 1740; Re-comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1544; 3R. [189] 1065
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1607
Masters and Workmen, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 519, 520
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1920
Metropolis—Statue of Canning, [189] 1295
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1428
Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 367
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, &c. [187] 1836
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1634
Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 62, 63; 2R. 486; Comm. 1493; *cl.* 3, 1561, 1568; [187] 706, 741, 800; *cl.* 35, 1215, 1227; *cl.* 5, 1239; *cl.* 15, [188] 43; *cl.* 18, 51; *cl.* 36, 295, 298; *cl.* 40, 459, 460, 482; *cl.* 43, 519; *add. cl.* 613, 615; *cl.* A, 620, 621, 634; *add. cl.* 671, 673, 700, 809, 870, 1011, 1012; Amendt. 1023, 1024, 1025, 1028, 1107, 1200, 1201, 1208, 1270; Lords Amendts. *cl.* 4, [189] 1122
Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 956
Sale of Land by Auction, Comm. *cl.* 6, [187] 922
Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1091
Summary Convictions—The Whortleberry Case, Res. [189] 654
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 103
Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 591
Supply—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1238, 1239
  Public Education, [189] 374
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [186] 1441; 3R. Motion for Adjournment, [188] 84
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1839
Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1278
Vaccination, Comm. [187] 1877
Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1652, 1671

HENNIKER-MAJOR, Hon. J. M., *Suffolk, E.*
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 540
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1277; Schedule D, Amendt. 1289

HERBERT, Hon. Colonel Percy E. (Treasurer of the Household), *Shropshire, S.*
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1677
  Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1970, 1974
  Recruiting, Res. [187] 683
  Transport and Supply Departments, [187] 1691
Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 795
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, [188] 457; Consid. *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1461

HERBERT, Mr. H. A., *Kerry Co.*
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1671, 1682
  Organization of the, [187] 374
Ireland—Disturbances in, [185] 1548, 1549; —Rewards to Constabulary, [186] 418
Offices and Oaths, Leave, [185] 116

HEYGATE, Sir F. W., *Londonderry Co.*
District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland), Leave, [188] 1315
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 597
Ireland—Dietary in County Prisons, Res. [189] 176
  Established Church, Res. [187] 114, 126
  Poor Law Medical Salaries, [189] 329
  Railways, [186] 1873; [189] 618
  Representation of, Res. [188] 728
  State of, [189] 190
  Taxation, Res. [188] 1310
  Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 75
Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1863
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1646
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 553; [186] 1585, 1750

HIBBERT, Mr. J. T., *Oldham*
Capital Punishment, [185] 78
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 232
Explanation—Mr. Osborne and Mr. Dillwyn, [187] 11
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 1075
Life Sentences, [185] 1918
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 756; Comm. *cl.* 49, 1681; *cl.* 79, 1695
Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 367
Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1417
Representation of the People, [185] 1203; Comm. [186] 1486; *cl.* 3, 1546; [187] 267; *cl.* 34, 1178, 1180; *cl.* 35, 1211; *cl.* 19, [188] 52; *cl.* 23, 53; *cl.* 31, 277, 533; *cl.* 43, 521; *cl.* A, 618, 623; Amendt. 624, 628; *add. cl.* 696, 882, 892, 897; Amendt. 1014, 1016, 1017, 1018; Consid. *cl.* 27, 1461; *cl.* 29, *ib*; Lords Amendts. *cl.* 3, [189] 1116

HODGKINSON, Mr. G., *Newark-upon-Trent*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [187] 708, 712, 733, 753, 780; *cl.* 4, 1145; *cl.* 34, 1176, 1182

HODGSON, Mr. W. N., *Carlisle*
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Non-Capitular Stipends, Motion for Papers, [187] 897
  London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1346
  Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. [188] 552; *cl.* 1, Motion for Adjournment, 556

HOGG, Colonel J. M., *Bath*
  District Metropolitan Lunatic Asylums, [189] 1450
  Ireland—Tipperary and Waterford Elections, Res. [189] 115
  Metropolis—New Poor Law Act, [189] 1605
  Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 752; Comm. *cl.* 9, 1618, 1622
  Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [187] 889
  Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 675, 1026

HOLDEN, Mr. I., *Knaresborough*
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, Amendt. [188] 451; Schedule B, Amendt. 1285
  Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 115

HOLLAND, Mr. E., *Evesham*
  Austria and Denmark—Agriculture of, [186] 1485
  Loss of Life at Sea, [187] 1128; [188] 170
  Navy—Admiralty Steering and Sailing Rules, [185] 809

Holyhead and London Railway Fares
  Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 9, [189] 1221

HOPE, Mr. A. J. Beresford, *Stoke-on-Trent*
  Art Unions, [186] 815
  Banns of Matrimony, 2R. Amendt. [188] 936
  Burlington House Site, [186] 1243
  Church Rates Abolition, 2R. Amendt. [186] 220
  Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [187] 62
  Courts of Justice, The New, Res. [185] 818; Res. [186] 2019
  Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 313
  Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 1071; *cl.* 7, 1074
  Metropolis—Statue of Canning, [189] 958, 1291, 1295
  National Art Collections, Motion for an Address, [189] 638
  National Gallery, The New, Motion for Papers, [186] 829
  Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, Leave, [185] 1706; 2R. Amendt. [187] 1619
  Paris Exhibition, [185] 897
    Munitions of War, [185] 1232
    Search of Passengers' Baggage, Res. [185] 1581, 1596, 1801
  Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 68; Comm. 1309; *cl.* 3, 1603; [187] 811; *cl.* 5, 1234; *cl.* 8, 1361; *cl.* 9, 1534; *cl.* 10, 1985; *cl.* 23, [188] 54; *cl.* 31, 279; *cl.* 40, 443; *cl.* A, 630; *add. cl.* 702, 788, 1016, 1019, 1032, 1274; 3R. 1561; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1138
  Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1075, 1092
[*cont.*

HOPE, Mr. A. J. Beresford—*cont.*
  Sunday Lectures, Leave, [186] 1002; 2R. [188] 97
  Supply—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1227, 1231
    National Gallery, [189] 1243, 1245
    Royal Palaces, [185] 503, 506
    Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 683
    University of London, [187] 1466, 1469
  Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [186] 1438, 1446; 3R. [188] 84; Motion for Adjournment, 86
  Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1268; 3R. [189] 1049
  Universal Catalogue of Art Books, [187] 394

HORSFALL, Mr. T. B., *Liverpool*
  Ireland—Railways, [189] 615
  Public Houses, &c. Regulation, 2R. [186] 1852
  Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 811, 815, 843
  Spain and Chile, [185] 340
  Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 585

HORSMAN, Right Hon. E., *Stroud*
  Army—Flogging in the, [186] 291, 292
  Birmingham—Riots at, [188] 173, 428
  Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [186] 1705
  Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1361
  Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 10, [186] 768; *add. cl.* 781, 783, 792, 918, 930
  Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 648
  Representation of the People—Reform Statistics, [185] 1648;—Electoral Statistics, 1820
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1574, 1644, 1651, 1942

HOTHAM, Lord, *Yorkshire, E.R.*
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1495
  Army—Military Reserve Fund, Motion for a Committee, [187] 557
  Parliament—House of Commons (Arrangements), Motion for a Committee, [188] 537
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* A, [188] 632

HOUGHTON, Lord
  Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, [188] 242
  Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [189] 40; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1097; *cl.* 2, Motion for Adjournment, 1099; 3R. 1326
  Cornwall, Bishopric in, [185] 1305
  Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [188] 147, 238, 239;—The Collective Guarantee, 966, 978
  Public Schools, Report, [185] 1428
  Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1975; Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 430, 463
  Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1438; Comm. *cl.* 4, [186] 271
  Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, [185] 1911

Hours of Labour Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Sir John Pakington*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 1, [185] 1271 [Bill 63]
  Read 2°, after debate *Mar* 22, [186] 452
  Committed to the Select Committee on *Factory Acts Extension Bill May* 2
[*cont.*

Hours of Labour Regulation Bill—cont.
Report presented *July* 16 (No. 443)
Committee—R.P. *July* 30, [189] 484 [Bill 258]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 13
Considered as amended * *August* 14
Read 3° * *August* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 15
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 16, 1594; read 2ª, after short debate (No. 341)
Committee *; Report *August* 17
Read 3ª * *August* 19
Royal Assent *August* 21 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 146]

Houses of Parliament Bill
(*Lord John Manners, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *Mar* 19, [186] 166 [Bill 81]
Read 2° *, and referred to a Select Committee *April* 2
And, on *May* 14, Select Committee nominated as follows:—Lord John Manners (Chairman), Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. William Cowper, Mr. Dalglish, Captain Grosvenor, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Charles. Howard, Major Jervis, Sir John Johnstone, Mr. Repton, and Sir Matthew Ridley
Report presented *May* 27 [Bill 170]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 3
Read 3° * *June* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 4
Read 2ª * *June* 18 (No. 136)
Committee *; Report *June* 21
Read 3ª * *June* 24
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 40]

Houses of Parliament (Expenses of Approaches) Bill
c. Considered in Committee *; Resolution *May* 30
Resolution reported *May* 31

HOWARD, Right Hon. Lord E. G. F., *Arundel*
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl* 44, [185] 1677

HOWARD, Hon. C. W. G., *Cumberland, E.*
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 556
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 787

HOWES, Mr. E., *Norfolk, E.*
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 3, [185] 1761
Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Whitby Rectory, [186] 565
Finsbury Estate, 2R. Amendt. [185] 309
India—Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1024
Police Superannuation Funds, [189] 1564
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1303; Amendt. 1314, 1332
Spiritual Destitution, 2R. Amendt. [186] 1073

HUBBARD, Mr. J. G., *Buckingham*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 694
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 233
Church Rates Regulation, [186] 266 [*cont.*

HUBBARD, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Education, [185] 1164; [186] 1995
Education of the Poor, 2R. [188] 1366
Financial Statement, [186] 1129
Fire Insurance, Res. [186] 134
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1919
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1430
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 632, 654
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1501; *cl.* 3, 1642; [187] 804; *cl.* 35, 1217; Lords Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1160
Supply—Public Education, [189] 370

HUGHES, Mr. T., *Lambeth*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 693
Associations of Workmen, 2R. [186] 1450
Engineers, Society of, [189] 851
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1967
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (No. 3)—Suspension of Standing Orders, [186] 1169
Martial Law — Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Res. [188] 918
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1486
Parliament—Suspension of Standing Orders, [186] 1169
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 462, 474; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1953; *add. cl.* [188] 876, 1025, 1043, 1204
Sunday Trading, Leave, [185] 653; 2R. [187] 576, 590, 592; Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 36, 38
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1406; *cl.* 1, 1411
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 191; Comm. *cl.* 5, 999
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1575; Res. [188] 740

Hume, Mr., Bust of the late
Question, Mr. Ewart; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 29, [186] 816

HUNT, Mr. G. W. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Northamptonshire, N.*
Army — Military Store Department, [185] 463
War Office, [186] 910
Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, 2R. [187] 1283; 3R. Amendt. [188] 922
Bridges (Ireland), 2R. [186] 797, 1483
Canada—Mr. Stayner, late Deputy Post Master General, [185] 479
Cattle Plague, [185] 403;—Compensation for Slaughtered Cattle, 1702; [188] 1668
Civil Servants' Half Holyday, [188] 773
Clerks of Convict Prisons, [186] 391
Commissioners for Crown Lands, [189] 765
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1000; *cl.* 45, 1521
Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [186] 1382
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 41, [186] 1164, 1165
Courts of Justice Concentration Act, [185] 725
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 5, [185] 1763, 1764; *add. cl.* [186] 701; 3R. 1416
[*cont.*

Hunt, Mr. G. W.—*cont.*
  Dogs, Duty on, Comm. Res. [185] 451, 475; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1197; *cl.* 2, 1198; *cl.* 4, 1199; *cl.* 8, 1200; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.* 1201; *cl.* 10, 1202; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1324; [188] 1516
  Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [188] 652
  Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), 2R. [186] 1259; Comm. [189] 1290
  Government Prison Clerks, [185] 1232
  Gurney, George Edward, Case of, [188] 425
  Hall, Mr. J. M., and the Royal Bounty Fund, [186] 322
  Holyhead and London Railway Fares, [189] 1221
  India—India, China, and Australian Mails, [185] 1808, 1809; [187] 372, 1494;—Postage to, 1807
  Ireland—Galway Harbour, Comm. [187] 67
    Limerick Harbour, Comm. [186] 1318
    Railways, Res. [185] 1941, 1948
    Registry of Deeds, [187] 852; Motion for a Committee, [188] 1772
    River Shannon, [186] 1582, 1705
    Royal Irish Academy, [185] 1602
    Sea Coast Fisheries, [187] 92
    Taxation, Res. [188] 1304
  Labourers' Dwellings, Applications for Loans, [185] 341
  Law Courts, The New, [186] 729; Res. 2019; [188] 507, 606
  Local Government Supplemental (No. 2), Lords Amendts. [188] 1422
  Metropolis—Statue of Canning, [189] 1298
  Metropolitan Board of Works, [186] 1336
  New Forest—Licenses to Shoot, [186] 1335
  Paris Exhibition, [185] 897;—Search of Passengers' Baggage, Res. 1585, 1801
  Parliament—Librarian of the House of Commons, [187] 1093;—Business of the House, [188] 1523
  Postal—American Mails, [189] 960
    Communication with the East, [185] 212
    Conveyance of Mails to Nassau, &c. [188] 603
    India and China Mails, [185] 1808, 1809; [187] 372, 1494
    Post Office Arrangements, [188] 1191
    United States Service, [185] 811
  Postal Service, Private, [188] 1391
  Printing—Sessional Committee, [185] 256
  Public Works Commissioners, [186] 1785
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1616; *add. cl.* [188] 898, 1012; Amendt. 1017, 1031
  Sale of Land by Auction, Comm. Preamble, [187] 923
  Scotland—Collectors of Taxes, [185] 1029
  Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1097
  Select Committees, Expenses of—Fire Protection, [186] 702
  Sugar—Drawback on, [185] 812, 1238
  Sugar Duties, Comm. [185] 473; Consid. 1202, 1325, 1698
  Supply—Agricultural Statistics, [188] 1906
    Anglo-Chinese Flotilla, [185] 512
    Board of Fisheries (Scotland), [188] 1904
    Board of Trade, [187] 856
    Cultivation of Flax (Ireland), [188] 1906
    Embassy House, Constantinople, [188] 1705, 1706
    Inspection of Corn Returns, [188] 1905
    Learned Societies, Great Britain, [189] 1246

[*cont.*

Hunt, Mr. G. W.—*cont.*
    Miscellaneous Charges, [188] 1490
    Miscellaneous Expenses, [188] 1907, 1908, 1909
    New Courts of Justice, [186] 1827
    Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1675
    Office of Woods, [187] 857
    Office of Works, [187] 857
    Paris Exhibition, Department of Science and Art, [189] 1260
    Polish Refugees, &c. [188] 1489
    Poor Law Commissioners, [187] 858, 859
    Post Office Packet Service, [189] 674, 675, 697, 702, 704
    Prisons and Convict Establishments, [187] 1094, 1095
    Privy Council Office, [187] 855
    Public Record Office, [187] 857
    Quarantine Establishment, [187] 928
    Rates for Government Property, [188] 1705
    Royal Palaces, [185] 498, 503, 504
    Salaries, &c. in Offices of Houses of Parliament, [187] 853, 854, 855
    Scottish Universities, [189] 1241
    Superannuation, [188] 1487, 1488
    Transportation, [187] 1096
    Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 684, 688
    University of London, [187] 1469; Report, Amendt. 1547
  Telegraph Lines, Government Superintendence of, [185] 813
  Telegraphic and Postal Systems, [188] 1621
  Thames Embankment—Sheilds' Petition, Motion for a Committee, Motion for Adjournment, [186] 371, 802
  United States, Postal Service with the, [185] 811
  Valuation of Property, Leave, [185] 250, 255; 2R. 1667
  War Clerks' Salaries, [186] 912
  Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for Papers, [186] 1377
  Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 433

Hurst, Mr. R. H., *Horsham*
  Criminal Law, 2R. [185] 679; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1756; *add. cl.* [186] 701

Hutt, Right Hon. Sir W., *Gateshead*
  Railway and Joint Stock Companies Accounts, Leave, [187] 1588, 1593
  Representation of the People, [186] 1105

Hyde Park—see *Metropolis, Hyde Park*

Hylton, Lord
  London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (Arrangement), 3R. [189] 1538
  Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [188] 762

Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Fordyce, Mr. E. Craufurd*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 26, [185] 1088 [Bill 54]
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Carnegie*) *May* 8, [187] 187

[*cont.*

Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) Bill—cont.
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Henry Baillie*)
After further debate, Question put, A. 96, N. 225; M. 129; Bill put off for six months

Hypothec Amendment (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 14 (No. 12)
185] Second Reading put off *Feb* 28, 1141
. Read 2ª *Mar* 1, 1222
. Committee; Report *Mar* 7, 1428 (No. 33)
. Referred to a Select Committee *Mar* 14, 1765
And, on *Mar* 15, Committee nominated as follows:—M. Tweeddale, E. Airlie, E. Selkirk, E. Graham, L. Saltoun, L. Blantyre, L. Sundridge, L. Wharncliffe, L. Hamilton, L. Panmure, L. Colonsay
Report presented *Mar* 18, [186] 1 (No. 49)
Committee* *Mar* 21 (No. 50)
Report* *Mar* 22
Read 3ª* *Mar* 25
c. Read 1°* *Mar* 29 [Bill 100]
Read 2°* *May* 8
Committee; Report *May* 17, [187] 758
Considered as amended* *May* 20
Read 3°* *May* 21
l. Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 42]

INCHIQUIN, Lord
Ireland — Condemned Fenian Prisoners, [187] 1102

Inclosure Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 13 [Bill 72]
Read 2°* *Mar* 18
Committee*; Report *Mar* 22
Read 3°* *Mar* 25
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 26
Read 2ª* *May* 7 (No. 65)
Committee*; Report *May* 13
Read 3ª* *May* 14
Royal Assent *May* 31 [30 *Vict.* c. 20]

Inclosure (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 4 [Bill 186]
Read 2°* *June* 6
Committee*; Report *June* 7
Read 3°* *June* 13
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 17
Read 2ª* *June* 18 (No. 158)
Committee* *July* 15
Report* *July* 16
Read 3ª* *July* 18
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 71]

Increase of the Episcopate Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Lyttelton*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 19 (No. 51)
187] Read 2ª, after debate *May* 7, 78
. Committee *May* 13, 380
. Committee *May* 20, 762 (No. 96)
. Committee *May* 28, 1193 (No. 118)
. Report *June* 3, 1478 (No. 129)
. Third reading put off, after debate *June* 4, 1551
Nos. 51, 51*a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, *f*; 96, 96*a*, *b*; 118, 118*a*, *b*, *c*; 129
[*cont.*

Increase of the Episcopate Bill—cont.
188] Read 3ª *June* 21, 245
Amendt. page 5, line 4, to leave out ("until One half of the Amount necessary for the Endowment of such Bishop shall have been otherwise provided") (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*)
. After short debate, on Question, "That the said words, &c.;" Cont. 82, Not-Cont. 73; M. 9; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 249
. Amendt. (*The Earl Grey*); Cont. 35, Not-Cont. 72; M. 37; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 259; resolved in the negative; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons *June* 21
c. Read 1°* *June* 27 [Bill 213]
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Roundell Palmer*) *July* 16, 1637
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Gilpin*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 45, N. 34; M. 11; Bill read 2°
. Question, Mr. White; Answer, Sir Roundell Palmer *July* 22, 1878:—Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir Roundell Palmer
189] *July* 25, 84
. Committee; Report *August* 7, 1069
Considered as amended* *August* 9 [Bill 307]
Read 3°* *August* 9
. *l.* Commons' Amendments considered *August* 15, 1539; after short debate, a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons to be offered to the Commons for the Lords disagreeing to some of the said Amendments
. *c.* Moved, "That the Lords' Reasons for disagreeing with certain of the Commons' Amendments be considered this day month" (*Sir Roundell Palmer*) *August* 16, 1614; Motion agreed to; Bill withdrawn

Indemnity Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 24 [Bill 280]
Read 2°* *July* 25
Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 25, [189] 86
Committee*; Report *July* 26
Read 3°* *July* 29
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 30
Read 2ª* *August* 6 (No. 274)
Committee*; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª* *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 88]

India
Army (India and the Colonies), Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the duties performed by the British army in India and the Colonies; and also to inquire how far it might be desirable to employ certain portions of Her Majesty's Native Indian Army in our Colonial and Military Dependencies" (*Major Anson*) *Feb* 26, [185] 1032; Amendt. to add "or to organize a force of Asiatic Troops for general service in suitable climates" (*Mr. O'Reilly*); after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Select Committee appointed
[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

And, on *March* 6, Committee nominated as follows:—Viscount Cranborne (Chairman), Major Anson, Mr. Childers, Sir James Fergusson, Viscount Hamilton, The Marquess of Hartington, Lord William Hay, Captain Hayter, Colonel Percy Herbert, Mr. Laing, Colonel North, Mr. Oliphant, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir William Russell, and Captain Vivian

Report *brought up, July* 26 (*Parl. P.* No. 478)

Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, Question, Mr. Denman; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 2, [186] 1871; Question, Colonel North; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *August* 1, [189] 603; Question, Mr. Denman; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *August* 2, 764; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *August* 13, 1452

Central India Prize Money, Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Viscount Cranborne *Feb* 8, [185] 146; Question, Mr. Thomas Chambers; Answer, Sir J. Pakington *July* 4, [188] 983—(*Parl. P.* No. 280)

Banks of Bombay and Bengal, Question, Mr. J. Peel; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 19, [186] 121

Ceylon—Barracks at Point de Galle, Question, Mr. Oliphant; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 28, [186] 729

Ceylon, &c., European Garrisons in, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to postpone the construction of barracks in Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, China, and Japan, until after the Report of the Select Committee upon the distribution of troops in India and the Colonies shall have been received" (*Mr. Oliphant*), [177] 1682; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Contract Law, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Viscount Cranborne *Feb* 28, [185] 1144—Return (*Parl. P.* No. 117)

Coolies Trade in Assam, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Viscount Cranborne *Feb* 25, [185] 936—*Exportation of,* Observations, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Reply, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 1, 1246

Covenanted Educational Service in Bombay, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 12, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of Correspondence between the Director of Public Instruction at Bombay and the Secretary to Government at Bombay, with respect to the constitution of a small Covenanted Educational Service in that Presidency" (*Mr. Grant Duff*), [188] 1482; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to

Indian Budget, Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Viscount Cranborne *Feb* 7, [185] 86; Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 25, [189] 79; Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *August* 8, 1105

(See *East India Revenue Accounts*)

[*cont.*

INDIA—*cont.*

Indian Railways, Question, Mr. Finlay; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 8, [188] 1192

Report—*Parl. P.* [3856]

Indian Securities, Question, Mr. Biddulph; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *June* 20, [188] 171

Land Revenues, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 11, [188] 1395

Leh, English Resident at, Question, Lord William Hay; Answer, Sir James Fergusson *Mar* 8, [185] 1549

Loan—Rumoured Loan of £2,000,000, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *August* 16, [189] 1613

Maharajah of Mysore, Questions, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answer, Viscount Cranborne *Feb* 22, [185] 827; Observations, Lord William Hay; Reply, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 24, [187] 1027—(*Parl. P.* No. 239, 271)

Mail Service to India and China, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 10, [187] 371; Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 3, 1493

Medical Retirement Funds, Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 13, [187] 389

Metric System—Weights and Measures, Question, Mr. J. B. Smith; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 2, [188] 856

Officers of the late Indian Army, Question, Major Jervis; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 3, [186] 1938

Orissa, Famine in, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Viscount Cranborne *Feb* 7, [185] 82; Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Viscount Cranborne *Feb* 28, 1144; Question, Mr. Barnes; Answer, Sir James Fergusson *Mar* 11, 1645; Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Sir James Fergusson *April* 12, [186] 1582; Question, Mr. Smollett; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 9, [187] 264; Question, Mr. Henry Seymour; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 15, [188] 1515

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 2, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that she will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Papers which are necessary to complete the Report and Appendices of the Famine Commission, and of any Minutes by Members of the Supreme Council of India relating to the Famine, or Dissents or Minutes by Members of the Indian Council in London on the Despatch of the Secretary of State for India (Public, No. 99)" (*Mr. Henry Seymour*), [189] 770; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

(*Parl. P.* 335, 481, 490)

Oude, Claims on, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 5, [186] 1172

Oude—Report of Mr. Davies, Claims of Ryots, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Viscount Cranborne *Feb* 28, [185] 1144

Postage to, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 14, [185] 1807

[*cont.*

INDIA—cont.
Revenues of India — Expenditure by Home Authorities, Questions, Mr. Otway; Answer, Colonel Sykes *July* 29, [189] 338
Simla Court Martial—(see title *Simla Court Martial*)
Straits Settlements, Observations, Mr. O'Reilly; Reply, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 8, [185] 1603; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir James Fergusson *Mar* 11, 1646; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 21, [186] 280
Sumatra, Dutch in, Question, Mr. White; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 11, [185] 1645

India, China, and Australian Mails
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 14, [185] 1807

Industrial and Provident Societies Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Thomas Hughes, Mr. Bright*)
c. Ordered * *May* 30
Read 1° * *June* 13 [Bill 198]
Read 2° * *June* 21
Committee * *July* 2—R.P.
Committee *; Report *July* 12
Considered as amended * *July* 22
Read 3° * *July* 23
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl De Grey*) *July* 23
Read 2ª * *July* 29 (No. 253)
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª * *August* 1
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 117]

Industrial Schools Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 12 (No. 223)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Marquess Townshend*) *July* 19, [188] 1711
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Earl of Devon*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now,") &c.; resolved in the negative

Industrial Schools (Ireland) Bill
(*The O'Conor Don, Mr. Monsell, Mr. Leatham*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 12, [185] 296 [Bill 17]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*The O'Conor Don*) *Mar* 13, 1741
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Peel Dawson*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; read 2°
Resolution in Committee *Mar* 25, [186] 558
Committee *; Report *April* 2 [Bill 102]
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*The O'Conor Don*) *June* 19, [188] 116
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Vance*); after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 198, N. 54; M. 144; main Question agreed to; Bill considered in Committee—R.P.
Bill withdrawn * *August* 9

Infectious Diseases
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty praying that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to cause such inquiry to be instituted as may lead to the better distinction between Contagious Diseases and such as are termed Infectious, so as to obviate, as far as possible, the loss, alarm, and injustice consequent on the theory of the infectious nature of certain Diseases when unsupported by demonstration" (*Sir J. Clarke Jervoise*), [186] 1991; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

INGHAM, Mr. R., *South Shields*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 499
Navy—The "Greenwich Sixpence," [187] 1736
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 15, [187] 2000; *cl.* 43, [188] 511

Inland Revenue Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 9 [Bill 239]
Read 2° * *July* 22
Committee *; Report *July* 29
Considered as amended * *August* 1
Read 3° * *August* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 2
Read 2ª * *August* 6 (No. 287)
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 90]

International Currency Conference
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 11, [186] 1478

Intestates' Widows and Children Bill
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 31 (No. 120)
Read 2ª * *June* 4
Committee *; Report *June* 6
Read 3ª * *June* 7
c. Read 1° * *July* 5 [Bill 230]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Intestates' Widows and Children (Scotland) Bill (*Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 18 [Bill 261]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Investment of Trust Funds Bill
(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Mr. Ayrton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 7 [Bill 197]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*) *June* 25, [188] 551; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Committee; Report *July* 16, 1653
Considered as amended * *July* 18 [Bill 259]
Read 3° * *July* 19

[*cont.*

Investment of Trust Funds Bill—cont.

l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 19
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord Chancellor*) *August* 15, [189] 1546; Bill read 2ª (No. 246)
Committee *; Report *August* 16
Read 3ª * *August* 17
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 132]

Ionian Islands, State of the
Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 29, [186] 816

IRELAND
Administration of Justice, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 26, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House, Copies of any Correspondence that has taken place with reference to cases referred to in Mr. Justice Keogh's statement at the Assize Court of the county of Tyrone, and of the Letter of Lord Chancellor Brady to the Lord Lieutenant of the county of Down, on the impropriety of conferring the commission of the peace on Members of the Orange Association; and of any Correspondence that arose thereupon" (*Sir John Gray*), [186] 867; after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" agreed to
Appointment of Sir Robert Kane, Question, Mr. Leader; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *August* 6, [189] 959
Bishop Moriarty, Explanation, Lord Naas *Feb* 27, [185] 1090
"*Black Death*," *The*, Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 6, [187] 1660
Burial Grounds, Unenclosed, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 24, [189] 2
Carlow Lunatic Asylum, Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 8, [188] 1189
Cattle, Importation of, Question, Sir H. Winston-Barron; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 24, [187] 1022
Charitable Bequests, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 18, [185] 468
Charity Commissions and Trinity College, Dublin, Question, General Dunne; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 20, [188] 169
College of Science in Dublin, Question, Mr. Leader; Answer, Lord Naas *August* 5, [189] 848
Cork Harbour, Docks in, Question, Mr. Murphy; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 18, [185] 460
Curragh of Kildare, Question, Lord Otho Fitzgerald; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 3, [187] 1491
Distress in the West of Ireland, Question, Mr.
186] Gregory; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 30, 1786
—*Connemara*, Question, Mr. G. Morris; An-
187] swer, Lord Naas *May* 7, 93—*Mayo*, Question,
Sir John Gray; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 13,
395; Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord
Naas *May* 17, 692; Question, Mr. Rearden;
Answer, Lord Naas *May* 23, 941; Question,
Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 6,
1662; Observations, Question, Sir John
Gray; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 7, 1740—
West Galway, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 27, [188] 605; Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 12, [189] 1333

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*
Dog Licences, Application of, Question, General Dunne; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 25, [189] 163
Drainage Improvements, Question, Lord John Browne; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 13, [187] 387
Dungarvan, The 12th Lancers at Waterford County Election, Question, Mr. Serjeant Barry; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 26, [185] 1030; Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 14, 1802
(See title, *Waterford and Tipperary Elections*)

Education
Education Commissioners, Question, Mr. Lanyon; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 21, [185] 720
National Education—The National Education Society, Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 29, [186] 1704
National Education Estimate, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 16, [187] 620
Queen's University, The, Question, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 6, [187] 3; Observations, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Reply, Lord Naas *May* 31, 1431
Roman Catholic University, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 1, [189] 603

Established Church (*Ireland*)—(See title—*Established Church* (*Ireland*)

Fenian Conspiracy, The
Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 10, [187] 364
Disturbances
The Outbreak, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 14, [185] 330; Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Mr. Walpole, 334; Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 6, 1418
In Kerry, Questions, Colonel Greville, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 18, [185] 469
Attack on Kilmallock, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 7, [185] 1427; Question, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Answer, Mr. Walpole, 1448
At Kilteely, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 8, [185] 1511; Question, Major Stuart Knox; Answer, Mr. Walpole, 1550
Prisoners
Fenian Prisoners, Explanation, Major Stuart Knox; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 22, [185] 813 — *Trial of*, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 28, [186] 733; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 3, 1945; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Mr. Walpole, 1987
Kirwan, Escape of, from Meath Hospital, Question, Mr. Peel Dawson; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 12, [186] 1583
Treatment of, Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 13, [187] 390; Question, Sir John Gray; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 395; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 6, 1663

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Condemned Fenian Convicts, The, Question, The Earl of Clarendon; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 27, [187] 1098; Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1131

Constabulary—Defence of Police Stations, Moved, that there be laid before this House, Return of the Names of the Police Stations in Ireland attacked during the late attempt at Insurrection, and successfully defended; the Numbers of Police Constables engaged in each such defence, and supposed Number of Insurgents; and other particulars (*The Viscount Lifford*) *Mar* 25, 458; after debate, Motion agreed to

Number of Force, 1867—
(*Parl. P.* No. 422, 525)

Constabulary, Rewards to the, Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 22, [186] 415; discussion thereon—SUPPLY—£2,000, Special Rewards to certain members of the Irish Constabulary Force *Mar* 29, 894; after short debate, Vote agreed to

"Cork Herald" Reporter, Arrest of the, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 1, [185] 1233

Cutting of Telegraph Wires, Question, The Earl of Shaftesbury; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 15, [185] 371; Question, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 16, 400

Death Sentence for Treason, Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 7, [187] 89

Duggan, Constable, Case of, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 25, [186] 471

Fenianism—Morewood, Mr. J. J., Petition of, Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the Statements contained in the Petition of Mr. John Joseph Morewood, presented on the 3rd of May last, and to report to the House thereupon" (*The Marquess Townshend*) *June* 28, [188] 660; after short debate, on Question? Cont. 8, Not-Cont. 42; M. 34; resolved in the negative; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 662

Fenian Drilling in Wicklow, Question, Mr. Fitzwilliam Dick; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 4, 988

Maginn, Rev. Mr., Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 22, [186] 395; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 11, 1484

Martial Law, Question, Mr. H. Herbert; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 8, [185] 1548; Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 11, 1647

Petition from Glasnevin presented (*Viscount Lifford*) *May* 17, [187] 690; Petition read, and ordered to lie on the table

Petition of E. Truelove and others, Moved, "That the Petition do lie upon the table" (*Mr. Bright*) *May* 3, [186] 1929; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Petition to lie upon the table; Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith *May* 6, [187] 13
(See title *Parliament—Privilege*)

Professor Thompson of Galway, Letters of, Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 16, [187] 621; Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 20, 777—(*Parl. P.* No. 504)

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Fishermen on the Lower Shannon, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 22, [186] 425

Habeas Corpus Suspension (*Ireland*) *Act,* Questions, The Earl of Essex, The Earl of Leitrim; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 18, [185] 453; Notice, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 22, 808; Question, Mr. Osborne; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 25, [186] 470; Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 23, [188] 2072; Observations, Mr. Whalley *August* 5, [189] 894

Holyhead Mail Packets, Question, Major Gavin; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 24, [187] 1021

Importation of Sheep, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Lord Naas *August* 5, [189] 849

Inland Fisheries, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Return of all Expenses of the Special Commissioners for the Inland Fisheries of Ireland, &c.: Similar Returns in relation to the Special Commissioners for England, &c." (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *July* 12, [188] 1427; after debate, Motion agreed to

Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Question, Mr. Bruen; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 1, [185] 1239

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 22, To leave out from "That," and add "a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the justice of a claim for compensation to the late Inspectors of Weights and Measures in Ireland for the loss of their offices" (*Mr. Bruen*), [186] 413; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 134, N. 41; M. 93; Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 20, [187] 769; Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 16, [188] 1622

Irish Peerage — The Royal Prerogative, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to consider the expediency of withholding the exercise of Her Royal Prerogative of creating Peers of Ireland, or filling up vacancies that may occur in the Peerage of that part of the United Kingdom, with a view to the ultimate union of the Peerage, of Ireland with the Peerage of the United Kingdom" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*), [188] 1127; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Land

Land Bills, The, Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 13, [187] 397

Land Tenure, Notice (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *Feb* 11, [185] 207

Landed Estates, Resolution (*Mr. O'Beirne*) *July* 16, [188] 1628
See title—*Landed Estates* (*Ireland*)

Law

Court of Admiralty, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 7, [185] 1447; Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 20, [187] 769

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Court of Exchequer, Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, Lord Naas *April 5*, [186] 1174; Question, Lord Dunkellin: Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *April* 30, 1786

Deeds, Registry of, Observations, General Dunne; Reply, Mr. Hunt *May* 20, [187] 852

Dietary in County Prisons, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 26, To leave out from "That" and add "it is the opinion of this House, that it is the duty of the Government to take steps to increase the dietary in the County Prisons in Ireland, especially for prisoners confined beyond two months" (*Mr. Blake*), [189] 173; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Inspectors of County and Convict Prisons, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 4, [186] 1106

Juries, Special and Common, Motion for a Select Committee (*Viscount Enfield*) *June* 4, [187] 1582; after short debate, Motion agreed to

And, on *June* 7, Committee nominated as follows:—Viscount Enfield (Chairman), Mr. Brett, Mr. Denman, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Alderman Lusk, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Colonel William Stuart, Mr. Turner, Mr. Whatman, and Mr. Charles Wynn

Justices, Clerks to, Question, Mr. Colvile; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 24, [187] 1021

Management of City Prisons, Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 4, [186] 1103

Morris, John, Release of, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 1, To leave out from "That" and add "there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Opinion of the Law Advisers of the Crown in Ireland relative to the release of John Morris, lately a prisoner, arrested on a charge of Treason-felony and Fenianism (*Mr. Bruen*), [185] 1240; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Mountjoy Convict Prison, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 3, [186] 1933

Petty Sessions Clerks, Question, General Dunne; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 25, [189] 103

Registration of Deeds, Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to inquire into the amount of Fees paid into the Office for the Registration of Deeds in Ireland, and the application of those fees" (*General Dunne*) *July* 18, [188] 1670; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Tyrone Magistrates, Postponement of Motion (*Sir John Gray*) *Mar* 22, [186] 392; Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 1, 911; Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Lord Naas *April* 29, 1709; Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 17, [187] 1935; Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 2, [188] 856; Question, Colonel Stuart Knox; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 22, 1874

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Legal and Medical Professions, Fees to, Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 23, [187] 940

Lord Mayor's Banquet — Cardinal Cullen, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 25, [185] 933; Observations, Mr. Newdegate *Feb* 25, 1001

Lunatic Asylums, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Lord Naas *August* 9, [189] 1219

Magherafelt Roman Catholic Church — (See *Salters' Company*)

Military at Downpatrick, Question, Sir Thomas Bateson; Answer, Lord Naas *August* 1, [189] 600

Military at Elections, Motion for Papers (*The Duke of St. Albans*) *Mar* 1, [185] 1213; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

(See ante *Dungarvan;* and title *Waterford and Tipperary Elections*)

Militia, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 28, [186] 797

Museum of Irish Industry, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 15, [188] 1517

Pawnbroking System in Dublin, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 10, [187] 370

Police

Constabulary, Employment of the, Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 26, [185] 1028

Constabulary Superannuations, Observations, Colonel Greville-Nugent; Reply, Lord Naas *Mar* 29, [186] 887; debate thereon

Return—(*Parl. P.* No. 262)

Jennings, Sub-Constable, Case of, Address for Papers (*The Earl of Leitrim*) *July* 16, [188] 1620; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Lord Naas *August* 5, [189] 851

Police Barracks, Question, The Earl of Bessborough; Answer, The Earl of Belmore *June* 25, [188] 503; Question, Mr. Bagwell; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 27, 603

Police (Dublin Metropolitan), Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 9, [187] 263

(See ante *Fenian Conspiracy*)

Poor Law

Flynn, Charles, Case of, Pauper Lunatic at Mohill, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 12, [189] 1335

Poor Law Medical Salaries, Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 29, [189] 329

Poor Relief, Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 21, [187] 881

Professorship of the University of Dublin, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 8, [185] 146

Public Records, Question, Sir Rowland Blennerhasset; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 11, [185] 213

Public Works Commissioners, Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 30, [186] 1784

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

Railways, Question, Mr. W. Ormsby Gore; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 18, [185] 459; Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 2, [186] 1873; Petition presented (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *June* 24, [188] 352; Question, Mr. Monsell; Answer, Lord Naas *August* 1, [189] 606; long debate thereon

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 15, To leave out from "That," and add "it is the opinion of this House that, with a view to affording to Irish Railways the full relief contemplated by the Act of last Session, intituled, 'The Railway Companies (Ireland) Temporary Advances Act, 1866,' it is expedient, under existing circumstances, that the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury should exercise the powers conferred on them under the fourth Section, by directing that the period within which temporary advances should be made be extended to the maximum period allowed by the Act" (*Mr. Blake*), [185] 1937; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Reform Bill (*Ireland*), Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 19, [185] 585

Representation of the People (*Ireland*)—(See title *Representation of the People* (*Ireland*)

River Shannon, Question, Mr. W. Ormsby Gore; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 12, [186] 1581; Question, Mr. W. Ormsby Gore; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 29, 1704—*Fishermen on the Lower Shannon*, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 22, [186] 425

Rivers, Pollution of, Question, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 20, [187] 773

Royal Academy, Observations, Mr. Gregory; Reply, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 8, [185] 1596

Salmon Fisheries, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 15, [185] 1915

Salters' Company and their Irish Estates—Magherafelt Roman Catholic Church, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 9, [187] 253; Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 20, 768

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to revoke such portion, if any, of the Charter of the Salters' Company as impedes the obtaining of a site for a Roman Catholic Church on their property at Magherafelt" (*Mr. O'Reilly*) *May* 21, 891; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Sea Coast Fisheries Annual Report, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Hunt *May* 7, [187] 92; Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Lord Naas *August* 5, [189] 850

Parl. P—Bill 50, 268

Report of Select Committee (No. 443)

State of Ireland, Observations, Sir Colman O'Loghlen *July* 26, [189] 181; Reply, Lord Naas, 227; long debate thereon

Taxation, Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, there has been a great and disproportionate increase of Irish Taxation since 1841, as compared with the increase of Taxation in Great Britain during the same period, which deserves the attention of Parliament" (*Mr. M'Kenna*) *July* 9, [188] 1292; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Trinity College (*Dublin*), Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is undesirable that the Fellowships and Foundation Scholarships of Trinity College, Dublin, should be exclusively appropriated to those who are members of the Established Church" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *June* 18, [188] 55

Amendt. to leave out from "House," and add "the constitution of the University of Dublin should be altered so as to enable and fit it to include Colleges connected with other forms of religion than that of the Established Church, and that the members of such Colleges should be entitled to share in all the benefits now enjoyed by the members of Trinity College" (*Mr. Monsell*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Debate adjourned till To-morrow; Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 16, 1623; Debate resumed *July* 24, [189] 3; after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put; A. 108, N. 108; the numbers being equal, Mr. Speaker declared himself with the Noes

Valuation of Counties, Question, The O'Conor Don; Answer Lord Naas *August* 8, [189] 1103

Vartry Waterworks, Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 18, [185] 462; Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, Lord Naas, 469; Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 21, 723; Question, Mr. Fitzwilliam Dick; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 28, 1146

Wesleyan Missionary, Attack on a, at Athlone, Question, Mr. Vance; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 12, [189] 1334

Wrecks on the Irish Coast, Question, Mr. Kavanagh; Answer, Mr. S. Cave *May* 13, [187] 395

Return of Wrecks 1864 to 1866—
(*Parl. P.* No. 231)

Italy

The Holy See and Russia, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 8, [185] 147

Ministry of Baron Ricasoli, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 5, [186] 1175

Jackson, Mr. W., *Derbyshire, N.*

Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1610

Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1427

Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1202

Jamaica

Alleged Excesses in, Question, Mr. Buxton; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 21, [186] 275

Courts Martial on Ensign Cullen and Surgeon Morris, Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *Feb* 25, [185] 933; Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 1, [189] 598

[*cont.*

Jamaica—cont.
Ecclesiastical Establishment in, Question, Mr. Baxter ; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 18, [185] 460
General O'Connor, Question, Mr. Gilpin ; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 11, [185] 214
Legal Proceedings against Officers, Question, Major Jervis ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 14, [185] 336
Lieutenant Brand, Question, Mr. Osborne ; Answer, Mr. Buxton *Feb* 28, [185] 1143 ; Question, Mr. Osborne ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 1, 1238
Prosecution of Mr. Eyre, Question, Major Anson ; Answer, The Attorney General *August* 2, [189] 764 ; Question, The Earl of Shrewsbury ; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *August* 13, 1437
Parl. Papers—
Further Correspondence . [3859, 3903]
Correspondence—Recent Occurrences 33
Lieut. Brand—Correspondence . . 103
Proceedings on Courts Martial . . 188
(See *Martial Law — Charge of the Lord Chief Justice*)

James, Mr. E., ***Manchester***
Law, Administration of the, [185] 881
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, [187] 1953 ; *cl.* 33, [188] 290 ; *add. cl.* 1196 ; Amendt. 1199, 1200

Japan—European Troops at Yokuhama
Question, Mr. Oliphant ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 4, [186] 1107

Jersey, Royal Court of
Question, Mr. Locke ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 26, [186] 562

Jervis, Major H. J. W., ***Harwich***
Army—Flogging in the, [186] 729
Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1812
Retirement, System of, Motion for a Committee, [187] 71
Transport and Supply Departments, [187] 168
Cattle Plague—Importation of Foreign Cattle, [186] 1106 ; Res. [188] 351 ; [189] 1609
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 45, [189] 1429
India—Officers of the late Indian Army, [186] 1938
Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1038
Ireland—Tipperary and Waterford Elections, Res. [189] 104
Jamaica—Legal Proceedings against Officers, [185] 336
Martial Law—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Res. [188] 917
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 10, [186] 768 ; *add. cl.* 787, 915, 929
Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1822 ; Comm. [186] 1278

Jervoise, Sir J. Clarke, ***Hampshire, S.***
Africa—West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2082
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 677

[*cont.*

Jervoise, Sir J. Clarke—*cont.*
Bermuda—Yellow Fever, [186] 561
Cattle Plague, [186] 552, 566
Cholerine, Physical Properties of, [185] 1446
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [189] 998 ; *add. cl.* 1525
Infection—Case of Emanuel Cook, [188] 852
Infectious Diseases, Motion for an Address, [186] 1991
Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1418
Quarantine at Southampton, [186] 1108
Representation of the People, Lords Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1143
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 703
Privy Council Office, [187] 855
Quarantine Establishment, [187] 928
Special Missions, Amendt. [188] 1903
Turkey—Cholera Congress at Constantinople, [186] 283, 732
Vaccination, Comm. Amendt. [187] 1871 ; 3R. [188] 651
Veterinary Congress at Vienna, [189] 1103

Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers) Bill (*Mr. Darby Griffith, Mr. Robert Torrens, Mr. Vance*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 6 [Bill 3]
Read 2°* *Feb* 13
Committee [No Report] *April* 3, [186] 1064

Judges' Chambers (Despatch of Business) Bill (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª, after short debate *Mar* 25, [186] 453 (No. 58)
Read 2ª *April* 2, 974
Committee* *April* 9
Report* *April* 11
Read 3ª* *April* 12
c. Read 1°* *May* 15 [Bill 154]
Read 2°* *June* 14
Committee* ; Report *July* 11
Considered as amended* *July* 15
Read 3°* *July* 18
l. Royal Assent *July* 25 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 68]

Judgment Debtors Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *Mar* 14 [Bill 75]
Read 2°* *April* 4
Committee* ; Report *May* 3
Committee* (*on re-comm.*) *June* 7—R.P.
Bill withdrawn* *July* 11 [Bill 132]

Justices of the Peace Disqualification Removal Bill (*Colonel Wilson Patten, The Marquess of Hartington*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *July* 10 [Bill 245]
Read 2°* *July* 15
Committee* ; Report *July* 24
Considered as amended* *July* 25
Read 3°* *July* 26
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 29 (No. 265)
Read 2ª* *August* 2
Committee* *August* 8 (No. 312)
Report* *August* 12
Read 3ª* *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 115]

Karslake, Sir J. B., *see* Solicitor General, The, *also* Attorney General, The

Karslake, Mr. E. K., *Colchester*
Bankruptcy Acts Amendment, Comm. [187] 1572
India—Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1022
Investment of Trust Funds, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1653
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 707; *cl.* 4, 829, 833, 996; *cl.* 29, [188] 205; *cl.* 36, 295
Sale of Land by Auction, Re-comm. [187] 603

Kavanagh, Mr. A. M., *Wexford Co.*
Ireland—Wrecks on the Coast, [187] 395

Kekewich, Mr. S. T., *Devonshire, S.*
Representation of the People—Fees of Returning Officers, [186] 1481; Comm. *cl.* 29, [188] 177; *add. cl.* 1212; Consid. 1450

Kendall, Mr. N., *Cornwall, E.*
Lime and Bude Lights, [189] 602
Mines and Miners, [186] 405
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1421
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1539; [187] 315; *cl.* 4, 996
Summary Convictions—The Whortleberry Case, [188] 1513; Res. [189] 651
Supply—Royal Palaces, [188] 1681, 1687;—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 703
Vaccination, Comm. [187] 1885; 3R. [188] 651

Kennard, Mr. R. W., *Newport* (*Isle of Wight*)
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1199

Kennedy, Mr. T., *Louth Co.*
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 746
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 584
Representation of the People (Ireland), [187] 1092
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1675
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1771

Ker, Mr. D. S., *Downpatrick*
Ireland—Release of John Morris, Motion for Papers, [185] 1242
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1893
Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 795
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1099; Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1400

Kimberley, Earl of
Agricultural Employment, 2R. [188] 1665
Agricultural Gangs, [186] 1475
County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. [187] 1550
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 843

cont.

Kimberley, Earl of—*cont.*
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for Papers, [185] 1540
Criminal Lunatics, 2R. [186] 978; Comm. 1101
Dublin University Professorships, 2R. [186] 705
Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 711
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 915
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 1117, 1121, 1124
Ireland — Constabulary, Motion for Returns, [186] 463
  Established Church, Motion for an Address, [188] 384, 386
  Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1429
  Railways, [188] 352
Limerick Harbour (Composition of Debt), Comm. [188] 1183
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [186] 108
Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 964
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [187] 1371, 1379, 1380; Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1369, 1374; *cl.* 4, 1379
Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for Returns, [188] 141
Poor Law Board, &c. 2R. [189] 752
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 3R. [189] 954
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 304, 312; *cl.* 10, 473; *cl.* 15, 577; *add. cl.* 719
Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 3R. [188] 1063
Tenure of Land (Ireland), 1R. [185] 798, 804
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 43
Trades Unions, Comm. *cl.* 4, [186] 274
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, [185] 1911
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, 2R. [187] 1380, 1382; Comm. [188] 1383, 1384

King, Hon. P. J. Locke, *Surrey, E.*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1002, 1011; Amendt. 1155, 1166; *cl.* 43, [188] 511; *cl.* 31, 531; Consid. Schedule B, 1478

Kinglake, Mr. Serjeant J. A., *Rochester*
Army—Government Powder Magazines, [185] 812
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 444; *cl.* 43, [188] 509; *add. cl.* 674

Kinglake, Mr. A. W., *Bridgwater*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1174; *cl.* 9, 1536

Kingscote, Colonel R. N. F., *Gloucestershire, W.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 45, [189] 1520

KINNAIRD, Hon. A. F., *Perth*
Africa—West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2079
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Leave, [185] 294; 2R. [186] 698
British North America, Comm. *cl.* 53, [185] 1317
Colonial Bishops, [189] 769
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [189] 1355
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [188] 487
Fire Protection, Motion for a Committee, [185] 1715
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1159
Game Preservation (Scotland), Leave, [185] 1396
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1983
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1651; Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 1077
India—Budget, The, [189] 1105
Contract Law, [185] 1144
Coolie Trade in Assam, [185] 936
Covenanted Educational Service in Bombay, Motion for an Address, [188] 1485
Maharajah of Mysore, [187] 1075
Ryots, Rights of the, [185] 144
Ireland—Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 77
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [187] 1925
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1921; Consid. [187] 185
Mines and Miners, [186] 401, 404, 411
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [186] 971
Navy—Naval Savings Banks, [187] 878
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1399
Parliament—St. Stephen's Crypt, [188] 1487; —Meeting in the Tea Room, [189] 768
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 441
Scotland—Representation of, [185] 1268
Sunday Lectures, Leave, [186] 1003; 2R. [188] 93; Amendt. 95
Supply—Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1897
Coolie Emigration, [188] 1772
Superannuation, [188] 1487
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 202
Uniformity Act Amendment, Leave, [185] 1510

KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, Mr. E. H., *Sandwich*
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [187] 375
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1743
Ireland—Constabulary Superannuation, [186] 893;—Dublin Metropolitan Police, [187] 263
Merchant Shipping Laws, Res. [189] 1491
"North," Loss of the Ship, [185] 342; [187] 1488
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1541, 1542; *cl.* 18, Amendt. [188] 49, 50; *cl.* 23, 53; *add. cl.* 810, 858, 1030; Lords Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1148
Sale of Land by Auction, 2R. [186] 568; Re-comm. [187] 601; *cl.* 5, 919; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 921; Preamble, 924
Sayer's Life Boat, [185] 476
Supply—Quarantine Establishment, [187] 928; —Printing and Stationery, 929
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1228
Turnpike Acts Continuance, 2R. [188] 1909
Turnpike Trusts, [185] 210; Leave, [186] 139, 158; 2R. 1845

KNIGHT, Mr. F. W., *Worcestershire, W.*
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1837

KNIGHTLEY, Sir R., *Northamptonshire, S.*
Corrupt Practices at Elections, [186] 123, 124; Comm. [187] 57
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1271; Instruction, 1272, 1277, 1500; Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 21, 461, 803; *cl.* 34, 1189; *cl.* 8, 1302; *cl.* 36, Amendt. [188] 290, 297; Preamble, 1290
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1780

KNOX, Hon. Colonel W. Stuart, *Dungannon*
Army—Conveyance of Troops from Chatham to Liverpool, [188] 604
Promotion in the, [188] 168, 169; Res. [189] 335
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [187] 1363, 1365, 1366, 1499
Gladstone, Mr., and the Reform League, [186] 911
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 744
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1938
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 859, 863, 867, 875
Disturbances in, [185] 1550
Fenianism, [186] 1931, 1933; —Alleged abetting of—Professor Thompson, [187] 621, 622, 777
Fenian Prisoners, [185] 813
Maginn, Rev. Mr., Case of, [186] 1485
Tyrone Magistracy, [186] 1709; [187] 1935; [188] 1874
Parliament—Meeting in the Tea Room, [189] 769
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1698; *cl.* 31, [188] 274
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1675

KNOX, Colonel B. W., *Marlow*
Ireland—Tyrone Magistrates, [186] 393
Naval Review, The, [188] 1519, 1520

LABOUCHERE, Mr. H., *Middlesex*
Africa—West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2078
Cattle Markets, Chartered, [189] 168, 169
Declaration of Paris 1856, [189] 894
Foreign Decorations, [188] 2070
London Coal and Wine Duties, 2R. [189] 1535
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [187] 259, 1910
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1484, 1485
Metropolis—Hall of Arts and Sciences, [189] 596
Naval Knights of Windsor, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1302
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 29, [188] 214; *cl.* A, Amendt. 627, 646; *add. cl.* 1007
Supply—Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1899
British Embassy Houses, [188] 1704
Consuls Abroad, [188] 1901
Ministers at Foreign Courts, [188] 1902
Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1694
Special Missions, [188] 1903
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [189] 1531

Labouring Classes Dwellings Acts (1866) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Secretary Walpole*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 9 [Bill 118]
Read 2° * *May* 13
Committee *; Report *May* 14
Considered as amended * *May* 15
Read 3° * *May* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *May* 17
Read 2ª * *May* 24 (No. 104)
Committee *; Report *May* 27
Read 3ª * *June* 3
Royal Assent *June* 17 [30 *Vict.* c. 28]

Lacon, Sir E. H. K., *Great Yarmouth*
Endowed Schools Commission, [187] 1294

Laing, Mr. S., *Wick, &c.*
Army Estimates—Military Education, [187] 1719
Army—(India and the Colonies), Motion for a Committee, [185] 1056
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [189] 1363; Res. 1411
Financial Statement, [186] 1124
India—Maharajah of Mysore, [187] 1050
Ireland—Railways, [189] 616
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 639
Railway Companies, Consid. *cl.* 4, [187] 1726; *cl.* 7, 1926
Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1051
Railway Debenture Holders, 2R. [185] 785
Representation of the People, Comm. [185] 978; 2R. [186] 617; Comm. 1284; *cl.* 4, [187] 838; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1388, 1428, 1515, 1538, 1780; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1942, 1972, 1984, 1986; *cl.* 14, 1990, 1991; *cl.* A, [188] 642; *add. cl.* 843, 874, 891, 1003, 1025, 1032; 3R. 1596
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 419
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 691, 700, 703

Laird, Mr. J., *Birkenhead*
Brazil—War in the River Plate, [185] 1233
Navy—Chain Cables and Anchors, [185] 1804
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [187] 1842
Men and Boys, [186] 448
Steam Machinery, [187] 1858
Postal—India, China, and Australian Mails, [189] 1561, 1564
Volunteers—Capitation Grant, [189] 1334

Lamont, Mr. J., *Buteshire*
Cape of Good Hope, Motion for an Address, [187] 1599
Ireland—Established Church, Res. [187] 146
Navy—H.M.S. "Gannet" and the "Arouca," [185] 87
Supply—Board of Fisheries (Scotland), Amendt. [188] 1904
Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1256

Lancaster Borough
Moved, "That the Mayor and Corporation of the Borough of Lancaster be heard, by Counsel, at the Bar of this House, in Committee on the Representation of the People Bill, upon their Petition, presented on the 14th March, against Clause 8 of the said Bill which provides for the disfranchisement of that Borough" (*Colonel Wilson Patten*) *April* 2, [186] 982; after debate, Motion withdrawn
Report of Bribery Commissioners [3777]

Land Drainage Supplemental Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 12 [Bill 123]
Read 2° * *April* 29
Committee *; Report *May* 3
Read 3° * *May* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *May* 7
Read 2ª * *May* 10 (No. 90)
Committee *; Report *May* 13
Read 3ª * *May* 14
Royal Assent *May* 31 [30 *Vict.* c. 22]

Land Improvement and Leasing (Ireland) Bill (*Lord Naas, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 18 [Bill 30]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Land Improvement Contracts (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Agar-Ellis, Colonel French*)
c. Ordered * *Feb* 18
Read 1° * *Feb* 19 [Bill 32]
Read 2° * *Mar* 8
Committee * *Mar* 27—R.P.
Committee * *July* 2—R.P.
Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

Land Tax Commissioners' Names Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 18 [Bill 31]
Read 2° * *Feb* 21
Committee *; Report *June* 20
Considered as amended * *June* 21
Read 3° * *June* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 25
Read 2ª * *July* 1 (No. 175)
Committee *; Report *July* 4
Read 3ª * *July* 5
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 51]

Land Tenure (Ireland)
Notice, The Marquess of Clanricarde *Feb* 11, [185] 207

Land Tenure (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Gregory*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 19]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *June* 26, [188] 560
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day six months" (*Sir Hervey Bruce*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Debate adjourned
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Landed Estates (*Ireland*)
Moved, "That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee, to consider an humble Address to be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to take into consideration the expediency of recommending to the House to grant a sum by way of loan, not exceeding one million sterling, to be employed in the purchase of estates which may be offered for sale in the Landed Estates Court in Ireland, such estates to be re-sold, in subdivided farms, of not less than ten or more than one hundred acres each to the occupying tenants of such estates; or in the event of the tenants declining to purchase, then to such other persons as may be willing to purchase the same in subdivided farms, the purpose being to assert and encourage an independent proprietary of small freehold estates in Ireland" (*Mr. O'Beirne*) *July* 16, [188] 1628; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Landed Property Improvement and Leasing (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Pim, Mr. Leader, Mr. Blake*)
c. Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *May* 14, [187] 562 [Bill 150]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Landlord and Tenant (*Ireland*) *Bill*
Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 9, [186] 1383

Lanyon, Mr. C., *Belfast*
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 597
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 878
Education Commissioners, [185] 720
Railways, [189] 614
Law Courts, The New, [186] 728; Res. 2018, 2020
Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1678
Thames Embankment (Sheilds' Petition), Motion for a Committee, [186] 801
Tramways (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 69

Law, Administration of the
Observations, Sir Roundell Palmer; Reply, The Attorney General *Feb* 22, [185] 841; debate thereon

Law Courts, New—see *Courts of Justice, New*

Lawrence, Mr. Alderman W., *London*
Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot, Res. [189] 103
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1522, 1524
Metropolis—Park Lane, [189] 1606;—Marlborough House Gate, 1608
Metropolitan Cabs, &c. [185] 280, 281
Metropolitan Common Fund, [189] 1571
Metropolitan Improvements, [186] 563
[*cont.*

Lawrence, Mr. Alderman W.—*cont.*
Metropolitan Municipal Government, Leave, [189] 1041
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 750; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1612; *cl.* 9, 1619; *cl.* 44, 1677; *cl.* 55, 1682, 1685; *cl.* 65, 1688, 1689; *cl.* 79, 1696; 3R. 1865
Metropolitan Poor Law Rating, [186] 726, 727
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 789, 1199; Lords Amendts. *cl.* B, [189] 1184
Sale of Land by Auction, 2R. [186] 568
Traffic of the Metropolis, [189] 1608
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. Amendt. [189] 1527, 1533

Lawson, Right Hon. J. A., *Portarlington*
Bridges (Ireland), 2R. [186] 797
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. [186] 448; *cl.* 5, 449; *cl.* 40, 1164
Dublin University Professorships, 2R. [185] 1130
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Comm. *cl.* 1, [185] 903
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1747
Ireland—Court of Exchequer, [186] 1174
Railways, Res. [185] 1945
Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 73
Waterford Election, [185] 1802
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1066, 1068
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1126
Petit Juries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 95

Layard, Mr. A. H., *Southwark*
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, Motion for an Address, [189] 244
Burlington House Site, [186] 1232, 1239
Crete—Case of the "Arkadi," [188] 1188, 2072, 2073
Insurrection in, Address for Papers, [185] 425
Danubian Principalities — Persecution of Jews, [187] 1497
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 976
Ionian Islands, State of the, [186] 816
Metropolis Gas, Consid. [187] 362
Metropolis—University of London, [186] 981, 982; [187] 265
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 79, [185] 1695
Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 928
Paris Exhibition, Purchases at the, [188] 2074
Russia—Eastern Policy of, [185] 1447
Russian America—Cession of, to the United States, [186] 911
Servia—Jews in, Motion for Papers, [186] 845
Supply—British Museum, [189] 343, 352
Coolie Emigration, [188] 1771, 1772
University of London, Amendt. [187] 1463, 1468

Leader, Mr. N. P., *Cork Co.*
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 599
Ireland—Appointment of Sir R. Kane, [189] 959;—College of Science in Dublin, 843

Leatham, Mr. W. H., *Wakefield*
Masters and Workmen, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. [189] 518
Personal Explanation, [186] 212

Leatham, Mr. W. H.
- Personal Explanation, Mr. Leatham *Mar* 20, [186] 212
- (See *Corrupt Practices at Elections*)

Lechmere, Sir E. A. H., *Tewkesbury*
- Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 237
- Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 932
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1243

Leeman, Mr. G., *York City*
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. [189] 758
- Bankruptcy, [188] 1065 ; Comm. 1416
- Commons Inclosure Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [189] 521
- Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. [189] 477
- Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 311
- Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1068
- Railway Companies, Consid. *cl.* 4, [187] 1725, 1726
- Railways Construction Facilities Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [187] 758
- Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. [188] 553
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, [188] 439 ; Lords Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1131
- Sale and Purchase of Shares, Leave, [185] 690 ; 2R. 1134, 1413 ; Comm. [186] 98 ; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 100, 101, 102, 267, 1063
- Sale of Land by Auction, Comm. *cl.* 5, [187] 921

Lefevre, Mr. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
- Army — Ordnance Department, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1806
- France—Fishery Convention, [189] 83
- Ireland—Irish Church Commission, [189] 1610
- Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 631
  - Paddle-wheel Steamers, Motion for Papers, [186] 207, 210
  - Promotion in the, Res. [186] 304, 309
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [185] 1855 ; [186] 357, 963
- Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1068
- Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1098
- Summary Convictions—The Whortleberry Case, Res. [189] 653, 655
- United States—The "Alabama" Claims, [186] 471

Lefroy, Mr. A., *Dublin University*
- Dublin University Professorships, 2R. [185] 1132
- Ireland — Established Church, [187] 6 ; Res. 144 ;—Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 63
- Supply— Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1678
  - Public Education (Ireland), [189] 925

Leitrim, Earl of
- Ireland — Constabulary, Sub-Constable Jennings, Address for Papers, [188] 1620
  - Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, [185] 453
- Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 433

Lennox, Lord H. G. C. G. (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Chichester*
- Naval Review, The, [188] 1520
- Navy—Brand, Lieutenant, [185] 1144
  - Chain Cables and Anchors, [185] 1804
  - Dockyards, Res. [185] 646
  - Greenwich Hospital, [189] 1612
  - Henwood's, Mr., Sea-going Monitors, [189] 870
  - Naval Engineers, [186] 313
  - Paddle-wheel Steamers, Motion for Papers, [186] 209
  - Roman Catholics, [186] 316, 317
  - Staff Commanders and Masters, [186] 5
- Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [187] 1844, 1847
  - Men and Boys, [185] 1824, 1846, 1855, 1992 ; [186] 936, 938
  - Scientific Departments, [187] 1840
  - Victualling Yards, [187] 1849
  - Victuals and Clothing, [186] 972
  - Wages, [186] 971
- Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1818, 1821, 1823
- Supply—Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 902

Leslie, Colonel C. P., *Monaghan Co.*
- Cattle Plague, [186] 1479

Lewis, Mr. Harvey, *Marylebone*
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 627
- Civil Service Examination, [186] 1265
- India—Prize Money, [185] 146
- Metropolis Gas, [186] 1107
- Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 751 ; Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1613 ; *cl.* 55, Amendt. 1683 ; *cl.* 79, 1695
- Mexico—The Bondholders, [185] 1547 ; [186] 279
- Navy—Courts Martial, [185] 1234
- Pollution of Rivers, [186] 280
- Poor Law Board, &c. Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 142
- Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 606 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 32 ; *add. cl.* [188] 817 ; Consid. 1482
- Supply—Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1692 ;—Houses of Parliament, 1696

Libel Bill (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Baines*)
- *c.* Ordered ; read 1°* *Feb* 8 [Bill 11]
- Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 13, [185] 1716
- And, on *Mar* 20, Select Committee nominated as follows :—Sir Colman O'Loghlen (Chairman), Lord Amberley, Mr. Baines, Mr. Collier, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Goldsmid, Mr. Gridley, Mr. Henley, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Sandford, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Walpole
- Report presented *April* 8 (No. 208)
- Committee ; Report *June* 25, [188] 539 [Bill 112]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *July* 16, 1659 ; after short debate, [House counted out]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *August* 7, [189] 1050

[*cont.*

Libel Bill—cont.
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Ayrton*); after debate, Question, "That 'now' *&c.*;" A. 79, N. 18; M. 61; main Question agreed to; Bill read 3° [Bill 215]
l. Read 1ª* *August* 8 (No. 313)

Licensing System
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 2, [186] 1874

LICHFIELD, Earl of
Agricultural Gangs, [189] 164
Factory Acts Extension, 3R. [189] 1433, 1436
Friendly Societies, Motion for Returns, [188] 125, 128; [189] 1597
Hours of Labour Regulation, 2R. [189] 1597
Master and Servant, 2R. [189] 844, 846
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 418; *cl.* 37, Amendt. 735; *cl.* 55, Amendt. 751
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1442, 1443
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Report, *cl.* 3, [189] 1327

LIDDELL, Hon. H. G., *Northumberland, S.*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 499
Army Estimates — Military Store Establishment, [187] 1710
Cattle Plague, [189] 80
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 999, 1224; *cl.* 45, 1519
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [186] 451; Re-comm. [189] 478; *cl.* 3, 483
Ireland—Importation of Sheep, [189] 849
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1606
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 1580
Metropolis Gas, [186] 1878
Mines and Miners, [186] 411
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1430
Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [186] 1584; Res. [189] 866
"Greenwich Sixpence," The, [187] 1735
Royal Naval Reserve, [187] 1021, 1022
Poor Law Board, &c. Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 144
Representation of the People — Registration Clauses, [188] 18
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 609; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1629; [187] 701; *cl.* 4, 1157; *cl.* 35, 1205; *cl.* 8, 1297, 1330; *cl.* 15, 1998, 1999; [188] 27; *cl.* 43, 510; *cl.* A, 618; *add. cl.* 872, 1042
Storm Warnings, Res. [188] 1738
Supply — Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 907;—Department of Science and Art, 1236

Life Policies Nomination Bill
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. T. Hughes*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *June* 18 [Bill 201]
Bill withdrawn* *August* 6

Life Sentences
Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 15, [185] 1918; long debate thereon

LIFFORD, Viscount
Army—Patents for the Improvement of Small Arms, [185] 807
Ireland—Constabulary, Motion for Returns, [186] 458
Convicted Fenians, [187] 689
Military at Elections, Motion for Papers, [185] 1219
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 289
Salmon Fishery Act (Ireland), [188] 262
Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [188] 762
Tenure of Land (Ireland), 1R. [185] 804

Light and Air to Ancient Windows
Observations, Mr. Goldney; Reply, The Attorney General *Mar* 1, [185] 1243

LIMERICK, Earl of
Limerick Harbour (Composition of Debt), Comm. [188] 1185

Limerick Harbour Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Lord Naas, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Resolution in Committee *April* 8, [186] 1318
Ordered; read 1°* *April* 9 [Bill 117]
Read 2°* *May* 27
And, on *May* 29, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Monsell (Chairman), Major Gavin, Mr. Graves, Mr. Gregory, Mr. George Morris, Mr. Paull, Mr. Mitford, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Parry, Mr. Robartes, and Sir Thomas Western
Report presented *May* 31
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 3
Read 3°* *June* 4 [Bill 176]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 4
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 18, [188] 4; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 138)
Committee; Report *July* 8, 1182
Read 3ª* *July* 9
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 53]

Limited Liability Acts
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Limited Liability Acts" (*Mr. Watkin*) *Mar* 5, [185] 1370; after debate, agreed to; Select Committee appointed
And, on *Mar* 8, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Watkin (Chairman), Mr. Brett, Mr. Stephen Cave, Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Finlay, Mr. George Grenfell Glyn, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Graves, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Lowe, Lord Robert Montagu, Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Solicitor General, and Mr. Vance; *Mar* 11, Mr. W. E. Forster added; *Mar* 12, Mr. Hodgson added; *April* 8, Mr. Morrison added
Report *brought up*, *May* 28—(*Parl. P.* No. 329)

Limited Liability, Law of
Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 20, [188] 171

Lincoln, Bishop of
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 10, [187] 384 ; *add. cl.* 1195

Lindsay, Hon. Colonel C. H., *Abingdon*
Army Estimates—Disembodied Militia, [187] 1757

Lindsay, Colonel R. Loyd, *Berkshire*
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 1571

Linen and other Manufactures (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Lanyon, Mr. Getty*)
c. Committee, Res.; Bill ordered ; read 1° * *June* 3
Read 2° * *June* 19 [Bill 183]
Committee * ; Report *June* 24
Read 3° * *June* 25
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Cairns*) *June* 27 (No. 186)
Read 2ª * *July* 8
Committee *; Report *July* 9
Read 3ª * *July* 11
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 60]

Lis Pendens Bill (*The Lord St. Leonards*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Feb* 7 (No. 6)
Read 2ª *Feb* 21, [185] 698
Committee * ; Report *Feb* 25
Read 3ª * *Mar* 1
c. Read 1° * *May* 15 [Bill 153]
Read 2° * *June* 7
Committee * ; Report *June* 14
Considered as amended * *June* 17
Re-comm. * ; Report *June* 20
Considered as amended * *June* 21
Read 3° * *June* 24
l. Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 47]

Liverpool—Engineer Surveyor at
Question, Mr. O'Beirne ; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 13, [187] 394
Sanitary Condition of, Question, Mr. Samuelson ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 4, [185] 1307

Lloyd, Sir T. D., *Cardiganshire*
Railway Debentures, [186] 816
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1157 ; *add. cl.* [188] 1001, 1019, 1022, 1023, 1024
Wales—Sanitary Condition of, [185] 809

Local Government Supplemental Bill (*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *April* 11 [Bill 121]
Read 2° * *April* 29
Committee * ; Report *May* 2
Read 3° * *May* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *May* 7
Read 2ª * *May* 10 (No. 89)
Committee * ; Report *May* 13
Read 3ª * *May* 14
Royal Assent *May* 31 [30 *Vict.* c. 21]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill (*Mr. Sec. G. Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *May* 21 [Bill 167]
Read 2° * *May* 23
Committee * ; Report *May* 27
Read 3° * *May* 29 [*cont.*

Local Government Supplemental (No. 2) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *May* 31
Read 2ª * *June* 3 (No. 119)
Committee * *June* 18
Report * *June* 20
Read 3ª * *June* 21
c. Lords' Amendts. considered *July* 11, [188] 1421 [Bill 218]
Committee appointed to draw up reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendments to which this House hath disagreed, 1422
Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Childers, Mr. Charles Forster, Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. John Abel Smith, Lord Hotham, and Mr. Bonham-Carter
l. Royal Assent *July* 25 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 65]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 3) Bill (*Mr. Sec. G. Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 4 [Bill 187]
Read 2° * *June* 6
Committee * ; Report *June* 17
Considered * *June* 18
Read 3° * *June* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *June* 21
Read 2ª * *June* 24 (No. 166)
Committee * ; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 27
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 49]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 4) Bill (*Mr. Sec. G. Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 6 [Bill 191]
Read 2° * *June* 17
Committee * ; Report *June* 18
Considered * *June* 19
Read 3° * *June* 20
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *June* 21
Read 2ª * *June* 24 (No. 167)
Committee * *July* 9
Report * *July* 11 (No. 207)
Read 3ª * *July* 12
Royal Assent *July* 25 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 67]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 5) Bill (*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 21 [Bill 206]
Read 2° * *June* 28
Committee * ; Report *July* 4
Considered * *July* 8
Read 3° * *July* 11 [Bill 295]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *July* 12
Read 2ª * *July* 15 (No. 221)
Order for Committee read *July* 16, [188] 1619 ; after short debate, Order discharged
Committee * *July* 25
Report * *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 29
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 67]

Local Government Supplemental (No. 6) Bill (*Mr. Sec. G. Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 9 [Bill 244]
Read 2° * *July* 12
Referred to Select Committee *July* 18
[*cont.*

Local Government Supplemental (No. 6) Bill—cont.
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. A. W. Kinglake (Chairman), Mr. Allen, Mr. Grove, Mr. Harvey Lewis
Report * *July* 29
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 1
Read 3° * *August* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *August* 2
Read 2ª * *August* 9 (No. 289)
Committee * *August* 12
Report * *August* 13
Read 3ª * *August* 15
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 125]

Locke, Mr. J., *Southwark*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Leave, [185] 292; 2R. [186] 687; Comm. [189] 755
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 317
Jersey—Royal Court of, [186] 562
Libel, Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 542; *add. cl.* 547, 549
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Amendt. [189] 382; Preamble, 1480
Metropolis—London University, [188] 1263;—Statue of Canning, [189] 1295
Metropolitan Municipal Government, Leave, [189] 1041
Metropolitan Police Force, [189] 1447
Metropolitan Poor, Leave, [185] 178; 2R. 749; *cl.* 55, Amendt. 1684; *cl.* 69, 1692; *cl.* 79, 1696
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [187] 887
Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 795, 796, 912, 915
Parliament—Public Business, [185] 1370
Poor Law Board, &c. Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 145
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. *cl.* 4, [188] 558
Representation of the People—Reform Statistics, [185] 1648;—Electoral Statistics, 1809
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1268, 1269, 1271; *cl.* 3, 1625, 1629; [187] 33, 463; *cl.* 4, 852; *cl.* 34, 1187; *add. cl.* [188] 678, 681, 698, 699, 1017, 1032, 1204, 1264; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1454; Lords' Amendts. [189] 1118
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 113
Sunday Trading, Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 35; *cl.* 2, 39
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [189] 1532
Turnpike Acts Continuance, 2R. [188] 1910

London, Bishop of
Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [189] 42
Book of Common Prayer, Address for Papers, [188] 1432
Church of England in the Colonies, Address for Papers, [185] 378, 399
Clerical Vestments, [187] 75
Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 507; [189] 1632
Consecration of Churchyards, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1164
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1172
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [187] 84; Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. 384, 386, 763; *cl.* 13, 1194; *add. cl.* 1195, 1196; Report, *cl.* 2, 1480; 3R. [188] 254

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway
Observations, Lord Redesdale *July* 12, [188] 1422; short debate thereon

London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (No. 3) Bill
c. Moved, "That the Standing Orders of this House, Nos. 18, 38, and 40, be suspended in the case of the Petition for the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (No. 3) Bill," (*Mr. Thomas Hughes*) *April* 5, [186] 1169; after short debate, agreed to
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the means adopted by the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company for raising the share capital and exercising their borrowing powers under the various Acts of Parliament authorizing the construction of the main line and its extensions and branches (*Sir Morton Peto*) *April* 9, 1339; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (Arrangement) Bill
l. Bill read 3ª *August* 15, [189] 1536; after short debate, Bill passed, and sent to the Commons

London Coal and Wine Duties Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Lord John Manners, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 21 [Bill 43]
Moved, "That the Bill be read 2° To-morrow" (*Sir James Fergusson*) *August* 14, [189] 1534
Amendt. to leave out from "That the" and add "said Order be discharged" (*Mr. Ayrton*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned till To-morrow
Bill withdrawn * *August* 15

Longford, Earl of (Under Secretary of State for War)
Army — Artillery — Converted Enfield Rifle, [185] 1211
Cavalry Barracks, Knightsbridge, [187] 1473
Industrial Employment of Soldiers, [186] 897
March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1492
Patents for the Improvement of Small Arms, [185] 807
Proof of Fire Arms, [187] 1729
Recruiting Commission, Address for a Return, [185] 1777, 1799
Transport and Supply Departments, [188] 592, 602
Army Enlistment, 2R. [187] 1382, 1383; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1478
Army Reserve, 2R. [189] 1328
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [187] 767
Ireland—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1431
Military at Elections, Motion for Papers, [185] 1216, 1222

[*cont.*

LONGFORD, Earl of—*cont.*
Militia, The, [185] 1546; Address for a Return, [186] 805, 810, 813
Militia Reserve, 2R. [189] 1328
Mutiny, 2R. [186] 1167
Patriotic Fund, 2R. [188] 1255
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 928; [186] 457, 458; [188] 754, 761
War Department Stores Protection, 2R. [188] 1062

LOPES, Sir M., *Westbury*
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [188] 1727
Dean and Chapter of Windsor, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, [187] 1024

Lord Chief Baron
Petition of Rigby Wason, Esquire (*Earl Russell*) *Feb* 12, [185] 257; after long debate, on Question, That the Petition do lie on the Table? resolved in the negative

LOWE, Right Hon. R., *Calne*
Army—Knightsbridge Barracks, [188] 1515
British North America, Comm. *cl.* 145, [185] 1321
Canada Railway Loan, Comm. [186] 757
Education, [185] 1161, 1164
Educational Grants, Res. [186] 1176, 1186, 1193
Explanation—Mr. Osborne and Mr. Dillwyn, [187] 12
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1985; —Public Right in, [187] 95;—Public Meetings in, 266
Ireland—Queen's University, [187] 1451, 1459, 1461, 1462
Merton College, [188] 1439
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1358, 1365
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1624, 1632
Representation of the People—Reform Statistics, [185] 1702
Representation of the People, Comm. [185] 952; Leave, [186] 52; Comm. 1310; *cl.* 3, 1603, 1678; [187] 323, 781; *cl.* 8, 1311; *cl.* 15, 1994, 1996, 1999; Motion for Adjournment, 2001; *cl.* 15, [188] 18, 44; *add. cl.* 101, 104, 1017, 1024, 1036, 1116; 3R. 1539; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1175
Supply—University of London, [187] 1468
Thames Embankment (Sheilds' Petition), Motion for a Committee, [186] 370, 798, 803
Vaccination, Comm. [187] 1883

LOWTHER, Mr. J., *York City*
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [187] 1366
Representation of the People—Working Classes—Borough Register, [186] 470
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 544; Comm. *cl.* 40, [188] 441, 480; *add. cl.* Motion for Adjournment, 702; Consid. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1453; *cl.* 46, Amendt. 1462, 1472; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* 4, [189] 1121
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1227, 1228

LUCAN, Earl of
Army—Cavalry Barracks, Knightsbridge, [187] 1471, 1472
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 3R. Amendt. [189] 953

Lunacy (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *June* 20 (No. 163)
Read 2ª* *June* 27
Committee*; Report *June* 28
Read 3ª* *July* 1
c. Read 1º* *July* 2 [Bill 219]
Read 2º* *July* 4
Committee*; Report *July* 5
Read 3º* *July* 8
l. Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 55]

LUSK, Mr. Alderman A., *Finsbury*
Africa — West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2082
Army Estimates — Barrack Establishment, Amendt. [187] 1746, 1749
Military Store Establishment, [187] 1704
Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1711, 1712, 1715
Army — Transport and Supply Departments, [187] 1697
Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1886
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1773
Church Rates, Imprisonment for, [189] 1560
Dogs, Duty on, 2R. [185] 780; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1198; *cl.* 2, *ib.*; *cl.* 8, 1200; *cl.* 9, 1201
"Ethiopian," Wreck of the, [188] 167
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1085
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 320
Government Prison Clerks, [185] 1232; [186] 391
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1652
Jurymen (Metropolis), [185] 1229
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 1586
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1918, 1924
Metropolis—Hyde Park, [185] 1916; [188] 1517
Metropolitan Poor, Leave, [185] 179; 2R. 754; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1613; *cl.* 9, 1620; *cl.* 20, 1623; *cl.* 38, 1674; *cl.* 41, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 44, Amendt. 1677; *cl.* 49, 1681; *cl.* 69, 1692; *cl.* 79, 1697; 3R. 1864
Navy—Chief Admiralty Chemist at Portsmouth Dockyard, [189] 1559
Dockyards, Res. [185] 603
Greenwich Hospital, Res. [189] 868
Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, &c. [187] 1836
Dockyards, &c. [187] 1845, 1847
Men and Boys, [185] 1856
Naval Stores, [187] 1858; Motion for Adjournment, 1859
Scientific Departments, [187] 1839
Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1867
Representation of the People, Comm: *cl.* 3, [187] 42
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1139; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [186] 100, 101
Sugar Duties, Comm. Res. [185] 353

[*cont.*

LUSK, Mr. Alderman A.—*cont.*
- Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 588
- Supply—Board of Fisheries (Scotland), [188] 1904
  - Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1773 ; Amendt. 1898, 1899
  - British Embassy Houses, Paris and Madrid, [188] 1704
  - British Museum, [189] 346
  - Cultivation of Flax (Ireland), [188] 1905 ; Amendt. 1906
  - Department of Science and Art, [189] 1233
  - Embassy House, Constantinople, [188] 1706
  - Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1256
  - Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 903
  - Hospitals (Dublin), [188] 1491
  - Houses of Parliament, [188] 1697
  - Labuan, [188] 1770
  - National Gallery, [189] 1245
  - Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1676 ; Amendt. 1680
  - Paris Exhibition—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1261
  - Polish Refugees, [188] 1489
  - Poor Law Commissioners, [187] 859 ; Motion for Adjournment, 860
  - Prisons and Convict Establishments, [187] 1094
  - Public Education, [189] 362
  - Quarantine Establishment, Amendt. [187] 927
  - Royal Palaces, [185] 511 ; [188] 1681, 1685
  - Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1692, 1694
  - Salaries, &c. in Offices of Houses of Parliament, Amendt. [187] 854
  - Services in China, &c. [188] 1901
  - Special Missions, [188] 1903
  - Superannuation, [188] 1487 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1488
- "Tornado," Seizure of the, [185] 88, 1306, 1338
- Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [189] 1533
- Weights and Measures, Inspection of, [188] 773

Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of

186] Question, Mr. Sandford ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 1, 909 ; Question, Sir R. Peel ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 2, 981 ; Question, Sir Robert Peel ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 5, 1248 ; Question, Mr. Horsman ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 29, 1705 ; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 30, 1785 ; Question, Earl Russell ; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 2, 1868

187] Question, Earl Russell ; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 9, 214—*The Conference*, Question, Mr. Labouchere ; Answer, Lord Stanley, 259 ; Observations, The Earl of Derby *May* 13, 379 ; Question, Sir Harry Verney ; Answer, Lord Stanley, 397 — *Treaty of*, Question, Mr. Labouchere ; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 14, 1910 ; Observations, Earl Russell ; Reply, The Earl of Derby *June* 20, [188] 144

[*cont.*

Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of—cont.
- *The Recent Debate*, Explanations, Lord Houghton *June* 21, [188] 238
- *Treaty of* 1867 — *The Collective Guarantee*, Question, Lord Houghton ; Answer, The Earl of Derby *July* 4, [188] 966

Parl Papers—
The Treaty . . . . [3865]
Protocols of Conference . . [3866]
Correspondence . . . . . . [3867]

Lyon King of Arms (Scotland) Bill
(*Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Hunt*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 2 [Bill 44]
Read 2° *Mar* 14, [185] 1867
Committee * ; Report *Mar* 21
Considered as amended * *Mar* 27
Read 3° * *Mar* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 29
Read 2ª * *April* 4 (No. 54)
Committee * ; Report *April* 5
Read 3ª * *April* 9
Royal Assent *May* 3 [30 *Vict.* c. 17]

LYTTELTON, Lord
- Brown's Charity, 2R. [188] 502
- Colonial Church, [187] 761
- Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1175
- Cornwall, Bishopric in, [185] 1305
- Friendly Societies, Motion for Returns, [188] 128
- Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [187] 78, 85, 88 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 380, 382 ; *add. cl.* 384 ; *cl.* 10, 385 ; *cl.* 11, Amendt. 386, 762, 765 ; *cl.* 13, 1195 ; *add. cl.* 1197 ; Report, *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1478, 1479 ; *cl.* 12, 1484 ; *cl.* 13, 1487 ; 3R. 1551 ; [188] 259 ; Commons' Amendts. [189] 1539, 1540, 1542, 1543
- Public Schools, 2R. [185] 333
- Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1921 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 307 ; *add. cl.* 426
- Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 374

LYVEDEN, Lord
- Agricultural Employment, 2R. [188] 1664
- Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [189] 42
- British Museum, [185] 1626
- British North America, 2R. [185] 582 ; Comm. 806 ; Commons' Amendts. 1701
- Canada Railway Loan, 3R. [186] 1457, 1465
- Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 153
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [187] 872
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 706, 717
- Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 1, [187] 380
- Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of—The Collective Guarantee, [188] 977
- New Palace Yard and the Houses of Parliament, [187] 765
- Offices and Oaths, 2R. [187] 1377 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [188] 1367
- Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for Returns, [188] 129, 136 ;—Notice of Questions, 1255

[*cont.*

Lyveden, Lord—*cont.*
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 325; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 592; 3R. 937
- Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Comm. [188] 1384

MacEvoy, Mr. E., *Meath Co.*
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 363, 369; 2R. [187] 564
- Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Motion for a Committee, [187] 687, 1096, 1097, 1336, 1499; Comm. [188] 487, 651
- Prison Ministers Act, [188] 1765

McKenna, Mr. J. N., *Youghal*
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 367
- Financial Statement, [186] 1150
- Ireland—Railways, Res. [185] 1946;—Taxation, Res. [188] 1292, 1314
- London Coal and Wine Duties, 2R. [189] 1534
- Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1853, 1859, 1867
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1733

Mackie, Mr. J., *Kirkcudbrightshire*
- Scotland—Southerness Lighthouse, [187] 774

Mackinnon, Captain L. B., *Rye*
- Masters and Workmen, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 520

McLagan, Mr. P., *Linlithgowshire*
- Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 516
- Agricultural Statistics, [185] 461
- Animals, Trade in, [185] 584
- Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1079
- Fire Protection, Motion for a Committee, [185] 1708
- Game Preservation (Scotland), Leave, [185] 1388; 2R. [187] 902, 910
- Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 199

McLaren, Mr. D., *Edinburgh*
- Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 501
- Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh), 2R. [185] 655, 664, 675
- Army—Good Conduct Medals, [189] 171
- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 696; Comm. [189] 759; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 761; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 762; *cl.* 15, 763
- Cattle Plague, Res. [186] 2017
- Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 45, [189] 1430, 1519, 1522
- East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. Res. [189] 1415
- Financial Statement, [186] 1156
- Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 914
- Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 205
- Ireland—Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 16;—Railways, 621
- Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1475
- Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 931
- Prison Ministers Act, [188] 1768

[*cont.*

McLaren, Mr. D.—*cont.*
- Public Health (Scotland), 2R. [186] 1925
- Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. [188] 553
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 36, 37, 469, 702; *cl.* 9, 1536; *cl.* 40, [188] 457; *cl.* 31, 534; *cl.* A, 619; *add. cl.* 671, 804, 1012, 1017, 1022, 1024; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1457
- Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 423
- Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 958
- Scotland—Management of Scotch Business in Parliament, [186] 400
  - Representation of, [185] 1265; [189] 332
- Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1100
- Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 112
- Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 587
- Supply—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1228
  - Embassy House, Constantinople, [188] 1706
  - Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1679
  - Public Education, [189] 372, 382

Maguire, Mr. J. F., *Cork City*
- Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [188] 487
- Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 595
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), Leave, [187] 901; 2R. 942, 945, 953, 973
- Ireland—Established Church, Res. [187] 175
  - Fenian Prisoners, [186] 1945, 1987, 1988, 1990; [187] 1663
  - Salters' Company—Roman Catholic Church at Magherafelt, [187] 253, 768; Motion for an Address, 894
  - State of, [189] 193
  - Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 30
  - Walsh, Dennis, Case of, [188] 605
- Political Prisoners, Memorials of, [189] 1217
- Prison Ministers Act, [188] 1767
- Supply—Cultivation of Flax (Ireland), [188] 1905
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), [186] 1934, 1935

Maintenance of Families Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1°* *July* 19 (No. 244)

Malmesbury, Earl of (Lord Privy Seal)
- Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 154
- Charities, Assessment of, [188] 745
- Egypt—Viceroy of, Visit of the, [188] 663
- Ireland—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1428, 1429
- Master and Servant, 2R. [189] 846
- Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 964
- Moldavia—Persecution of Jews, Motion for an Address, [188] 750
- New Forest, [189] 1306
- Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 264
  - Construction of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 657

[*cont.*

MALMESBURY, Earl of—*cont.*
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 256, 271, 274, 277, 281, 286; *cl.* 4, 304, 311, 315, 318; *add. cl.* 441; *cl.* 10, 473; *add. cl.* 748
Sale of Land by Auction, Commons Amendts. [188] 4
Salmon Fishery Act (Ireland), [188] 261
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1327
"Tornado," Case of the, [186] 1260; [188] 767, 768
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 373, 376; [188] 759

Malt Tax
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Malt Tax" (*Colonel Barttelot*) *May* 14, [187] 526; after long debate, Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed
And, on *May* 31, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel Barttelot (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Benyon, Sir Edward Buller, Mr. Stephen Cave, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Dent, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Hardcastle, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Laing, Mr. G. Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. More, The O'Conor Don, Major Parker, Mr. Arthur Peel, Mr. Read, and Mr. H. Surtees; *June* 3, Colonel Duncombe added
Report *brought up, July* 25 (*Parl. P.* No. 470)

MANCHESTER, Duke of
Cape of Good Hope—Withdrawal of Troops, [188] 5
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 419

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Chief Commissioner of Works, &c.), *Leicestershire, N.*
Canning and Peel, Statues of, [186] 1874; [187] 3; [189] 958, 1296
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 231
Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 183
Courts of Justice, The New, Res. [185] 826; [189] 1221, 1570, 1571
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 483; Schedules, 484
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 991
Hours of Labour Regulation, Re-comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 485
Houses of Parliament, Leave, [186] 166
Hume, Mr., Bust of the late, [186] 816
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 1075
London University, [186] 981, 982
Metropolis—Barricade round Hyde Park, [185] 213, 1916
  Buckingham Palace Gardens, [186] 1482
  Burlington House Site, [186] 1237, 1267
  Chelsea Hospital Gardens, [187] 1026
  Foot-paths bounding Crown Property, [187] 770, 771
  Hyde Park Gravel Pits, [188] 1437;—Railings, 1518;—Review, 772
  Marlborough House Gate, [189] 1608
  Ornamental Waters in the Parks, [185] 585, 1550

[*cont.*

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R.—*cont.*
  Park Lane and Halkin Street, [185] 465; [189] 1607, 1608
  Public Parks, [187] 1387
  University of London, [187] 265, 266, 1290, 1661; [188] 1263
  Victoria Park, [187] 1293
Metropolitan Improvements, [186] 564
National Art Collection, Motion for an Address, [189] 643
National Gallery, The New, [185] 1644; Motion for Papers, [186] 837
National Gallery Enlargement, Leave, [186] 159
Parliament — House of Commons (Arrangements), Motion for a Committee, Amendt. [188] 538
  Meeting in the Tea Room, [189] 768
  Reporters' Gallery, The, [186] 122, 123
  St. Stephen's Crypt, [188] 1486
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), Leave, [185] 1284
Representation of the People, [185] 1027;—Electoral Statistics, 1822
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 304; *cl.* 4, 1000, 1006; *cl.* 5, 1232; *add. cl.* [188] 1016
Supply—British Embassy Houses, [188] 1704
  Houses of Parliament, Report, [185] 682, 683; [188] 1697, 1698, 1701, 1704
  National Gallery, [189] 1245
  New Foreign Office, [188] 1704
  Royal Palaces, [185] 501; [188] 1681, 1686
  Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1690, 1692, 1693, 1695
  University of London, [187] 1464, 1468, 1469
Thames Embankment (Sheilds' Petition), Motion for a Committee, [186] 801
Wellington, Duke of, Monument to the, [186] 1267

Marine Mutiny Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Corry, Lord Henry Lennox*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *April* 2
Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir John Pakington *April* 5, [186] 1174
Read 2° *April* 5, 1257
Committee *; Report *April* 8
Considered as amended * *April* 8
Read 3° * *April* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *April* 9
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *April* 11
Read 3ª * *April* 11 (No. 76)
Royal Assent *April* 12 [30 *Vict.* c. 14]

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of (Lord President of the Council)
Brown's Charity, 2R. [188] 496
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1089
Contagious Diseases (Animals), 2R. [187] 864, 872; Report, 1369; Comm. *cl.* 31, 1549
Education — Revised Code — Certificated Teachers, [188] 1054
Established Church — Ritualistic Practices, [186] 1329; Explanation, 1453
France, Mr., Pamphlet of, Res. [185] 1629
Increase of the Episcopate, 3R. [188] 249
Morewood, Mr. J. J., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [188] 660

[*cont.*

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of—*cont.*
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1864, 1916; Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 304, 305; *add. cl.* 430, 455; *cl.* 37, 735; *cl.* 55, 751; Report, *cl.* 5, 836
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. Amendt. [189] 47

Marriage Law Commission—Report of
Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 23, [187] 938

Marriages (Odessa) Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Ordered read 1°* *Feb* 20 [Bill 40]
Read 2°* *Feb* 22
Committee*; Report *Feb* 25
Read 3°* *Feb* 28
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 1
Read 2ª* *Mar* 5 (No. 30)
Committee*; Report *Mar* 7
Read 3ª* *Mar* 8
Royal Assent *Mar* 29 [30 *Vict.* c. 2]

MARSH, Mr. M. H., *Salisbury*
British North America, 2R. [185] 1195
Dogs, Duty on, Comm. *cl.* 1, [185] 1197; *cl.* 8, 1199; *cl.* 10, 1202
Financial Statement, [186] 1126
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1153
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 45, 309; *add. cl.* [188] 668, 670; Consid. *add. cl.* 1446

Martial Law
Question, Mr. Headlam; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 6, [187] 3
Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Moved, "That whereas, by the Law of this Kingdom no man may be forejudged of life or limb but by the lawful judgment of his Peers, or by the Law of the Land; and no commission for proceeding by Martial Law may issue forth to any person or persons whatever, by colour of which any of Her Majesty's subjects may be destroyed or put to death contrary to the Laws and Franchise of this land, and the pretended power of suspending of Laws, or the execution of Laws by Regal authority without consent of Parliament is illegal; this House would regard as utterly void and illegal any commission or proclamation purporting or pretending to proclaim Martial Law in any part of this Kingdom" (*Mr. O'Reilly*) *July* 2, [188] 899; after long debate, Motion withdrawn
Martial Law in the Colonies—Instructions to Governors, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 21, [188] 268; *July* 19, 1723
Purcell, Mr., Stipendiary Magistrate of Jamaica, Question, Earl Russell; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *July* 19, [188] 1718; short debate thereon
Regimental Courts Martial, Question, Colonel Annesley; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *June* 18, [188] 16
Circular Despatch on Subject of—
Parl. Paper . . . . [3881]

MARTIN, Mr. P. Wykeham, *Rochester*
Army Estimates—Military Store Establishment, [187] 1704;—Works, Buildings, &c. 1712
Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [188] 939
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [187] 1365
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 208
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [187] 1841
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 23, [188] 54; *add. cl.* 894, 1010, 1011
Sale and Purchase of Shares, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 267
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 112

Master and Servant, Law of
Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 1, [185] 1259; debate thereon

Master and Servant Bill (*Lord Elcho, Mr. George Clive, Mr. Algernon Egerton*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *April* 2, [186] 1059
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Lord Elcho*) *June* 4, [187] 1603
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Edmund Potter*); Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Bill read 2° [Bill 105]
Committee*; Report *June* 20 [Bill 204]
Re-comm.*; Report *July* 9 [Bill 240]
Re-comm.*; Report *July* 12
Considered* *July* 18
Read 3°* *July* 19
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Lichfield*) *July* 19
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Lichfield*) *August* 5, [189] 844; after short debate, Bill read 2ª (No. 248)
Committee*; Report *August* 9 (No. 325)
Re-comm.* *August* 13 (No. 334)
Report* *August* 15 (No. 342)
Read 3ª* *August* 16
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 141]

Masters and Operatives Bill (*afterwards* **Masters and Workmen Bill**)
(*The Lord St. Leonards*)
l. Presented; after short debate, read 1ª *Feb* 7, [185] 79 (No. 3)
Read 2ª *Feb* 21, 696
Committee *Feb* 25, 930
Report* *Mar* 1
Read 3ª* *Mar* 4
c. Read 1°* *Mar* 15 [Bill 77]
Read 2°* *May* 27
Committee; Report *July* 31, [189] 518
Considered as amended* *August* 5
Read 3°* *August* 5
l. Royal Assent *August* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 105]

Mauritius—Yellow Fever in the
Question, Mr. J. A. Smith; Answer, Mr. Adderley *May* 30, [187] 1292; Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 8, [188] 1192; Question, Mr. J. A. Smith; Answer, Mr. Adderley *August* 7, [189] 1042

Meetings in Royal Parks Bill (*afterwards* **Parks Regulation Bill**)
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Mr. Attorney General*)
186] *c.* Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *May* 3, 2024 [Bill 134]
188] Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 16, 1626
. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *July* 22, 1878
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Taylor*); after further short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 181, N. 64; M. 117; main Question agreed to; Bill read 2°
. Committee; Report *July* 23, 2033 [Bill 273]
189] Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 25, 85
. Order for Committee (*on re-comm.*) read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 29, 382
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House deems it inexpedient to proceed further at the present moment with any Bill touching the regulation of the Parks" (*Mr. Locke*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, A. 133, N. 88; M. 45; main Question agreed to; Bill considered in Committee—R.P.
. Committee *August* 13, 1453—R.P.
. Committee deferred *August* 14, 1536
. Committee [No Report] *August* 15, 1571

Meetings in Royal Parks Bill
(*The Lord Redesdale*)
l. Presented; read 1ª, after short debate *May* 24, [187] 1013 (No. 113)
After short debate, Second Reading put off to Friday *July* 12, [188] 1424
After short debate, Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn *July* 19, 1709

Meetings in Royal Parks, see *Metropolis—Hyde Park*

Meller, Mr. W., *Stafford*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 699

Melville, Viscount
Army Enlistment, 2R. [187] 1383
Jamaica—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice—Mr. Purcell, [188] 1718, 1721
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 375

Mercantile Marine
Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 7, [185] 83; Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *August* 12, [189] 1337

Merchant Seamen, Treatment of, in Welsh Ports
Question, Colonel Williams; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 4, [188] 989

Merchant Shipping Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Richmond*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 25 (No. 180)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Duke of Richmond*) *July* 2, [188] 848; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee *; Report *July* 11 (No. 219)
Re-comm. * *July* 16
Report * *July* 18
Read 3ª * *July* 19 (No. 319)
c. Read 1° * *July* 24 [Bill 274]
Read 2° * *July* 25
Committee *; Report *August* 5 [Bill 299]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 8
Considered as amended * *August* 9
Read 3° * *August* 9
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 124]

Merchant Shipping Laws
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that the Laws with reference to Merchant Shipping should be revised and consolidated, and that such Amendments should be made therein as will better protect the interests of the public and the mercantile marine of this Country" (*Mr. O'Beirne*) *August* 13, [189] 1487; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Meredyth, Lord
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1376
Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [188] 762
Tenure of Land (Ireland), 1R. [185] 796

"*Mermaid*," *Case of the*—see *Spain*

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill
Question, Mr. Tollemache; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Mar* 5, [185] 1336

Merton College, Oxford
Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 12, [188] 1439
Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* No. 494)

Meteorological Department of the Board of Trade
Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 15, [185] 401
Storm Signals, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 5, [186] 1173; *June* 7, [187] 1731—(*Parl. P.* No. 240)

Metropolis
Bunhill Fields Burial Ground, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 11, [185] 211; Question, Mr. Remington Mills; Answer, Mr. Mowbray *Mar* 1, 1229
Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* No. 51, 83, 104)
Burlington House Site, Observations, Mr. Layard; Reply, Lord John Manners *April* 5, [186] 1232; short debate thereon
Cabs and Hackney Carriage Trade, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 12, [185] 280
Canning Statue, The—(See title *Canning*)

[*cont.*

Metropolis—cont.

Cattle Plague in the, Question, Mr. Dent; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 8, [185] 46 — *Reported Outbreaks* (*London*), Question, Mr. Dent; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 8, 146; Question, Viscount Galway; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 6, [187] 6; Question, Mr. Mitford; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 17, 693; Question, Sir William Bagge; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 30, 1291

Chelsea Hospital Gardens, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 24, [187] 1026

Courts of Justice, The New—(See title *Courts of Justice*)

Crown Property — Footpaths bounding Buckingham Palace Gardens, Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 11, [186] 1482; Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 20, [187] 770

False Weights and Measures, Question, Mr. Goldsmid; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 4, [188] 987

Hall of Arts and Sciences — Charter, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 1, [189] 596

Hyde Park, Barricade around, Question, Mr. Dyce Nicol; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 11, [185] 213; Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 15, 1916

Hyde Park—Cabs, Admission of, Question, Mr. Yorke; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 6, [187] 7; Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 10, 370

Hyde Park—Proposed Demonstration of Trades Unions, Question, The Earl of Dudley; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 8, [185] 136; short debate thereon

Hyde Park, Meeting in

Interference of the Government, Observations, Mr. Bright *May* 3, [186] 1955

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *May* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "Her Majesty's Government in refusing the use of Hyde Park for the purpose of holding a Political Meeting, have asserted the legal right of the Crown, and deserve the support of this House in so doing" (*Mr. Neate*), 1963; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Resolution of the Reform League, Question, Sir Charles Russell; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 3, [186] 1935

Swearing in of Special Constables, Question, Mr. R. J. Harvey; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 3, [186] 1936

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Copies of the Notice issued by the Secretary of State warning the Public against attending the recent Meeting in Hyde Park, and also of the Instructions given to the Police on the Subject" (*The Earl Cowper*) *May* 9, [187] 214; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

Hyde Park, Question, Mr. Ewart; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 12, [188] 1437; Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 15, 1517 [*cont.*

Metropolis—cont.

Hyde Park Review, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 1, [188] 772

Hyde Park—Stanhope Street Gate, Question, Lord Ebury; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *July* 25, [189] 76

Hyde Park—Threatened Meeting of the Reform League, Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 2, [189] 769

(See *Public Meetings in the Parks* infra)

Jurymen (*Metropolis*), Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, The Solicitor General *Mar* 1, [185] 1229

London Water Supply, Observations, Lord de Mauley; Reply, The Duke of Richmond *July* 15, [188] 1496

Marlborough House Gate, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 16, [189] 1608

Metropolitan Board of Works, Question, Mr. Treeby; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 9, [186] 1336; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 28, [188] 666

Metropolitan Improvements Bill, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 26, [186] 563

Metropolitan Local Government, &c., Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the Local Government and Local Taxation of the Metropolis" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *Feb* 12, [185] 300

And, on *Feb* 13, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Ayrton (Chairman), Mr. Bazley, Mr. Beecroft, Mr. Bentinck, Sir William Gallwey, Mr. Hanbury (Died, 30th March), Mr. Kekewich, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Alderman Lawrence, Mr. Locke, Lord John Manners, Mr. Mill, Mr. Sandford, Mr. Tite, and Mr. Turner

Reports—(*Parl. P.* No. 135, 268, 301)

Metropolitan Police Force, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *August* 13, [189] 1447

New Palace Yard and the Houses of Parliament, Question, Lord Lyveden; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 20, [187] 765; *May* 24, 1012

Park Lane and Halkin Street, Question, Sir Henry Winston-Barron; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 18, [185] 465; Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Lord John Manners *August* 16, [189] 1606

Poor Law

Bethnal Green Workhouse, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 13, [189] 1452

District Metropolitan Lunatic Asylums, Cost of Buildings, Question, Colonel Hogg; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 13, [189] 1450; *August* 16, 1605

Metropolitan Common Fund, Question, Lord Charles Bruce; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 6, [189] 957; Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 15, 1571

Metropolitan Poor Law Rating, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 28, [186] 726 [*cont.*

Metropolis—cont.

Metropolitan Poor Relief Act — Nominees, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 24, [188] 425

Poplar, Distress in, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 8, [186] 1266

Vagrancy in the Metropolis, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 21, [189] 1640

Public Meetings in the Parks, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *May* 20, [187] 778—*Opinion of the Law Officers,* Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 7, 95; Question, Mr. Neate; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 9, 257; Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, Mr. Walpole, 266

Public Parks—Seats in, Question, Mr. Ewart; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 31, [187] 1387

Regent's Park, Ornamental Water in, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Lord John Manners *Feb* 19, [185] 584; Question, Mr. Thomas Chambers; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 8, 1550

Stray Dogs, Questions, Sir P. O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 13, [189] 1452

Street Outrages, Preservation of the Peace—the Militia, Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 6, [187] 1664; *June* 14, 1860; Question, Colonel Biddulph; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 19, [188] 87

Theatres and Places of Public Amusement, Regulation of, Question, Lord Ernest Bruce; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 17, [187] 1983

Traffic Regulations — Waggons and Drays, Question, Mr. Read; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 24, [188] 428—*Removal of Bars,* Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 16, [189] 1608

University of London, The New Buildings—(See title *University of London*)

Ventilation of Sewers, Question, Sir George Stucley; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 6, [187] 1661

Victoria Park, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 30, [187] 1293

Metropolis Gas Bill
(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 22 [Bill 45]
Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *April* 4, [186] 1107
Moved, "That the Bill be read 2° upon Monday 29th April" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*) *April* 11, 1576
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "Monday 29th April," and add "this day six months" (*Mr. Edward Craufurd*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after further short debate, Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Ayrton*); A. 85, N. 48; M. 37; debate adjourned
Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *May* 2, 1878

Metropolis Gas Bill—cont.
Debate resumed *May* 2, 1913
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Ayrton*); Motion withdrawn; Amendt. and original Motion negatived; Motion agreed to; Bill read 2°
Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*), 1924; Motion withdrawn
Committee *; Report *May* 2 [Bill 129]
Considered as amended *May* 7, [187] 185
Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed to a Select Committee of Five Members" (*Sir Stafford Northcote*)
Amendt. after "Committee of," to insert "Seven Members" (*Mr. Ayrton*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Monk*); A. 53, N. 5; M. 48; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *May* 9, 361
Question, "That 'Seven Members' be there inserted," negatived; original Question agreed to
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Cardwell (Chairman), Mr. Goldney, Mr. Graham, Mr. J. Hardy (Dartmouth), Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. J. Peel (Tamworth); *May* 17, Mr. Graham disch.
Report of Select Committee *August* 8 (No. 520 & 521)

Metropolis Subways Bill
(*Mr. Tite, Colonel Hogg*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 8 [Bill 139]
Read 2° * *May* 30, and referred to a Select Committee
And, on *June* 6, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Tite (Chairman), Mr. Bagwell, Mr. R. W. Duff, Mr. Floyer, Viscount Galway, Mr. Grove, Mr. Jackson, Major Cornwall Legh, Mr. Paull, and Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens
Report of Select Committee *July* 12
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 29
Read 3° * *July* 31 [Bill 249]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Harrowby*) *August* 1
Read 2ª * and committed to a Select Committee *August* 6 (No. 279)

Metropolitan Buildings and Management Bill (*Mr. Tite, Colonel Hogg*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 31 [Bill 293]

Metropolitan Improvements Bill
(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Tite*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 26 [Bill 55]
Bill withdrawn *August* 14, [189] 1533

Metropolitan Municipal Government Bill
(*Mr. Mill, Mr. Thomas Hughes, Mr. Tomline*)

c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. J. S. Mill*) *August* 6, [189] 1040
After debate, Bill ordered; read 1° [Bill 303]

Metropolitan Police [*Salary of Receiver*]
Resolution * *May* 31; Report * *June* 3

[*cont.*

Metropolitan Police Bill
(*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 27 [Bill 171]
Read 2° * *May* 28
Committee * *May* 30—R.P.
Committee *; Report *June* 3
Read 3° * *June* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *June* 4
Read 2ª * *June* 7 (No. 135)
Committee *; Report *June* 18
Read 3ª * *June* 20 (No. 171)
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 39]

Metropolitan Poor Bill
(*Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Earle*)
185] *c.* Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 8, 150 [Bill 9]
Read 2° *Feb* 21, 746
Committee; Report *Mar* 7, 1510 [Bill 66]
Committee (*on re-comm.*) *Mar* 8, 1608; after debate—R.P.
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *Mar* 11, 1673
Considered as amended * *Mar* 13
Read 3° *Mar* 14, 1861
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *Mar* 15
186] Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 19, 102 (No. 45)
Committee; Report *Mar* 22, 388
Read 3ª, after short debate *Mar* 25, 465
Royal Assent *Mar* 29 [30 *Vict.* c. 6]

Metropolitan Water Supply Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. Lusk*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 22 [Bill 88]

Mexican Bondholders
Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 8, [185] 1547; *Mar* 21, [186] 279

Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian
Question, Mr. Butler; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 3, [187] 1495; Question, The Earl of Kimberley; Answer, The Earl of Malmes-
188] bury *July* 4, 964; Question, Earl Russell; Answer, The Earl of Derby, 976; Question, Mr. Sandford; Answer, Lord Stanley, 983; Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Corry, 984; Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington; Observations, Sir Lawrence Palk, 985; Question, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe; Answer, The Earl of Derby *July* 9, 1252; Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 11, 1393; Notice withdrawn (*Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*) *July* 19, 1709; short debate thereon

Middlesex Registry Office
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 2, [186] 1872; Moved, "That it is incumbent on Her Majesty's Government to institute inquiries with a view to the reform of the Middlesex Registry; and that, pending such inquiries, steps should be taken to put a stop to the receipt of illegal fees by the sinecure Registrars, and to prevent any appointment to the office of Registrar on a va-
[*cont.*

Middlesex Registry Office—cont.
cancy occurring" (*Mr. Childers*) *June* 18, [188] 80; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Resolved, That it is incumbent on Her Majesty's Government to institute inquiries with a view to the reform of the Middlesex Registry (*Mr. Childers*)
Parl. P—
Return of Fees, 1862 to 1866 . . 224
Report on Office 573

Milbank, Mr. F. A., *Yorkshire, N.R.*
Representation of the People, Comm. Schedule B, Amendt. [188] 1282, 1284; Consid. *add. cl.* 1452

Military at Elections (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Serjeant Barry, Major Esmonde, Mr. O'Beirne*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 14 [Bill 23]

Military Knights of Windsor
Question, Mr. Eykyn; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 30, [189] 474
Statutes relating to—(*Parl. P.* No. 327)

Military Reserve Funds
Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the origin of the Military Reserve Funds, the sources from which they are derived, and the objects to which they are applied" (*Lord Hotham*) *May* 14, [187] 557; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed
And, on *June* 19, Committee nominated as follows:—Lord Hotham (Chairman), Mr. Baxter, Mr. Childers, Mr. Goschen, The Marquess of Hartington, Colonel Hogg, Colonel North, Mr. O'Reilly, Colonel Wilson Patten, General Peel, Sir Charles Russell, Mr. Trevelyan, Sir John Trollope, Captain Vivian, and Mr. Percy Wyndham
Report presented *July* 22 (*Parl. P.* No. 453)
Account of 1866 65

Militia Bill (*Sir J. Pakington, Colonel Herbert*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *August* 8 [Bill 308]

Militia Pay Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered * *Mar* 18
Read 1° * *July* 29
Read 2° * *July* 31
Committee *; Report *August* 1
Read 3° * *August* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *August* 5
Read 2ª * *August* 6
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Read 3ª * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 92]

Militia Reserve Bill (*Sir John Pakington, Mr. Hunt, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 13 [Bill 149]
Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 21, [187] 880
[*cont.*

Militia Reserve Bill—cont.
Read 2° * *July* 25
Committee * ; Report *August* 5
Considered as amended * *August* 6
Read 3° * *August* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *August* 8
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Longford*) *August* 12, [189] 1328 ; Bill read 2ª (No. 314)
Committee * ; Report *August* 13
Read 3ª * *August* 15
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 111]

Militia, The
Courts Martial — Deserters, Question, Mr. Owen Stanley ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 20, [187] 776 ; *May* 24, 1023
Militia Regiments, Address for a Return of all Regiments of Militia in the United Kingdom ; and other particulars (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *Mar* 29, [186] 804 ; after debate, Motion agreed to—(*Parl. P.* No. 134)
Quartermasters, Question, Major Walker ; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 18, [185] 467
Training, Question, Earl Cowper ; Answer, The Earl of Longford *Mar* 8, [185] 1545
(See *Army*)

MILL, Mr. J. Stuart, *Westminster*
Associations of Workmen, 2R. [186] 1452
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1572
Declaration of Paris, 1856, [189] 876
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [189] 1382
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 983, 991
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1157
Ireland — Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1894
Jamaica—Recent Court Martial in, [189] 598
Libel, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [188] 546
Martial Law—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Res. [188] 912
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1888, 1890 ; Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1482
Metropolitan Municipal Government, Leave, [189] 1040
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 5, [185] 1608 ; *cl.* 9, 1616 ; *cl.* 45, 1678, 1680 ; *cl.* 55, 1685 ; *cl.* 79, 1696 ; 3R. 1861
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [187] 882, 891
Navy—Commodore Wiseman and the Turkish Navy, [188] 1621, 1622, 1873
Parliament—Public Business, [186] 1321 ;—Meeting in the Tea Room, [189] 768, 769
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1492 ; *cl.* 3, [187] 280, 738 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *817, 842, 1142 ; *cl.* 34, 1185 ; Amendt. 1188 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1343, 1362 ; *cl.* A, [188] 635 ; *add. cl.* 1024, 1026, 1029, 1102 ; 3R. 1579 ; Lords Amendts. *cl.* C, [189] 1192
Straits Settlement, [185] 1606
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 99
Supply—Public Education, [189] 373

MILLER, Mr. W., *Leith, &c.*
Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh), 2R. [185] 667, 668
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1410
Scotland—Gunpowder at Leith, &c. [187] 91
Standards of Weights and Measures, [185] 466

MILLS, Mr. J. Remington, *Wycombe* (*Chepping*)
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 230
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188] 1415
Ecclesiastical Establishments in the West Indies, [186] 887 ; [189] 171
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 483
Metropolis — Bunhill Fields Cemetery, [185] 1229
West India Bishops and Clergy, Leave, [186] 1825 ; [188] 1878

Millwall Ironworks Company
Question, Mr. Weguelin ; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 15, [185] 1916

MILTON, Viscount, *Yorkshire, W.R.—S.*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 36, [188] 299

Mines
Select Committee appointed, "To inquire into the operation of the Acts for the Regulation and Inspection of Mines, and into the complaints contained in Petitions from Miners of Great Britain with reference thereto, which were presented to the House during Session 1865" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *Feb* 8
And, on *March* 14, Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Neate (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Bromley, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Clive, Viscount Cranborne, General Dunne, Sir Philip Egerton, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. William Orme Foster, Mr. Greenall, Mr. Kinnaird, Mr. Liddell, Mr. Powell, Mr. Hussey Vivian, and Mr. Woods
Report presented *July* 31 (*Parl. P.* No. 496)
Observations, Mr. G. Clive *Mar* 22, [186] 400 ; Reply, Mr. Walpole, 408 ; discussion thereon

Mines, &c. Assessment Bill
(*Mr. Percy Wyndham, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Henderson*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° *Feb* 19, [185] 649 [Bill 33]
Read 2°, after long debate, and committed to a Select Committee *April* 10, [186] 1431
Committee nominated as follows :—Mr. Percy Wyndham (Chairman), Mr. Beach, Lord George Cavendish, Lord Eustace Cecil, Mr. Colvile, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Kekewich, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Liddell, Mr. Read, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. St. Aubyn, and Mr. Villiers
Instruction moved (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *May* 6, [187] 71
Re-comm. * *June* 25—R.P. [Bill 174]
Re-comm. * *July* 2—R.P.
Bill withdrawn * *July* 24

MINISTERS—*Resignation of Members of the Cabinet*
Ministerial Explanations, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 4, [185] 1284; Question, Mr. Osborne; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1309, 1323; Statement, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 5, 1339; long debate thereon; Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, 1573

Missionaries, Grants to—Return
Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 21, [185] 726

MITCHELL, Mr. A., *Berwick-on-Tweed*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [187] 1973, 1976

MITFORD, Mr. W. T., *Midhurst*
Cattle Plague, [187] 693
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, [188] 452; *cl.* A, 622

Mixed Marriages (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, Mr. Cogan*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *April* 9, [186] 1374
Second Reading * *May* 7; Debate adjourned
Adjourned debate resumed *May* 8, [187] 213
After short debate, Bill read 2° [Bill 120]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 1

MOFFATT, Mr. G., *Southampton*
Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1882
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1560
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. Amendt. [189] 476, 482; Schedules, 484
Sale and Purchase of Shares, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 102
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 700, 704

Moldavia—Persecution of Jews
Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 3, [187] 1497
Motion for an Address (*Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*) *July* 1, [188] 746; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Explanation, Lord Denman *July* 2, 848
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 5, To leave out from "That" and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of further Correspondence relating to the persecution of Jews in Moldavia" (*Sir Francis Goldsmid*), 1136; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 23, 2071; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 26, [189] 173; *August* 8, 1101
Parl. P. *l.* . . . . . . [2128]
Correspondence . . . [2222]

MONCK, Lord
British North America, 2R. [185] 579
Colonial Churches, [186] 385
Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1324

MONCREIFF, Right Hon. J., *Edinburgh*
Annuity Tax Abolition (Edinburgh), 2R. [185] 669
Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1885
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [188] 487
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 904
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 206; Comm. *cl.* 4, 757
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 407, 1499
Scotland—Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), [187] 693
Canongate Church, Edinburgh, [185] 1704
Education, [188] 343
Representation of the People, [186] 2020

Monetary Laws
Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 8, [185] 147

MONK, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester*
Army Estimates — Barrack Establishment, [187] 1748, 1750
Manufacturing Departments, [187] 1711, 1714
Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1711, 1714
Banns of Matrimony, [185] 1800; [186] 902; [187] 4; Leave, 362; 2R. [188] 926
Canada Railway Loan, 2R. [186] 972
Cattle Plague—Cattle Market at Gloucester, [186] 735
County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. [188] 1914
Crete—Affairs of, [188] 173;—Insurrection in, 269
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [187] 1365
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. [189] 5; Amendt. 1072
Marriage Law Commission Report, [187] 938
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1895
Metropolis Gas, Consid. Motion for Adjournment, [187] 186
Parliament — Public Business—Standing Orders, [187] 1133
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 35, [187] 1202; Amendt. 1206; *cl.* 40, [188] 483; *add. cl.* 807, 808, 810, 882; Amendt. 1026, 1029, 1036, 1213
Ritual Commission—Report, [189] 1639
Supply—Brehon Laws (Ireland), [188] 1905
Consuls Abroad, [188] 1900
Embassy House, Constantinople, Amendt. [188] 1705, 1706
Miscellaneous Expenses, [188] 1907

MONSELL, Right Hon. W., *Limerick Co.*
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1678
Promotion in the, Res. [189] 337
Snider Ammunition, [187] 1493
Birmingham Riots, [188] 17, 88
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 41, [186] 1164, 1165
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 599

[*cont.*

MONSELL, Right Hon. W.—*cont.*
Ireland—Church Revenues Commission, [189] 602
  Disturbances in, [185] 1418
  Established Church — The Commission, [188] 983
  Galway Harbour, Comm. [187] 68
  Railways, [189] 606, 615, 616
  Rewards to Constabulary, [186] 415
  State of, [189] 219
  Taxation, Res. [188] 1302
  Trinity College, Dublin, Res. Amendt. [188] 58, 73 ; [189] 23
Irish Peerage—The Royal Prerogative, Motion for an Address, [188 1135
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1390
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1647
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1097
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1759
Tramways (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 68

MONTAGU, Right Hon. Lord R. († Vice President of the Committee of Privy Council for Education), *Huntingdonshire*
† Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 15, [189] 763
† Art Unions, [186] 815
† Bermuda—Yellow Fever, [186] 561
† Brown's Charity, [189] 169
† Cattle Plague, [186] 566, 731 ; [187] 6 ; [189] 79, 80, 81, 1105, 1609, 1610
†   Cattle Market at Gloucester, [186] 735
†   Cattle Pass, [188] 16
†   Cattle Trade, [188] 1623
†   Chartered Cattle Markets, [189] 168, 169
†   Compensation for Slaughtered Cattle, [186] 1230
†   Exhibitions of Live Stock, [186] 1338; Res. 2014
†   Foreign Cattle, [187] 92, 391, 879, 1129; —In the Metropolis, 694, 777, 1291, 1292, 1295
†   Importation of Foreign Cattle, [186] 1106 ; [188] 350, 666
†   Removal of Manure, [188] 1436
† Clifton-on-Dunsmore Plot Rents, [187] 372, 772
† Contagious Diseases (Animals), [188] 1728 ; [189] 86 ; Comm. 991 ; *cl.* 4, 999 ; *cl.* 9, 1000, 1001 ; *cl.* 12, 1002 ; *cl.* 45, 1424, 1428, 1516, 1521; Amendt. 1522 ; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1523, 1524, 1525
† Department of Science and Art, [187] 936
† Education—In America and Canada, [187] 880
†   Inspection of Schools, [188] 170
†   National, [186] 2000
†   School Building Grants, [188] 1187
†   Technical, in Foreign Countries, [189] 598
† Educational Building Grants, [187] 1659, 1660
† Endowed Schools Commission, [187] 1294
† Infectious Diseases, Motion for an Address, [186] 1993
† Ireland—Appointment of Sir R. Kane, [189] 960
†   Charity Commission and Trinity College, Dublin, [188] 169
†   Museum of Irish Industry, [188] 1517
† Liverpool, Importation of Cattle into, Res. [189] 631, 633, 634
† Merton College, [188] 1439
[*cont.*

MONTAGU, Right Hon. Lord R.—*cont.*
† Metropolis—Ventilation of Sewers, [187] 1661
† National Gallery Pictures (South Kensington Museum), Motion for an Address, [188] 539
Naval Yards, [185] 405
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 626
† Paris Exhibition, [187] 619, 620
†   Expenses of the, [187] 623
†   Purchase of Articles, [187] 693
† Quarantine at Southampton, [186] 1108
Representation of the People—The Resolutions, [185] 337, 338
† Sanitary Report, [189] 1338
† Scotland—Education, [188] 321, 343
† Supply—Charity Commission, [187] 925
†   Department of Science and Art, [189] 1228, 1238, 1240
†   Paris Exhibition—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1261
†   Public Education, [189] 353, 379
†   Quarantine Establishment, [187] 928
  Royal Palaces, [185] 500
† Tancred's Charities, [189] 86
† Universal Catalogue of Art Books, [187] 392, 393, 394, 615, 616, 617
† Utilization of Sewage Act, [186] 908
† Vaccination, [186] 1878 ; [187] 776 ; Comm. 1863, 1877 ; 3R. [188] 651
† Veterinary Congress at Vienna, [189] 1104

MONTGOMERY, Sir G. G. (Lord of the Treasury), *Peeblesshire*
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 913
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), Leave, [185] 1088
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 757
Lyon King of Arms (Scotland), 2R. [185] 1867
Public Health (Scotland), Leave, [186] 559 ; 2R. 1318, 1925
Railways (Scotland), 2R. [187] 1011
Representation of the People (Scotland), Leave, [187] 441
Scotland—Annuity Tax (Edinburgh), [187] 693
  Collection of Fees, [188] 769
  Judicial Annual Returns, [189] 1564, 1565
  Steam Ferries between Granton and Burntisland, [188] 1389
Supply—Board of Fisheries (Scotland), [188] 1904, 1905

MONTROSE, Duke of (Postmaster General)
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), Comm. [185] 1431
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, [188] 1423
North British Railway (Carlisle Deviations), 3R. [189] 524
Postal—Conventions with the United States, India, and China, [189] 1200
Railway Companies, Comm. [189] 161
Railway Traffic Protection, Comm. [186] 118

MORE, Mr. R. J., *Shropshire, S.*
Financial Statement, [186] 1146
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 548, 552, 556
Representation of the People, Consid. *add. cl.* [188] 1451

Morley, Earl of
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1080
Public Schools, 3R. [185] 1546
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1822, 1823

Morris, Right Hon. M. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Galway Bo.*
Ireland—Court of Admiralty, [185] 1447
Morris, John, Release of, Motion for Papers, [185] 1242
Salmon Fisheries, [185] 1915
Waterford Election, [185] 1804

Morris, Mr. G., *Galway Bo.*
Ireland—Galway Harbour, Comm. [187] 68 ;—Distress in Connemara, 93

Morrison, Mr. W., *Plymouth*
Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot, Res. [189] 103
Egypt—Viceroy of, Visit of the, [188] 854
Greenland, Edward, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 876
Gurney, George Edward, Case of, [188] 425
Ireland—Tipperary and Waterford Elections, Res. [189] 112
Limited Liability Acts, Motion for a Committee, [185] 1380
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1921
Representation of the People, [186] 1104; Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1359 ; *add. cl.* [188] 873, 1074, 1204 : Preamble, 1290
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 704
Totnes Election Commission Report, [186] 725 ; Res. 1370, 1372
Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1251

Morro Velho Marriages Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *June* 27 (No. 182)
Read 2ª * *July* 4
Committee * ; Report *July* 5
Read 3ª * *July* 8
c. Read 1° * *July* 18 [Bill 265]
Read 2° * *July* 19
Committee * *July* 22—R.P.
Committee * ; Report *July* 23
Considered as amended * *July* 24
Read 3° * *July* 25
l. Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 93]

Mortmain, Law of
Question, Mr. Hadfield ; Answer, The Attorney General *Feb* 19, [185] 583

Mowbray, Right Hon. J. R. (Judge Advocate General), *Durham City*
Army—Articles of War, Res. [187] 1670
Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1958, 1961
Regimental Courts Martial, [188] 16
Bunhill Fields Burial Ground, Leave, [186] 997
Ecclesiastical Commission, [186] 4
Dean and Chapter of Westminster, [186] 1266 ; [187] 94, 1024
Non-Capitular Stipends, Motion for Papers, [187] 897
[*cont.*

Mowbray, Right Hon. J. R.—*cont.*
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 327
Jamaica—Courts Martial in, [185] 933
Metropolis—Bunhill Fields Cemetery, [185] 1229
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 210
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 10, [186] 767 ; *add. cl.* 789, 916
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 15, [187] 1994 ; [188] 36, 37, 38, 41, 44
St. Edmunds, Dudley, [189] 1592

Municipal Corporations Charities Bill
(*Mr. Richard Young, Mr. William E. Forster*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Feb* 28 [Bill 60]
Moved, "That the Bill be read 2° upon the 19th day of June next" (*Mr. R. Young*) *May* 8, [187] 208
Amendt. to leave out from "That the" and add "Order for the Second Reading of the said Bill be discharged" (*Viscount Galway*) ; Question, "That the words, &c. ;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; Bill to be read 2° upon 19th June
Bill withdrawn * *June* 19

Municipal Corporations (Metropolis) Bill
(*Mr. Mill, Mr. Thomas Hughes, Mr. Tomline*)
c. Ordered, after short debate ; read 1° *May* 21, [187] 882 [Bill 166]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 19

Murder Law Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° *Feb* 14, [185] 359 [Bill 25]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Murphy, Mr. N. D., *Cork City*
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), 3R. [188] 1911
District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [188] 1915
Ireland—Docks in Cork Harbour, [185] 460 ;—Established Church, Res. [187] 137
Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1867
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1646 ; Comm. Amendt. [188] 918
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 553

Muscat, Imaum of
Question, Sir T. F. Buxton ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 11, [186] 1478

Mutiny Bill
(*Sir John Pakington, Judge Advocate General*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 15
Read 2° * *Mar* 18
Committee *Mar* 28, [186] 764—R.P.
Committee ; Report *April* 1, 912
Considered as amended * *April* 2
Read 3° * *April* 3
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Longford*) *April* 4
Read 2ª *April* 5, 1167
Committee * ; Report *April* 9
Read 3ª * *April* 9
Royal Assent *April* 12 [30 *Vict.* c. 13]

Naas, Right Hon. Lord (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *Cockermouth*
Bridges (Ireland), 2R. [186] 796, 797
British North America, [185] 1091
Cattle Plague, [186] 1479
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Re-comm. *cl.* 35, [188] 1250
District Lunatic Asylums Officers (Ireland), Leave, [188] 1314, 1316; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1915; *cl.* 3, *ib*
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, 2R. [187] 572; Comm. 1364, 1366; [188] 652
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 597
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [185] 690; 2R. 727; Comm. *cl.* 1, 898, 903
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), Leave, [187] 897; 2R. 945, 961
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. [186] 558; [188] 119
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 876
Black Death, [187] 1660
Carlow Lunatic Asylum, [188] 1189, 1190
Charitable Bequests, [185] 469
Church Revenues Commission, [189] 602
College of Science, Dublin, [189] 848
Constabulary Barracks, Defence of, [188] 603
Constabulary, Employment of the, [185] 1028
Constabulary Superannuation, [186] 890
"Cork Herald" Reporter, [185] 1234
Court of Admiralty, [187] 770
Court of Exchequer, [186] 1174
Curragh of Kildare, [187] 1491
Dietary in County Prisons, Res. [189] 176
Distress in Connemara, [187] 93, 395, 692, 940, 1662, 1742
Distress in West Galway, [186] 1786; [188] 605
Disturbances in, Rewards to Constabulary, [186] 420
Drainage Improvements, [187] 388, 389
Dublin Metropolitan Police, [187] 263
Education Commissioners, [185] 720
Established Church, Res. [187] 157, 166;—Commission, [188] 983
Fenian Disturbances in, [185] 469, 470, 1419
Fenian Drilling in Wicklow, [188] 989
Fenian Prisoners, [185] 813; [186] 732, 1953, 1989;—Death Sentence on, [187] 90, 390, 1664
Fenianism, Alleged Abetting of—Professor Thompson, [187] 621, 622, 777
Holyhead Mail Packets, [187] 1021
Importation of Cattle, [187] 1022, 1023;—Sheep, [189] 849
Inspectors of County, &c. Prisons, [186] 1106
Inspectors of Weights and Measures, [185] 1239; Motion for a Committee, [186] 413
Jennings, Richard, Case of, [189] 852
Kirwan, John, Escape of, [186] 1583
Land Bills, [187] 397
Landed Estates, Res. [188] 1633
Lunatic Asylums, [189] 1219
Maginn, Rev. Mr., [186] 395, 471, 1484, 1485
Management of City Prisons, [186] 1103
Military at Downpatrick, [189] 600, 601

[*cont.*

Naas, Right Hon. Lord—*cont.*
Moriarty, Bishop, Explanation, [185] 1090
Morris, John, Release of, Motion for Papers, [185] 1241
Mountjoy Convict Prison, [186] 1933
National Education, [186] 1704; [187] 620; [189] 1267, 1283, 1285
Pawnbroking System in Dublin, [187] 370
Petty Sessions Clerks, [189] 104
Pollution of Rivers, [187] 773
Poor Law Medical Salaries, [189] 329
Poor Relief, [187] 881
Public Records, [185] 213
Queen's University, [187] 4, 1439, 1463
Railways, [186] 1874; [189] 612
Reform Bill, [185] 585
Salters' Company, [187] 253, 769
Sea Coast Fisheries, [189] 850
State of, [189] 183, 210, 227
Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, [186] 470; [188] 2072
Tipperary and Waterford Elections, Res. [189] 112
Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [188] 66, 1623; [189] 12, 19
Tyrone Magistrates, [186] 911, 1709; [187] 1935; [188] 856, 1875
Unenclosed Burial Grounds, [189] 2
Valuation of Counties, [189] 1103
Vartry Waterworks, [185] 469, 1146
Walsh, Dennis, Case of, [188] 605
Weights and Measures (Dublin), [187] 769; [188] 1622
Irish Peerage—The Royal Prerogative, Motion for an Address, [188] 1134
Land Improvement and Leasing (Ireland), Leave, [185] 530
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1111, 1120
Records (Ireland), Leave, [187] 562
Representation of the People (Ireland), Leave, [186] 1353; [187] 526, 779
Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1647; Comm. [188] 921
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1096; Comm. [187] 212, 605
Supply—Hospitals (Dublin), [188] 1490
National Gallery (Ireland), [189] 1242
Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1680
Poor Law Commissioners, [187] 859
Public Education (Ireland), [189] 908
Queen's Colleges (Ireland), [189] 1242
Queen's University (Ireland), [188] 1707; [189] 1241
Rewards to Irish Constabulary, [186] 894, 896
Royal Irish Academy, [189] 1242
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 530, 554, 555; [186] 290; 2R. 1162, 1711, 1779, 1781; [187] 881
Vice President of the Board of Trade, Re-comm. [187] 477

Nantlle Railway Company
Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 26, [186] 562

National Art Collections
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 1, To leave out from "That" and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to

[*cont.*

National Art Collections—cont.
give directions for the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider and report what portions of the National collections of Fine Arts ought to be exhibited in the New National Gallery in Trafalgar Square, and other Museums, &c." (*Mr. William Cowper*), [189] 634; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

National Debt Acts Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to *April* 5
Resolution reported; Bill ordered; read 1° * *April* 8 [Bill 114]
Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 30, [186] 1787
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°," *May* 16, [187] 623
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "a further reduction of the Duty on Fire Insurances, to which this House is already pledged, would be a better mode of disposing of a portion of the surplus of Ways and Means for the present year than the creation of Terminable Annuities proposed by the present Bill" (*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan*); after long debate, Question put; A. 162 N. 38; M. 124; Bill read 2°
Committee*; Report *May* 20
Read 3° * *May* 21
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *May* 23
Read 2ª; Committee negatived *May* 27
Read 3ª * *May* 28 (No. 111)
Royal Assent *May* 31 [30 *Vict.* c. 26]

National Gallery Enlargement Bill
(*Lord John Manners, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 19, [186] 159 [Bill 82]
Read 2° * and referred to a Select Committee *April* 2
And, on *May* 14, Committee nominated as follows:—Lord John Manners (Chairman), Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. William Cowper, Mr. Dalglish, Captain Grosvenor, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Charles Howard, Major Jervis, Sir John Johnstone, Mr. Repton, and Sir Matthew Ridley
Report of Select Committee *May* 27 [Bill 169]
Committee * *June* 3—R.P.
Committee * *June* 4; Report * *June* 5
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 6
Read 3° * *June* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 7
Read 2ª * *June* 18 (No. 150)
Committee *; Report *June* 21
Read 3ª * *June* 24
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 41]

National Gallery Pictures (*South Kensington Museum*)
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Report of the Committee appointed by the Science and Art Department, to inquire into the alleged deterioration of the Pictures belonging to the National Gallery deposited at the South Kensington Museum" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *June* 25, [188] 539; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

National Gallery, The New
Question, Mr. Julian Goldsmid; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 11, [185] 1644
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "there be laid before this House a Copy of any further Correspondence between the Architects and the First Commissioner of Works relative to the competition for the New National Gallery" (*Mr. Goldsmid*), [186] 819; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
(*Parl. P.* No. 91, 176, 196)

Naval Knights of Windsor Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 22 (No. 252)
Read 2ª * *July* 25
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 29
c. Read 1° * *August* 5 [Bill 300]
Read 2° * *August* 9
Committee; Report; Read 3° *August* 10, [189] 1300
l. Royal Assent *August* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 100]

Naval Stores Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 18 (No. 160)
Read 2ª * *June* 24
Committee *; Report *June* 25
Read 3ª * *June* 27
c. Read 1° * *June* 28 [Bill 214]
Read 2° * *July* 4
Committee *; Report *July* 8
Considered as amended * *July* 11
Read 3° * *July* 12
Bill withdrawn * *July* 18

Naval Stores (No. 2) Bill
(*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Read 1ª * *July* 18 (No. 234)
Read 2ª * *July* 22
Committee *; Report *July* 23
Read 3ª * *July* 25
c. Read 1° * *July* 26 [Bill 289]
Read 2° * *July* 29
Committee *; Report *July* 31
Considered as amended * *August* 1
Read 3° * *August* 2
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 119]

NAVY
Admiralty Contracts—Marine Engines, Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Corry *August* 14, [189] 1516; *August* 15, 1568
Admiralty Steering and Sailing Rules, Question, Mr. Holland; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 22, [185] 809
Board of Admiralty, Constitution of the, Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. Corry *July* 4, [188] 980

[cont.

Navy—cont.

Brand, Lieutenant, Question, Mr. Osborne; Answer, Mr. Buxton *Feb* 28, [185] 1143; Question, Mr. Osborne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 1, 1238
Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* No. 108)

Chain Cables and Anchors, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Mar* 14, [185] 1804

Chief Admiralty Chemist at Portsmouth Dockyard, Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. Corry *August* 15, [189] 1559

Clare, Mr., Claims of, Question, Mr. Bazley; Answer, Mr. Corry *Mar* 26, [186] 563

Contract for Gunboats, Question, Mr. Henderson; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 1, [185] 1231; Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. Corry *July* 15, [188] 1512

Courts Martial — Sentences, Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Mar* 1, [185] 1234

Dockyard Accounts, Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. Corry *July* 8, [188] 1190

Dockyards — Recommendations of the Royal Commission, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 15, [185] 405

Dockyards, Resolution (*Mr. Seely*) *Feb* 19, [185] 588—(See title *Dockyards*)

"Gannet," H.M.S., and the "Arouca," Question, Mr. Lamont; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 7, [185] 87

Greenwich Hospital, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 5, To leave out from "That," and add "the cost of management of Greenwich Hospital is too great, and ought to be reduced" (*Mr. Seely*), [189] 853; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Returns—(*Parl. P.* No. 558)

Greenwich Hospital Accounts, Question, Mr. Seely; Answer, Mr. Corry *Mar* 28, [186] 736

Greenwich Hospital and School—see *Supply*

Greenwich Hospital— Girls School, Question, Mr. Stone; Answer, Mr. Corry *May* 9, [187] 254

Greenwich Hospital—Merchant Seamen's Hospital, Question, Sir Charles Bright; Answer, Mr. Du Cane *Mar* 14, [185] 1803; Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Corry *April* 12, [186] 1584; Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *August* 16, [189] 1612

"Greenwich Sixpence," The, Question, Mr. Trevelyan; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 25, [185] 936; Observations, Mr. Trevelyan; Reply, Mr. Childers *June* 7, [187] 1733—(*Parl. P.* No. 168, 350)

Henwood's Sea-going Monitors, Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Lord H. Lennox *August* 5, [189] 869

Lieutenants, Motion for Return of the Number of Lieutenants on the Active List of the Navy in Each Year from 1856 to 1867: And also, Return showing the Number of Lieutenants employed in each year from 1856 to 1867 (*The Duke of Somerset*) *Mar* 29, [186] 813; after short debate, agreed to
Return—(*Parl. P.* No. 79)

Lime and Bude Lights, Question, Mr. Kendall; Answer, Mr. Corry *August* 1, [189] 602

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*

Marine Depôt at Deal, Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Mr. Corry *August* 15, [189] 1569

Naval Arsenals and Dockyards — Defences, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 15, [189] 1566

Naval Cadets—Corporal Punishment of, Question, Mr. Bass; Answer, Mr. Corry *June* 3, [187] 1490; *July* 25, [189] 82

Naval Engineers, Observations, Sir Edward Dering; Reply, Lord Henry Lennox *Mar* 21, [186] 311

Naval Reserve—Shipping Masters, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 24, [187] 1021

Naval Review, Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 11, [188] 1396; Question, Mr. Samuda; Answer, Mr. Corry *July* 19, 1724—*The Naval Reserve at the,* Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Corry *August* 1, [189] 599

Naval Savings Bank, Question, Mr. Kinnaird; Answer, Mr. Corry *May* 21, [187] 876

Naval Squadron (West Coast of Africa), Moved, "That the maintenance of the Naval Squadron on the West Coast of Africa, as it has hitherto been placed, is no longer expedient" (*Sir Hervey Bruce*) *July* 23, [188] 2074; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Naval Yards—Recommendation of the Royal Commission, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 15, [185] 405

Officers' Leave, Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Mr. Corry *June* 17, [187] 1934

Paddle-Wheel Steamers, Moved, "That there be laid before this House, a Copy of a Submission of the Comptroller of the Navy to the Board of Admiralty, and a Memorandum thereon by Admiral Sir Frederick Grey, on the building of Paddle-wheel Steamers, dated 1866" (*Mr. Shaw-Lefevre*) *Mar* 19, [186] 207; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Pay, Increase of, to Labourers in the Dockyards and to the Marines, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Mr. Corry *May* 7, [187] 94

Promotions in the Navy, Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 14, [185] 343
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 21, To leave out from "That," and add "the promotion by the First Lord of the Admiralty of a junior Lieutenant in the Navy without any special or distinguished service, over the heads of hundreds of meritorious Lieutenants senior to him in the Service, is prejudicial to the public interests" (*Mr. Hanbury-Tracy*), [186] 293; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Promotions—(*Parl. P.* (No. 179)

Promotion, Service in the Coastguard, Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Mr. Corry *July* 25, [189] 82

Reserved Captains, Question, Mr. B. Cochrane Answer, Mr. Corry *June* 20, [188] 165

Roman Catholics, Observations, Mr. O'Reilly; Reply, Lord Henry Lennox *Mar* 21, [186] 315; discussion thereon

Royal Marine Artillery and Light Infantry, Question, Mr. Stone; Answer, Mr. Corry *April* 4, [186] 1102

[*cont.*

NAVY—cont.
Sayer's, Commander, Life Boat, Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Sir John Pakington *Feb* 18, [185] 476
Shipbuilding, &c., Motion for Returns (*The Duke of Somerset*) *Feb* 8, [185] 120; after debate, Motion amended, and agreed to
Returns—(*Parl. P.* No. 34)
Staff Commanders and Masters, Question, Sir Lawrence Palk; Answer, Lord Henry Lennox *Mar* 18, [186] 5
Swan, Claim of Assistant-Commissary General, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, Mr. Corry *May* 2, [186] 1873
Tenders for Engines, Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Corry *August* 14, [189] 1516; *August* 15, 1568
Twin Screws, Memorial of Mr. G. Gill, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Corry *August* 5, [189] 848

Navy Estimates—see *Supply*

NEATE, Mr. C., *Oxford City*
Associations of Workmen, Leave, [185] 299; 2R. [186] 1448
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 236
Commons Inclosure Act Amendment, 2R. [189] 521
Consecration of Churches and Churchyards, Consid. *add. cl.* [189] 1594
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 5, [185] 1763
Cuncanon, Martin, Case of, [189] 1629
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 978
Fees to the Legal and Medical Professions, [187] 940
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1158
Game Protection (Scotland), 2R. [187] 912
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, Amendt. [186] 1963, 1987; [187] 257, 258; [189] 769
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 1072
Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1898;—Dietary in County Prisons, [189] 180
Libel, Re-comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. [188] 539; *cl.* 4, 544; *add. cl.* 545; 3R. [189] 1068
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1882; Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 464
"Mermaid," Destruction of the Ship, Motion for an Address, [188] 1754
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1618; *cl.* 44, 1677, 1678; *cl.* 59, 1685
Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 368
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1619, 1626
Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1417
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 472, 749; *cl.* 4, 999; *cl.* 34, 1179; *cl.* 10, 1978; *cl.* 29, [188] 208; *cl.* 40, 466, 482; Motion for Adjournment, 484, 486; *cl.* 43, 514; *add. cl.* 792, 795, 796, 808, 810, 892; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1458; *cl.* 46, 1470; Lords Amendts. *cl.* 4, [189] 1122
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1141, 1397; Comm. [186] 98
Scott, James, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 1514
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [186] 1437
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1216, 1220
[*cont.*

NEATE, Mr. C.—*cont.*
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1408
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 195; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 994, 995
Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1652
Vice President of the Board of Trade, Recomm. [187] 477
Wales—Holyhead Union, [185] 810
Walpole, Mr., Resignation of, [187] 398
Witnesses (House of Commons), Motion for Papers, [186] 1376, 1382

NELSON, Earl
Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 503
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 13, [187] 1193; *add. cl.* 1196

NEVILLE-GRENVILLE, Mr. R., *Somersetshire, E.*
Army Estimates—Disembodied Militia, [187] 1752
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1524
Paris Exhibition, [185] 897
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1511; *cl.* 31, [188] 535; *add. cl.* 841, 872, 883, 897; Schedule D, Amendt. 1289
Supply—Agricultural Statistics, [188] 1906
Houses of Parliament, [188] 1695
Paris Exhibition, Department of Science and Art, [189] 1260, 1261
Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1692
Totnes Elections, Res. [186] 1368
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1413

New Courts of Justice—see *Courts of Justice, The New*

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
Agricultural Children's Education, Leave, [187] 561
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1025
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1478
Army—Ordnance Department, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1812
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 240
Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 206
Commutation of Church Rates, Leave, [185] 294, 295; * 2R. [186] 250
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [189] 475; Comm. *cl.* 9, 1000; Amendt. 1001; *cl.* 45, Amendt. 1430
County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 7, [188] 1912; *cl.* 29, 1914
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 368; 2R. [187] 565, 572, 882; [188] 507; [189] 1223, 1224, * 1614
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [187] 1364, 1365, 1366, 1495, 1496; Motion for Adjournment, [188] 487, 652
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 913
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 978
Holy See and Russia, [185] 147
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1653
[*cont.*

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N.—*cont.*
Ireland—Established Church, Res. [187] 179
Fenianism, [186] 1931 ; [187] 15
Lord Mayor's Banquet—Cardinal Cullen, [185] 933, 1001
Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 79 ; [189] 27
Libel, 2R. [185] 1730 ; 3R. [189] 1059, 1067
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1888 ; Comm. 2033 ; Re-comm. [189] 403, 1579
Mixed Marriages (Ireland), Leave, [186] 1376
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 209
Offices and Oaths, Leave, [185] 114 ; 2R. 1093 ; Amendt. 1102, 1107 ; Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 210, 211 ; *cl.* 1, 1391, 1398 ; Consid. 1580
Parliament—Public Business, [188] 776;—Custody of Petitions, [189] 1044, 1045, 1047
Railway Debenture Holders, 2R. [185] 787
Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites), Consid. [186] 798
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1272, 1273, 1501 ; *cl.* 3, [187] 26, 806 ; *cl.* 4, 1008, 1166, 1174, 1175 ; *cl.* 8, 1300 ; *cl.* 9, 1405, 1522, 1540, 1783 ; *cl.* 10, 1951, 1979, 1984 ; *cl.* 29, [188] 220 ; *cl.* 40, 447 ; *cl.* 31, 530 ; *cl.* A, 617 ; *add. cl.* 784, 1088, 1093, 1195, 1226, 1238 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1449 ; *cl.* 3, 1455 ; 3R. 1593 ; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* C, [189] 1193
* Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. Amendt. [188] 943
Scott, James, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 1509, 1514
Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 591
Supply—Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 686
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1780, 1784
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [186] 1442 ; 3R. [188] 85
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Leave, [185] 111 ; 2R. 1092, 1093 ; Comm. Amendt. [186] 1408, 1414 ; 3R. [187] 574

New Forest, The—Licenses to Shoot
Question, Colonel Hamlyn Fane ; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 9, [186] 1335
Enclosures under Deer Removal Act, Petitions presented (*Viscount Eversley*) *August* 12, [189] 1304 ; short debate thereon
Return—(*Parl. P. l.* 329, *c.* 430)

New Parishes and Church Building Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Archbishop of York*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª* *June* 7 (No. 146)
Read 2ª* *June* 25

New Peers
New Peers Introduced
Feb 5 — Charles Stanley Baron Monck of Ballytrammon in the County of Wexford
Gustavus Frederick Baron Brancepeth of Brancepeth in the County Palatine of Durham
Mar 1 — The Right Honourable Duncan McNeill, Baron Colonsay of Colonsay and Oronsay in the County of Argyll
The Right Honourable Sir Hugh McCalmont Cairns, Knight, Baron Cairns of Garmoyle in the County of Antrim

Sat First
Feb 5—The Marquess Camden, after the Death of his Father
The Earl of Chesterfield, after the Death of his Father
Feb 7—The Marquess of Exeter, after the Death of his Father
Feb 8—The Lord Tyrone, after the Death of his Father
Feb 22—The Duke of Brandon, after the Death of his Father
Mar 14—The Lord Feversham, after the Death of his Father
Mar 21—The Earl of Rosslyn, after the Death of his Father
Mar 29—The Earl of Eldon, after the Death of his Father
April 2—The Earl of Camperdown, after the Death of his Father
May 2—The Lord Rivers, after the Death of his Brother
May 17—The Earl of Brownlow, after the Death of his Brother
The Lord Northbrook, after the Death of his Father
May 24—The Lord Vernon, after the Death of his Father
July 22—The Lord Kingston, after the Death of his Brother
August 16—The Lord Willoughby d'Eresby, after the Death of his Father

New Writs
Issued during the Recess
Feb 5 — *For* Brecknock Borough, *v.* Earl of Brecknock, now Marquess Camden
For Penryn, *v.* Hon. Thomas George Baring, now Lord Northbrook
For Gloucester County (Western Division), *v.* John Rolt, esq., Attorney General
For Pembroke County, *v.* George Lort Phillips, esq., deceased
For Guildford, *v.* Sir William Bovill, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas
For Tipperary, *v.* John Blake Dillon, esq., deceased
For Belfast, *v.* Sir Hugh M'Calmont Cairns, Judge of the Court of Appeal in Chancery
For Wexford County, *v.* John George, esq., Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland
For Waterford County, *v.* Earl of Tyrone, now Marquess of Waterford
For Armagh City, *v.* Stearne Ball Miller, esq., Judge of the Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency in Ireland

Ordered
Feb 5 — *For* Northampton County (Northern Division), *v.* Lord Burghley, now Marquess of Exeter
For Suffolk (Eastern Division), *v.* Sir Edward Clarence Kerrison, Baronet, Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 6 — *For* The College of the Holy Trinity, Dublin, *v.* Right Hon. John Edward Walsh, Master of the Rolls for Ireland

[*cont.*

New Writs—Ordered—cont.

Feb 6 — *For* Galway Town, *v.* Right Hon. Michael Morris, Attorney General for Ireland
For Andover, *v.* William Henry Humphery, esq., Chiltern Hundreds
Feb 7 — *For* Cork County, *v.* George Richard Barry, esq., deceased
Feb 8 — *For* Colchester, *v.* Taverner John Miller, esq., Manor of Northstead
Feb 22—*For* York County (North Riding), *v.* The Hon. William Ernest Duncombe, now Lord Feversham
Feb 27—*For* Salop (Southern Division), *v.* Colonel The Hon. Percy Egerton Herbert, Treasurer of the Household
Mar 7—*For* Salop (Northern Division), *v.* The Hon. Adelbert Wellington Brownlow Cust, now Earl Brownlow
Mar 8—*For* Droitwich, *v.* Right Hon. Sir John Somerset Pakington, Baronet, Secretary of State
For Tyrone, *v.* Right Hon. Henry Thomas Lowry Corry, First Commissioner of the Admiralty
For Devon County (Northern Division), *v.* Right Hon. Sir Stafford Henry Northcote, Baronet, Secretary of State
Mar 11—*For* Boston, *v.* Meaburn Staniland, esq., Manor of Northstead
Mar 15—*For* Huntingdon County, *v.* The Hon. Robert Montagu, commonly called Lord Robert Montagu, Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education
Mar 25—*For* Galway Town, *v.* Right Hon. Michael Morris, Puisne Judge of the Court of Common Pleas in Ireland
For College of the Holy Trinity, Dublin, *v.* Hedges Eyre Chatterton, esq., Attorney General for Ireland
April 5—*For* Middlesex, *v.* Robert Culling Hanbury, esq., deceased
May 13—*For* Sutherlandshire, *v.* Right Hon. Sir David Dundas, Knight, Chiltern Hundreds
May 14—*For* Oxford University, *v.* Right Hon. Gathorne Hardy, Secretary of State
June 6—*For* Weymouth and Melcombe Regis, *v.* Henry Gillett Gridley, Steward of Northstead
June 24—*For* Lancaster County (Northern Division), *v.* Colonel John Wilson Patten, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
July 16—*For* Gloucester County (Western Division), *v.* Sir John Rolt, Knight, one of the Judges of the Court of Appeal in Chancery
For Andover, *v.* Sir John Burgess Karslake, Knight, Attorney General
For Cambridge University, *v.* Charles Jasper Selwyn, esq., Solicitor General
For Coventry, *v.* Morgan Treherne, esq., deceased
For Birmingham, *v.* William Scholefield, esquire, deceased
July 29—*For* Downpatrick, *v.* David Stewart Ker, esq., Chiltern Hundreds

[*cont.*

New Writs—Ordered—cont.

August 14—*For* Stroud, *v.* George Poulett Scrope, esq., Manor of Northstead
August 21—*For* the College of the Holy Trinity (Dublin), *v.* The Right Hon. Hedges Eyre Chatterton, Vice Chancellor of Ireland

New Members Sworn

Feb 5 — Richard Garth, esq., *Guildford*
Howel Gwyn, esq., *Brecknock Borough*
John Vance, esq., *Armagh City*
Jervoise Smith, esq., *Penryn*
Charles Lanyon, esq., *Belfast*
James Bevan Bowen, esq., *Pembroke County*
Hon. George Douglas Pennant, *Carnarvon County*
Hon. Adelbert Wellington Cust, *Salop* (*Northern Division*)
Hon. Captain Charles White, *Tipperary*
Sir John Rolt, *Gloucester County* (*Western Division*)
Feb 6 — Arthur Kavanagh, esq., *Wexford County*
Feb 12—Sir John Burgess Karslake, Knight, *Andover*
Feb 15—Sackville George Stopford, esq., *Northampton County* (*Northern Division*)
Feb 18—Hedges Eyre Chatterton, esq., *College of the Holy Trinity, Dublin*
Edward Kent Karslake, esq., *Colchester*
Feb 21—Right Hon. Michael Morris, *Galway Town*
Feb 25—Frederick Snowdon Corrance, esq., *Suffolk* (*Eastern Division*)
Mar 4 — Arthur Hugh Smith Barry, esq., *Cork County*
Mar 11—Hon. Percy Egerton Herbert, *Salop* (*Southern Division*)
Mar 12—Hon. Octavius Duncombe, *York County* (*North Riding*)
Mar 15—Viscount Newport, *Salop* (*Northern Division*)
Right Hon. Sir John Somerset Pakington, Baronet, *Droitwich*
Mar 18—Thomas Parry, esq., *Boston*
Mar 19—Right Hon. Sir Stafford Henry Northcote, Baronet, *Devon* (*Northern Division*)
Mar 21—Right Hon. Henry Thomas Lowry Corry, *Tyrone*
Mar 25—Right Hon. Lord Robert Montagu, *Huntingdon County*
April 1—Right Hon. Hedges Eyre Chatterton, *College of the Holy Trinity, Dublin*
April 8—George Morris, esq., *Galway Town*
April 29—Henry Labouchere, esq., *Middlesex*
May 20—Right Hon. Gathorne Hardy, *Oxford University*
May 30 — Lord Ronald Sutherland Leveson Gower, *Sutherlandshire*
June 13—Henry Edwards, esq., *Weymouth*
July 22—Sir John Burgess Karslake, Knight, *Andover*
July 23—Charles Jasper Selwyn, *Cambridge University*
July 24—Henry Mather Jackson, esq., *Coventry*

[*cont.*

New Members Sworn—cont.
July 25—George Dixon, esq., *Birmingham*
August 5—Edward Arthur Somerset, esq., *Gloucester County*
August 8—William Keown, esq., *Downpatrick*
August 21—Henry Self Page Winterbotham, esq., *Stroud*

Newspaper Securities by Proprietors
Observations, Mr. Milner Gibson; Reply, The Attorney General *May* 24, [187] 1076; Question, Mr. Craufurd; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 3, 1492

New Zealand
British Troops in, Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 12, [185] 282; Observations, Mr. Gorst; Reply, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 15, 1932
Medal to Troops in, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 30, [187] 1289
Withdrawal of Troops, Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, for a Return of the Regiments in New Zealand since the 1st January, 1865, and the dates of their Embarkation" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *July* 15, [188] 1496; after short debate, Motion agreed to
Affairs of New Zealand—*Parl. P.* [3833]

NICOL, Mr. J. Dyce, *Kincardineshire*
Game Preservation (Scotland), Leave, [185] 1396
Metropolis—Barricade round Hyde Park, [185] 213, 1916
Storm Warnings, Res. [188] 1732
Supply—Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 688

NORMANBY, Marquess of
British North America, 2R. [185] 576 *b*

North British Railway (*Carlisle Deviation*) *Bill*
c. Bill considered, after short debate *May* 30, [187] 1285
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *August* 1, [189] 523; read 3ª, after short debate

NORTH, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1676
Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1984, 1986
Promotion in the, Res. [189] 333
Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1808
Army Estimates, [187] 369
Barrack Establishment, [187] 1748
Land Forces, [185] 1499
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 45, [189] 1431, 1518
India—Banda and Kirwee Prize Money, [189] 603
Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1899
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 10, [186] 768; *cl.* 22, 775; *add. cl.* 777, 919
Naval Knights of Windsor, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1301
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. *cl.* 4, [188] 558
Volunteers, Res. [188] 736

NORTHCOTE, Right Hon. Sir S. H. († President of the Board of Trade, afterwards Secretary of State for India), *Devonshire, N.*
Abyssinia—Expedition to, [188] 1512
† Admiralty Jurisdiction, Leave, [185] 529
† Agricultural Statistics, [185] 462
Army—Captain Jervis and the Simla Court Martial, [188] 608, 776; Motion for an Address, [189] 1036
† Cattle Plague in Cheshire, [185] 586
Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 188, 198
Civil Service Examination, [186] 1265
Corrupt Practices at Elections, Leave, [186] 1382; Comm. [187] 60
† Deslandes, Captain, of the "Anne," [185] 584
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [189] 1357, 1376; Res. 1389; Amendt. 1416
India—Banda and Kirwee Booty, [186] 1871; [189] 603, 764
Banks of Bombay and Bengal, [186] 121
Covenanted Educational Service in Bombay, Motion for an Address, [188] 1485
Indian Budget, [189] 79, 1105
Indian Loan, [189] 1613
Indian Prize Money, [189] 1452
Indian Securities, [188] 172
Land Revenues, [188] 1395
Medical Retirement Funds, [187] 389
Metric System of Weights and Measures, [188] 856
Mysore, Maharajah of, [187] 1061
Officers of the late Indian Army, [186] 1939
Orissa, Famine in, [187] 264; [188] 1515; Motion for an Address, [189] 814
Oude, Claims on, [186] 1172
Railways, [188] 1192
Revenues of, [189] 341
India Office—State Entertainment to the Sultan, [188] 1624, 1669, 1727
† Ireland—Railways, [185] 459
† Limited Liability Acts, Motion for a Committee, [185] 1384
Mauritius—Yellow Fever in the, [187] 1293
† Mercantile Marine, [185] 83
† Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, [185] 1337
† Meteorological Department of the Board of Trade, [185] 401
Metropolis Gas, [186] 1107; 2R. 1577, 1878, 1914, 1922, 1924; Consid. Amendt. [187] 185
† Navy—The "Greenwich Sixpence," [185] 936
† "North," Loss of the, [185] 342
† Railway Companies Arrangements, Leave, [185] 89, 106
Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1055
† Railway Debenture Holders, Leave, [185] 298
† Railway Traffic Returns, [185] 212
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1302, 1307; [187] 1175
† Sale and Purchase of Shares, Leave, [185] 690
† Scurvy—Mercantile Navy, [185] 283
† Shipping Local Dues, Leave, [185] 108
† Storm Signals of the Board of Trade, [185] 1029, 1030
† Supply—Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 690;—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 701
† Vice President of the Board of Trade, Leave, [185] 356; 2R. 471; 3R. [187] 67
† Waterworks, [185] 467

"North," Loss of the Ship
  Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 14, [185] 342; Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 3, [187] 1488

NORWOOD, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
  Admiralty Jurisdiction, [187] 939
  Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1886; [186] 909; Comm. [188] 1416
  Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1769
  "Cestus," Case of the, [189] 1610
  Declaration of Paris, 1856, [189] 884
  Investment of Trust Funds, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1654
  Navy—Greenwich Hospital, [189] 1612
  Supply — Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 898, 905

Oaths Commission—The Report
  Question, Earl Stanhope; Answer, The Duke of Richmond *Mar* 26, [186] 560; Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 9, [187] 255; Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 25, [189] 78

O'BEIRNE, Mr. J. L., *Cashel*
  Army Estimates—Military Education, [187] 1717
  Army—Medical Officers of the Guards, [188] 1514
    Medical Officers on the West Coast of Africa, [187] 1290
    War Office, [186] 910
  Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 41, Amendt. [186] 1165
  Crete—Treatment of Christians, [189] 849
  Fortifications and Works, Comm. Res. [189] 141
  Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1416
  Fortifications (Provision for Expenses) (No. 2), Comm. Amendt. [189] 1285, 1289
  Grey, Mr. H. D., Case of, [187] 89, 394
  Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 745
  Ireland — Disturbances in, "Cork Herald" Reporter, [185] 1233
    Fenian Prisoners, [186] 1951
    Landed Estates, Res. [188] 1628
    Representation of the People, [186] 818
    State of, [189] 225
  Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 569
  Libel, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [188] 548
  Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 1585
  Merchant Shipping Laws, Res. [189] 1487
  Metropolis—Admission of Cabs to Hyde Park, [187] 370
  Navy—Naval Arsenals and Dockyards, [189] 1566, 1568
  Parliament—The Count-out, [189] 604
  Railway Accident at Warrington, [188] 1518, 1667
  Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. [188] 554; *cl.* 4, 558
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1546
  Representation of the People (Ireland), [187] 1090
  Sierra Leone—Supreme Court, [189] 1611
[*cont.*

O'BEIRNE, Mr. J. S.—*cont.*
  Supply — Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 903
    Rewards to Irish Constabulary, [186] 895
    Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1690
  Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 552; [187] 881
  Thames Embankment (Sheilds' Petition), Motion for a Committee, [186] 803
  Theatres, &c. [185] 468
  War Clerks' Salaries, [186] 912

O'BRIEN, Sir P., *King's Co.*
  Army Estimates—Military Education, [187] 1716, 1717, 1719
    Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1714
  Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1676
    Staff Appointments, Motion for Returns, [187] 1430, 1431
  Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 88, Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1166
  Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 369
  Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, Leave, [185] 694
  Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 980
  India—Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1022
  Ireland—State of, [189] 187
  Law Courts, New, [189] 1571
  Metropolis—Bethnal Green Workhouse, [189] 1452;—Stray Dogs, *ib.*
  Paris Exhibition—Search of Passengers' Baggage, Res. [185] 1596
  Prison Ministers Act, [188] 1769
  Sierra Leone—Trial by Jury, [186] 1106
  Supply—Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1256
    Learned Societies, Great Britain, [189] 1246
    Paris Exhibition—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1260
    Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1692
  Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 550

O'CONOR DON, The, *Roscommon Co.*
  Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 595
  Industrial Schools (Ireland), Leave, [185] 296; 2R. 1749; Comm. [188] 119
  Ireland—Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 64, 1623
    Valuation of Counties, [189] 1103
  Life Sentences, [185] 1928
  Supply—National Education (Ireland), [189] 1279
  Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1763

O'DONOGHUE, The, *Tralee*
  Ireland — Employment of the Constabulary, [185] 1028
    Fenian Convict Burke, [187] 1131
    Fenian Prisoners, [186] 732, 1949
    Martial Law, [185] 1647
    Queen's University, [187] 1447
    Waterford Election, [185] 462, 723, 724
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1536
[*cont.*

O'Donoghue, The—*cont.*
Representation of the People (Ireland), [187] 778, 779, 1092; Res. [188] 712
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 546; 2R. [186] 1163, 1750; [187] 373
Trades Unions Commission—Mr. Conolly, [188] 1438

Office of Judge in the Admiralty, Divorce, and Probate Courts Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Feb* 14 (No. 11)
Read 2ª *Feb* 26, [185] 1003
Committee *May* 16, [187] 606
Report * *May* 20 (No. 102)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Lord Chancellor*) *May* 27, 1098
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Lord Cranworth*); after debate, on Question, "That ('now,') &c.;" Cont. 86, Not-Cont. 40; M. 46; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1113; Bill read 3ª
c. Read 1°* *June* 20 [Bill 203]
Order for Second Reading discharged *July* 25

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod
On *May* 20, Committee appointed as follows:—Ld. Chancellor, Ld. President, Ld. Privy Seal, D. Richmond, M. Salisbury, M. Bath, Ld. Steward, E. Devon, E. Carnarvon, E. Chichester, V. Sydney, V. Eversley, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Foley, L. Redesdale, L. Colchester, L. Wynford, L Stanley of Alderley, L. Cranworth
First Report from the Select Comm. (No. 125)
Second Do. Do. . . (No. 261)

Offices and Oaths Bill
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Cogan, Sir J. Gray*)
185] *c.* Considered in Committee; after debate, Resolution agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° *Feb* 7, 111 [Bill 7]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *Feb* 27, 1093
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Newdegate*); after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 195, N. 93, M. 102; read 2°; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1128
186] Committee; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *Mar* 19, 210
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Newdegate*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; original Motion withdrawn; Committee deferred
Committee; Report *April* 9, 1383
Considered as amended *April* 11, 1580
Read 3°* *May* 14
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *May* 16
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *May* 31, [187] 1371
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Earl of Courtown*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Bill read 2ª (No. 100)
[*cont.*

Offices and Oaths Bill—cont.
Committee *July* 11, [188] 1367 (No. 218)
Report * *July* 16
Read 3ª* *July* 19
c. Lords' Amendt. considered *July* 25, [189] 147; [House counted out] [Bill 272]
l. Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 75]

Ogilvy, Sir J., *Dundee*
Parliament—Business of the House, [187] 941
Representation of the People (Scotland), [185] 1264; Leave, [187] 419; [189] 331

Oliphant, Mr. L., *Stirling, &c.*
Army—European Garrisons in Ceylon, &c. Res. [187] 1682
Military Store Department, [185] 463
Army Estimates—Military Store Establishments, [187] 1703, 1704
Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 712
Ceylon—Barracks at Point de Galle, [186] 729
India—Straits Settlements, [185] 1607
Japan—European Troops at Yokuhama, [186] 1107
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1618
Representation of the People (Scotland), [185] 1270; [186] 1785

O'Loghlen, Sir C. M., *Clare Co.*
Bridges (Ireland), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 797
County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 9, [188] 1913
Court of Chancery (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 11, Amendt. [186] 450; *cl.* 88, Motion for Adjournment, 1165
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Re-comm. *cl.* 35, [188] 1250; 3R. 1911
Easter Holydays, The, [186] 911
Ireland—State of, [189] 181
Weights and Measures, [188] 1622
Irish Peerage—The Royal Prerogative, Motion for an Address, [188] 1127
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 560, 585
Libel, 2R. [185] 1716, 1741; Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 541; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 543; *add. cl.* 544, 546, 548; 3R. [189] 1058
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 1581
Metropolis—Statue of Canning, [189] 1295
Naval Knights of Windsor, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 1300, 1303
Offices and Oaths, Leave, [185] 111; 2R. 1093 Comm. [186] 211, 1408
Parliament—Railway Bills—Standing Orders, [185] 279
Writs for re-election, Res. [186] 1199
Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 941, 956, 961
Supply—Agricultural Statistics, [188] 1906
Houses of Parliament, [188] 1695
Miscellaneous Expenses, [188] 1908
Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1676
Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1690
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Leave, [185] 109; 2R. 1091; Comm. [186] 1413

O'Neill, Mr. E., *Antrim Co.*
- Ireland—Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 440
- Supply—Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1679

Onslow, Mr. G. J. H., *Guildford*
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 842

O'Reilly, Mr. M. W., *Longford Co.*
- Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [187] 687; [189] 131
  - Land Forces, [185] 1479
- Army—(India and the Colonies), Motion for a Committee, Amendt. [185] 1041, 1053
- Civil Servants' Half Holyday, [188] 773
- Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1595
- Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 363; 2R. [187] 572
- India—Straits Settlements, [185] 1603, 1605, 1646;—New Appointments, [186] 280
- Ireland—Constabulary Superannuation, [186] 892
  - National Education, [187] 620
  - Queen's University, [187] 1445
  - Royal Irish Academy, [185] 1602
  - Salters' Company — Magherafelt Roman Catholic Church, Motion for an Address, [187] 891, 894
  - Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 10
  - Unenclosed Burial Grounds, [189] 2
  - Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 428, 433, 439, 441; [187] 256, 257
- Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 581
- Martial Law—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice, Res. [188] 899, 918
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [185] 1856
- Navy—Roman Catholics, [186] 315
- Petit Juries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 95
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. [188] 921

Osborne, Mr. R. B., *Nottingham*
- Army—Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1974
- British North America, Comm. [185] 1310; Motion for Adjournment, 1311, 1312
- Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 173, 184, 192
- Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [187] 64
- County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 29, [188] 1914
- Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1587, 1590, 1591
- Explanation—Mr. Dillwyn, [187] 7
- Financial Statement, [186] 1158, 1159
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act, [186] 470; [189] 896, 897
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 969
- Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1323, 1324
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 10, [186] 767; *add. cl.* 777
- Naval Review, The, [188] 1521
- Navy—Lieutenant Brand, [185] 1143, 1144, 1238
- Paris Exhibition, [185] 890, 898
- Representation of the People—The Resolutions, [185] 339;—Electoral Statistics, 1820 [*cont.*

Osborne, Mr. R. B.—*cont.*
- Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 81; Comm. 1272, 1273, 1291, 1494, 1505; *cl.* 3, 1626, 1698, 1945; [187] 48, 746; *cl.* 15, Amendt. [188] 29, 42, 202; *add. cl.* 615, 895; Consid. *add. cl.* 1443, 1448; 3R. 1581, 1593
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1645
- Spain—Relations with, [186] 1109, 1110, 1267, 1482
- Supply—British Department, Paris Exhibition, [189] 1245
  - Department of Science and Art, [189] 1234, 1236, 1238, 1239
  - Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1246
  - Houses of Parliament, Report, [185] 681, 682, 683
  - National Gallery, [189] 1243
  - Public Education (Ireland), [189] 926
  - Royal Irish Academy, [189] 1242
  - Royal Palaces, [185] 501, 507, 511
  - Universal Exhibition at Paris, [185] 684, 688, 689
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1159
- Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 527
- Universal Art Catalogue, [187] 616

Ossory, Bishop of
- Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1180
- Ireland—Established Church, Motion for an Address, Amendt. [188] 390

Otway, Mr. A. J., *Chatham*
- Army—Corporal Punishment, [185] 463; Res. 1951, 1961
  - Flogging in the, [186] 3, 290, 292
  - Simla Court Martial, [188] 770; Motion for an Address, Amendt. [189] 1033
  - System of Retirement, Motion for a Committee, [187] 71
- Army Estimates, [185] 1308
  - Barrack Establishment, [187] 1747, 1750
  - Hospital Establishment, [187] 1751
  - Increase Pay, [187] 687;—Marines, [189] 139
  - Military Education, [187] 1717
  - Military Store Clerks, [189] 1611
  - Sergeant Instructors of Volunteers, [189] 1606
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1713, 1714
- Bribery Commissioners, Report of the, [185] 1146
- Fortifications and Works, Comm. Res. [189] 141
- Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1981
- India—Revenues of, [189] 338
- Lancaster, Yarmouth, &c. Commissions, [185] 1338
- Marine Mutiny, [186] 1174, 1175; 2R. 1258
- Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1893, 1894; Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1468
- Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 1394
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 771; *add. cl.* Amendt. 794, 795; Motion for Adjournment, 796, 920, 927, 932; Preamble, 933, 934

[*cont.*

Otway, Mr. A. J.—*cont.*
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 645
Increase of Pay, Dockyards and Marines, [187] 94; [189] 139
Roman Catholics, [186] 316
Navy Estimates—Victuals and Clothing, Motion for Adjournment, [186] 971, 972;—Dockyards, &c. [187] 1847
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1575
Supply—Prisons and Convict Establishments, [187] 1094
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1217

Outlawries Bill
c. Read 1° * *Feb* 5

Overstone, Lord
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1181
North British Railway (Carlisle Deviations), 3R. [189] 523
Railway Companies, Comm. [189] 159; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 163
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil disturbances, [188] 760

Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education Bill
(*Mr. Ewart, Mr. Neate, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart*)
c. Ordered *Mar* 12, [185] 1704
Read 1° * *Mar* 13 [Bill 71]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. W. Ewart*) *June* 5, [187] 1613
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*), 1619; after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 164, N. 150; M. 14
Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee
And, on *June* 26, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Ewart (Chairman), Mr. Acland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Viscount Cranborne, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. W. Edward Forster, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Goschen, Sir William Heathcote, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Liddell, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Neate, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. Powell, Mr. Sclater-Booth; *July* 24, Mr. Solicitor General added
Report of Select Committee *July* 31 (No. 497)

Oxford, Bishop of
Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [189] 41; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1096
Book of Common Prayer, Address for Papers, [188] 1431, 1432
Church of England in the Colonies, Address for Papers, [185] 397
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1091
Clerical Vestments, [187] 75, 78
Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 512, 522
Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1017; Comm. 1649, 1651; *cl.* 1, [188] 1163, 1165
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 123, 1179
[*cont.*

Oxford, Bishop of—*cont.*
Ecclesiastical Courts, [189] 1559
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [187] 88; Comm. *cl.* 1, 382; *cl.* 10, 385; *cl.* 11, 386; *cl.* 13, 1194; *add. cl.* 1196, 1197, 1198; Report, *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1482; 3R. [188] 246, 251, 256; Comm. Amendts. [189] 1542

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Bill
(*Mr. Stephen Cave, Sir Stafford Northcote*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 1 [Bill 61]
Read 2° *Mar* 4, [185] 1325
Committee *; Report *Mar* 13
Considered as amended * *Mar* 14
Read 3° * *Mar* 16
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *Mar* 18
Read 2ª * *Mar* 29 (No. 47)
Committee *; Report *April* 8 (No. 75)
Read 3ª * *April* 9
Royal Assent *May* 3 [30 *Vict.* c. 18]

Packe, Mr. C. W., *Leicestershire, S.*
Metropolis Gas, Consid. [187] 362
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1000, 1167; *cl.* 40, [188] 463

Pakington, Right Hon. Sir J. S. († First Lord of the Admiralty, afterwards Secretary of State for War), *Droitwich*
Army—Artillery—Chilled Shot, [186] 1481;—Cast Iron Guns for Australia, [187] 91;—Elswick Company's Guns, 617;—Armstrong Guns and Chilled Shot, 1290;—Rifled Cannon, Res. [189] 1505, 1506, 1508, 1509
Barrack Stores, Supply of, [186] 1598
Camps at Aldershot and Colchester, [188] 987
Cavalry Half Pay, [187] 263
Chatham Garrison, Late Inspection of, [189] 1565
Connell, Colour Sergeant, Case of, [188] 852
Conveyance of Troops from Chatham to Liverpool, [188] 604
Distinguished Service Promotions, [187] 1935
86th Regiment, [189] 331
Enlistment, [189] 1451
European Garrisons in Ceylon, &c. Res. [187] 1684
Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1678, 1681
Fenian Raid in Canada—Field Allowance, [187] 1680
Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1980; [186] 2, 3, 290, 291, 292, 293, 394, 466, 729, 903
Forts at Portsmouth and Spithead, [189] 1104
Good Conduct Medals, [189] 171
Hartlepool, Batteries at, [187] 772
Household Cavalry, [186] 732
Increase Pay, [187] 1938; [188] 1874
Inspectors of Volunteer Artillery, [187] 1698, 1700
Jervis, Captain, and the Simla Court Martial, [188] 606; [189] 1024
Knightsbridge Barracks, [188] 1515
[*cont.*

PAKINGTON, Right Hon. Sir J. S.—*cont.*
  Lieutenant Colonels of Cavalry, [188] 429
  March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1191, 1391, 1392 ; Explanation, 1523, 1526
  Medical Officers, [186] 281 ; Res. [188] 1144
  Medical Officers of the Guards, [188] 1514
  Medical Officers on the West Coast of Africa, [187] 1291
  Medical Warrant of 1858, [188] 1390
  Military Reserve Fund, Motion for a Committee, [187] 558
  Military Store Clerks, [189] 1612
  Military Store Department, [187] 773
  Militia Ballot, Res. [189] 91, 96, 97
  Militia Courts Martial, [187] 776
  Militia Deserters, [187] 1023
  Militia Reserve, [187] 880
  New Zealand, Troops in, [187] 1289
  98th Regiment, [187] 771
  Ordnance Department, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1807, 1808, 1811
  Organization of the Army, [187] 373, 374
  Palliser, Major, Reward to, [186] 1583
  Promotion in the Army, [188] 168, 169 ; Res. [189] 335, 1105 ;—In the 96th Regiment, 1450
  Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1813
  Recruiting, Res. [187] 678, 686, 1489
  Reserve, [187] 255
  Retirement, System of, Motion for a Committee, [187] 70
  Rewards for Military Service, [189] 1449
  Rewards to Military Inventors, [186] 283, 1104
  Royal Engineers, [187] 876
  Sale of Commissions, [187] 1663, 1939
  Sanitary Committee, [186] 282
  Scott's, Captain, Claim for Rifling Ordnance, [189] 1333
  Snider Ammunition, [187] 1493
  Snider Rifle, [188] 1517 ; [189] 79
  Staff Appointments, [187] 1431
  Staff Officers of Pensioners, [188] 1390
  13th Hussars, The, [188] 1393
  Transport Commission, Report of the, [188] 855
  Troops in Huts, [187] 618
  Volunteer Corps Capitation Money, [187] 1294, 1732
  Volunteers, [187] 1937, 1938 ;—Sergeant Instructors for, [189] 1606
  War Department, [186] 1582 ; [187] 397
  Whitworth's Ordnance, [187] 1295
 Army Estimates, [185] 1992, 1995 ; [187] 264, 265, 369, 370
  Administration of the Army, [187] 1721
  Barrack Establishment, [187] 1747, 1749, 1750
  Disembodied Militia, [187] 1751, 1753
  Enrolled Pensioners, [187] 1765
  Hospital Establishment, [187] 1751
  Increase Pay, [187] 687 ; [189] 118, 138
  Manufacturing Departments, [187] 1701, 1702
  Martial Law, [187] 1750
  Military Education, [187] 1717, 1719
  Military Store Establishment, [187] 1703, 1704, 1707, 1709, 1710
  Miscellaneous Services, [187] 1720
  Volunteer Corps, [187] 1761
  Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1711, 1712, 1714

[*cont.*

PAKINGTON, Right Hon. Sir J. S.—*cont.*
  Army Transport Committee, [186] 727, 1873
  Birmingham—Riots at, [188] 174, 428
 † British North America, 2R. [185] 1185
  Ceylon—Barracks at Point de Galle, [186] 729
  Fortifications and Works, Comm. Res. [189] 140, 141
  Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), 2R. [186] 1258, 1259 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1416 ; [189] 1290
  Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1985
  India—Central India Prize Money, [188] 983 ;—Simla Court Martial, [188] 606 ; Motion for an Address, [189] 1024
 † Ireland—Docks in Cork Harbour, [185] 461 ;—Militia, [186] 727
  Marine Mutiny, [186] 1175
  Metropolis—Hyde Park Review, [188] 772, 985
  Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 985
  Millwall Ironworks Company, [185] 1917, 1918
  Mutiny, [186] 290, 321, 729; Comm. 765; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 767 ; *cl.* 22, Amendt. 768 ; *cl.* 40, 776, 780, 783, 792, 794, 796 ; *add. cl.* 913, 926, 927, 928 ; Preamble, 934
 † Naval Yards, [185] 406
 † Navy—Admiralty Steering and Sailing Rules, [185] 809
   † Brand, Lieutenant, [185] 1239
   † Courts Martial, [185] 1234
   † Dockyards, Res. Previous Question moved, [185] 604, 622, 646
   † "Gannet," H.M.S., and the "Arouca," [185] 87
   Naval Arsenals and Dockyards, [189] 1567, 1568
   † Promotion in the, [185] 343 ; Res. [186] 300, 306, 311
   † Tenders for Gunboats, [185] 1231, 1232
  Navy Estimates—Coast Guard Service, &c. [187] 1838
   Men and Boys, [186] 347, 355, 362
   Naval Stores, [187] 1853
  Parliament—Business of the House, [188] 1523
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1888 ; *cl.* 10, [187] 1974 ; *cl.* 29, [188] 199, 201
 † Sayer's Life Boat, [185] 478
  Scotland—Gunpowder at Leith, &c. [187] 91
  Street Outrages—The Militia, [188] 87
  Supply, [186] 934 ;—Volunteers, Report, [188] 846
  Volunteers, Res. [188] 738, 749 ;—At Shoeburyness, [189] 1100 ;—Capitation Grant, 1334, 1566
  Warbourg's, Dr., Tincture, [187] 1200

PALK, Sir L., *Devonshire, S.*
  Corrupt Practices at Elections—Removal of Magistrates, [186] 730, 731
  Education—School Building Grants, [188] 1187
  Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 986, 1393
  Navy—Staff Commanders and Masters, [186] 5
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [186] 1575 ; *cl.* 34, [187] 1178 ; *cl.* 9, 1507 ; *cl.* A, [188] 620 ; *add. cl.* 1271 ; Schedule B, 1283
  Supply—Volunteers, Report, [188] 845
  Totnes Elections, Res. [186] 1353, 1366, 1373

Palmer, Sir R., *Richmond*
Bankruptcy Acts Amendment, Comm. [187] 1566
Christ Church Ordinances, [189] 85
Churchward, Mr., Case of, Motion for an Address, [186] 194, 198
Companies Act Amendment, 2R. [189] 930
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, Comm. [185] 1332
County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 7, [188] 1912
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188 1414
Courts of Justice, The New, Res. [185] 820
Courts of Law and Equity, [189] 474
Declaration of Paris, 1856, [189] 890
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, [187] 1025
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1637, 1878; [189] 84; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1070; *cl.* 2, *ib.*; *cl.* 5, 1071; *cl.* 6, 1072; *cl.* 7, 1073, 1075; *cl.* 9, 1076; *add. cl.* 1079; Lords' Amendts. 1614
Investment of Trust Funds, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1653, 1654
Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 992, 994
* Law, Administration of the, [185] 841, 853
Middlesex Registry, Res. [188] 81
Parliament—Business of the House, [188] 1877
Railway Companies, Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [187] 1722, 1725
Railway Companies Arrangements, Leave, [185] 104
186] Representation of the People, 2R. 512, 576,
596; Comm. 1503; *cl.* 3, 1893:—Amendt.
187] 21, 28, 53, 55, 473; *cl.* 4, 1001, 1009;
cl. 34, 1176, 1179, 1187; Amendt. 1188;
cl. 35, 1191, 1206; *cl.* 5, 1232, 1235; *cl.* 6,
Amendt. 1240; *cl.* 8, 1341, 1342; *cl.* 9,
1539, 1545; *cl.* 14, 1990
188] *cl.* 18, 49; *cl.* 29, 194, 200; *cl.* 36, 296;
cl. 40, 303; Amendt. 437, 450, 453, 454, 456,
460, 484; *cl.* 43, Amendt. 509, 521, 522;
add. cl. 613; *cl.* A, 621; *add. cl.* 1027, 1028,
1030, 1203; Schedule D, Amendt. 1288;
Preamble, 1291; Consid. *cl.* 46, 1471,
1472; Schedule F, Amendt. 1475:—Lords'
189] Amendts. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1118; *cl.* 46,
Amendt. 1197; *cl.* 54, Amendt. 1198
Supply—Entertainment of Foreign Potentates, [189] 1258
"Tornado," Case of the, [188] 2052
Totnes Elections, Res. [186] 1364, 1366, 1369
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1411

Paris, Declaration of, 1856—*Goods in Neutral Vessels*
Observations, Mr. J. Stuart Mill *August* 5, [189] 876; short debate thereon

Paris Universal Exhibition, 1867
English Jurors, Question, Viscount Amberley; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 28, [185] 1143
Expenses, Vote (£50,000) for Supply *Feb* 20, [185] 683; after short debate, Vote agreed to; Question, Mr. Osborne; Answer, Mr. Bruce *Feb* 22, 890
Munitions of War, Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, General Peel *Mar* 1, [185] 1232
Search of Passengers' Baggage, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 8, To leave out from "That," and add "as the Customs Revenue is now derived from an exceedingly small number of articles, the prices of most of which in London and Paris are equal, this House considers that no appreciable injury would be inflicted upon the income of the Country were the present practice of the search of the baggage of travellers at Dover, Folkestone, Newhaven, and in London suspended during the period of the French Exhibition of 1867" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*), [185] 1581; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Akroyd; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 14, 1801
Correspondence—(*Parl. P.* 98, 189, 379)
Purchases for Schools of Science and Art, Select Committee appointed, "to consider and report on the advisability of making purchases from the Paris Exhibition for the benefit of the Schools of Science and Art in the United Kingdom, and any other means of making that Exhibition useful to the manufacturing industry of Great Britain and Ireland" (*Mr. Layard*) *June* 20, [188] 238
And, on *June* 21, Committee nominated as follows: — Mr. Layard (Chairman), Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. A. Bruce, Mr. Childers, Mr. W. Cowper, Sir Philip Egerton, Lord Elcho, Mr. Gregory, Colonel Hogg, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Locke, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Otway, Mr. Seymour; *June* 25, Mr. Potter added; *June* 28, Mr. Marsh added
Report presented *July* 11 (*Parl. P.* No. 433)
Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 23, [188] 2074
Purchases for the South Kensington Museum—(see *Education*)

Parker, Major Windsor, *Suffolk, W.*
Army—(India and the Colonies), Motion for a Committee, [185] 1063
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1026

Parks Regulation Bill—(*See* **Meetings in Royal Parks Bill**)

Parliament, Meeting of the
The Session of Parliament opened by The Queen in Person *Feb* 5, [185] 1; The Lord Chancellor, taking direction from Her Majesty, delivered

Her Majesty's Most Gracious Speech
LORDS—
Address to Her Majesty in Answer to Her Most Gracious Speech, moved by The Earl Beauchamp (the Motion being seconded by The Lord Delamere), and, after long debate, Motion agreed to *Feb* 5, [185] 9
Her Majesty's Answer to the Address reported *Feb* 8, [185] 120
Chairman of Committees—The Lord Redesdale appointed, *Nemine Dissentiente,* to take the Chair in all Committees of this House for this Session *Feb* 5
Appeal Committee—appointed *Feb* 5

[cont.

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

Committee for Privileges—appointed *Feb* 5

Sub-committee for the Journals — appointed *Feb* 5

Business of the House, Motion for Returns of Attendance of Peers, Measures passed, Number of Divisions, &c. (*Lord Lyveden*) *June* 20, [188] 129; after debate, Motion withdrawn; Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *August* 1, [189] 525

Despatch of Public Business, Observations, The Earl of Shaftesbury *June* 17, [187] 1928

Meeting of the House, Select Committee appointed "to inquire into the Expediency of making such arrangements as shall enable the House to meet at Four o'Clock instead of Five o'Clock for the Despatch of Business, and to consider if any and what Changes may be desirable for the better Transaction of the Business of the House" (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *June* 21, [188] 262

And, on *June* 24, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Privy Seal, M. Bath, Ld. Chamberlain, E. Shaftesbury, E. Stanhope, E. Carnarvon, E. Grey, E. De Grey, E. Stradbroke, E. Granville, E. Kimberley, L. Colville of Culross, L. Ponsonby, L. Redesdale, L. Portman, L. Stanley of Alderley, and L. Lyveden

Report presented *July* 25 (*Parl. P.* No. 259)

Construction of the House, Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider whether any and what arrangements can be made to remedy the present defective Construction of the House in reference to Hearing" (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *June* 28, [188] 653; after short debate, Motion agreed to

And, on *July* 1, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—E. Carnarvon, E. Romney, E. De Grey, E. Kimberley, V. Eversley, L. Redesdale, L. Somerhill, and L. Cairns

Report presented *July* 4 (*Parl. P.* No. 203)

Arrangement for the Reporting of Speeches in this House, Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Arrangements for reporting the Speeches of the Members of the House, and with special Reference to certain Proceedings in the Reporters' Gallery on Thursday, the 11th of July" (*The Marquess of Westmeath*) *August* 9, [189] 1202; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Easter Holydays—The House adjourned to Thursday 2nd May *April* 12

New Palace Yard and the Houses of Parliament, Question, Lord Lyveden; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 20, [187] 765; *May* 24, 1012

185] *Privilege—Pamphlet of Mr. R. S. France*—Statement, Lord Redesdale *Feb* 8, 119; Personal Explanation, Lord Redesdale *Feb* 15, 370; On Motion of Lord Redesdale, Ordered that Mr. R. S. France do attend at the Bar of this House To-morrow *Feb* 18, 452; Select Committee appointed *Feb* 19, 556

And, on *June* 21, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—Ld. Steward, E. Spencer, E. Cathcart, L. Somerhill, and L. Taunton

Report of the Select Committee on Mr. France's Pamphlet read *Mar* 11, 1627; Resolution (*The Lord Chancellor*) agreed to

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—LORDS—*cont.*

Standing Orders — Parliamentary Deposits, *l.* Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, Lord Redesdale *June* 4, [187] 1552

Select Committee appointed to join with a Committee of the Commons to consider the Act 9th and 10th Vict. Cap. 20. and the Standing Orders of both Houses in relation to Parliamentary Deposits and for securing the Completion of Railways within a prescribed Time, and to report what Alterations it is expedient to make therein for the present and for the ensuing Session: The Lords following were named of the Committee:—D. Richmond, V. Eversley, L. Redesdale, L. Portman, L. Stanley of Alderley; and a Message sent to the Commons (*The Chairman of Committees*) *June* 21, [188] 265

Parl. Papers—

First Report 213

Second Report . . . 308

Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, Select Committee on, appointed; List of the Committee *May* 20, [187] 767; Reports from the Select Committee (No. 125, 261)

Order—Notice of Questions, Observations, Lord Redesdale *July* 9, [188] 1254

Private Bills

Standing Order Committee on—appointed and nominated *Feb* 21, [185] 719

Churchyards and Cemeteries—On Motion of The Earl of Belmore, Standing Order 182 amended *Feb* 25, [185] 906

Reports of Board of Trade on, Question, Lord Taunton; Answer, The Duke of Richmond *Mar* 28, [186] 704

Petitions, Resolution thereon *April* 11, [186] 1477

On the Motion of *The Chairman of Committees* — Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 18th Day of June next; and other Orders *May* 3, [186] 1928

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Wednesday the 6th November next, *August* 21

COMMONS—

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT *Feb* 5

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH reported; Resolution for an humble ADDRESS thereon moved by Mr. DE GREY (the Motion being seconded by Mr. GRAVES), and, after long debate, agreed to *Feb* 5, [185] 43; Committee appointed to draw up the said Address

Report of Address brought up, and read; after short debate, agreed to; to be presented by Privy Councillors; to be considered To-morrow *Feb* 6, 76

HER MAJESTY'S ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS reported *Feb* 8, [185] 144

Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms—Standing Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 7, [185] 119—First Report *June* 5 (No. 351)

Controverted Elections, General Committee of Elections appointed *Feb* 8

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Opening of the Session—Access of Members to the House—Police Orders, Questions, Lord Ernest Bruce, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 7, [185] 83

Printing—Select Committee—Cost of Papers—After short debate, Select Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 11, as follows:—Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Childers, Mr. Gaskell, Mr. Henley, Mr. Hunt, Sir Stafford Northcote, The O'Conor Don, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Hastings Russell, and Mr. Walpole

Public Accounts—Committee of Public Accounts nominated *Feb* 18, [185] 556

Public Petitions—Select Committee appointed and nominated *Feb* 11, [185] 257—*Custody of*, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. Speaker *August* 7, [189] 1044

Approaches to the Houses of Parliament, Observations, Mr. Davenport-Bromley *Feb* 22, [185] 888

Business of the House

Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 8, [185] 149; Observations *Mar* 5, 1370; Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 8, [186] 1319; Question, Sir John Ogilvy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 23, [187] 941; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Reply, Mr. Fawcett *August* 9, [189] 1225; Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Speaker *August* 12, 1338

Count-out on July 30, Observations, Mr. O'Beirne; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 1, [189] 604

Easter Holydays, Question, Sir C. O'Loghlen; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 1, [186] 911; after short debate, the House adjourned to Monday, 29th April *April* 12, 1587

Election Petitions Committees, Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 9, [186] 1336

House of Commons (Arrangements)—The Reporters' Gallery, Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 19, [186] 122

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed "to consider whether any alteration can be made in the internal arrangements of the House of Commons, so as to enable a greater number of Members to hear and take part in the proceedings" (*Mr. Headlam*) *June* 25, [188] 536; Amendt. to leave out "internal" (*Lord John Manners*) agreed to; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; Select Committee appointed

And, on *June* 28, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Headlam (Chairman), Mr. Bazley, Mr. Bright, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Baillie Cochrane, Mr. William Cowper, Lord Elcho, Viscount Enfield, Mr. Darby Griffith, Mr. Hankey, Sir Frederick W. Heygate, Mr. Beresford Hope, Lord Hotham, Mr. Lanyon, Lord John Manners, and Mr. Tite

Report *brought up July* 19 (*Parl. P.* No. 451)

Hyde Park Review, Accommodation for Members, Question, Captain Vivian; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 1, [188] 772

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—cont.

Librarian of the House of Commons, Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith; Reply, Mr. Hunt *May* 24, [187] 1092

Morning Sittings, Standing Orders [19th July 1854 and 21st July 1856] relative to Morning Sittings read, and suspended *May* 27, [187] 1132; The House to meet at 2 o'clock on Tuesdays and Fridays; Question, Mr. B. Cochrane; Answer, The Chancellor of the
188] Exchequer *June* 28, 664; Moved, "That the Standing Orders [19th July, 1854, and 21st July, 1856], relative to the Morning Sittings be read, and further suspended" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *July* 1, 774; Resolutions agreed to [and other Resolutions]; Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 5, 1068; Questions, Mr. Bruce; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 15, 1521; short debate thereon; Moved, "That, on Thursday and Friday next, this House will meet at Twelve o'clock, subject to the Standing Orders relating to sittings of the House on Wednesday" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *July* 16, 1626; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Statement, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, 1875; short debate thereon

The Proposed Saturday Sitting, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, [189] 475

Privilege and Order

Privileges—Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed *Feb* 5

Alteration of Notices of Questions, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 5, [188] 1065

Members' Seats in this House, Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith; Reply, Mr. Speaker *June* 20, [188] 160

Petition of E. Truelove and Others, Observations, Mr. Darby Griffith *May* 6, [187] 13

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 14, To leave out from "That" and add "the Order of the House [3rd May], That the Petition of E. Truelove and others do lie upon the table be read and discharged; and that so much of the Appendix to the Twenty-second Report of Public Petitions as comprises a printed copy of the said Petition be cancelled" (*Major Anson*), 1886; after long debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," A. 43, N. 11; M. 32

Privilege—Meeting in the Tea-Room, Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, Mr. Speaker *August* 2, [189] 766; short debate thereon

Signatures to a Petition, Moved, "That the Order of the 26th Day of June, that the Petition of 'Inhabitants of Halifax and its environs' do lie upon the table, be read, and discharged; and that the Petition be rejected" (*Mr. Charles Forster*) *July* 5, [188] 1124; after short debate, Petition rejected

Scotch Business, Conduct of, in Parliament, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 12, [185] 283; *Feb* 21, 721; *Mar* 22, [186] 394, 408

Select Committees, Expense of, Select Committee on Protection from Fire nominated; Observations, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 27, [186] 703

[*cont.*

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*cont.*

Private Bills

Board of Trade Reports, Observations, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 14, [185] 1800

Standing Orders—Railway Bills, Question, Sir Colman O'Loghlen; Answer, Colonel Wilson Patten *Feb* 12, [185] 279

Standing Orders — Parliamentary Deposits, Moved, "That a Select Committee of Five Members be appointed to join with the Select Committee appointed by the House of Lords, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message of the 21st day of June, to consider the Act 9 and 10 Vic. c. 20, and the Standing Orders of both Houses in relation to Parliamentary Deposits, and the completion of Railways within a prescribed time, and to report what alterations it is expedient to make therein for the present and for the ensuing Session" (*Mr. Dodson*) *June* 24, [188] 424; Motion agreed to; And a Message sent to the Lords; List of the Committee

Parl. Papers—

First Report 432

Second Report 511

Statue of Mr. Canning, Observations, Mr. Beresford Hope *August* 10, [189] 1291; debate thereon—(See title *Canning*)

St. Stephen's Crypt, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 12, [188] 1486

Witnesses (*House of Commons*), Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Copy of Recommendation of the Chairman of the Select Committee on Mines in the last Session to the Treasury, with reference to the Expenses of Witnesses examined before that Committee" (*Mr. Neate*) *April* 9, [186] 1376; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Return—(*Parl. P.* No. 6)

Writs for Re-Election, Observations, Sir Colman O'Loghlen *April* 5, [186] 1199

The Parliament Prorogued, by Commission, to Wednesday, the 6th November *August* 21

Parliamentary Reform, &c.—see *Representation of the People Bill*

Patagonia, Welsh Colony in

Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 1, [189] 599

Patriotic Fund Bill [H.L.]

(*The Earl of Longford*)

l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 4 (No. 201)

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Longford*) *July* 9, [188] 1255; Bill read 2ª

Committee * *July* 16

Report * *July* 18

Read 3ª * *July* 19

c. Read 1° * *July* 24 [Bill 278]

Read 2° * *July* 29

Committee *; Report *August* 6

Read 3° * *August* 8

l. Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 98]

PATTEN, Right Hon. Colonel J. W. († Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster), *Lancashire, N.*

Army Estimates, [185] 459

Disembodied Militia, [187] 1752

Land Forces, [185] 1501

† Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 9, [189] 762; *cl.* 15, 763

† District Prothonotaries (Duchy of Lancaster), [189] 81, 1102, 1103;—Fee Fund, 172

Gas and Water Bills, Res. [185] 1228

Great North of Scotland Railway, Consid. [187] 1248

Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 982, 996

Lancaster Election Commission, Report, [185] 726

London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (No. 3)—Suspension of Standing Orders, [186] 1170

† Masters and Workmen, Comm. *cl.* 5, [189] 520

† Metropolis—Statue of Canning, [189] 1294

† Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1419

Parliament—Railway Bills—Standing Orders, [185] 279; Res. [187] 1655

Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 483; Comm. 1488; *cl.* 8, [187] 1297, 1328, 1329, 1339; † Consid. *add. cl.* [188] 1452

† Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1413

Trades Unions, Comm. *cl.* 5, [185] 999

PAULL, Mr. H., *St. Ives*

Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1913, 1924; Consid. [187] 362

Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. *cl.* 4, [188] 557, 558; 3R. 847

Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 31, [188] 610; *cl.* A, 618, 623; *add. cl.* 1011

Pawnbroking Bill (*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. O'Beirne*)

c. Resolution; Bill ordered; read 1° * *June* 3

Bill withdrawn * *August* 7 [Bill 182]

PEASE, Mr. J. W., *Durham, S.*

Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1604

Metropolis—The New Law Courts, [189] 1221

Mines, &c. Assessment, Leave, [185] 652; 2R. [186] 1426

Public Houses, &c. Leave, [186] 163

Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. *cl.* 4, [188] 558

Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [187] 473, 699, 706; *cl.* 4, 847, 1161; *cl.* 40, [188] 458, 666; *add. cl.* 890; Schedule B, Amendt. 1281; Consid. *add. cl.* 1451; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* 5, [189] 1124

Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1412

Spirits, Beer and Wine Licences, [185] 1307

PEEL, Right Hon. Sir R., *Tamworth*

Clifton-on-Dunsmore Plot Rents, [187] 372, 772

Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. [186] 558

Ireland—Alleged Abetting of Fenianism, [187] 621

Luxemburg—Grand Duchy of, [186] 981, 1248, 1257

[*cont.*

Peel, Right Hon. Sir R.—*cont.*
"Mermaid," Destruction of the Ship, Motion for an Address, [188] 1755
Naval Review, The, [188] 1396
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1238, 1241
Supply—Queen's University (Ireland), [188] 1707

Peel, Right Hon. Lt.-Gen. J. († Secretary of State for War), *Huntingdon*
† Army—Artillery—Stud Shot, [185] 725
† Corporal Punishment, [185] 464
Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1681
† Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1986
† Government Powder Magazines, [185] 812
† (India and the Colonies), Motion for a Committee, [185] 1049, 1053
† Land Transport, [185] 1145
† Medical Officers of the Guards, [185] 584
Ordnance Department, Motion for a Committee, [187] 1804
† Quartermasters of Militia, [185] 467
Recruiting, Res. [187] 685
† Army Estimates, [185] 213, 459
Increase of Pay, [187] 687; [189] 127, 137
† Land Forces, [185] 1448, 1483, 1508, 1509
Military Store Establishment, [187] 1706, 1708, 1709, 1710
† Supplementary, [185] 1233, 1308, 1309
Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1711, 1714
Chester Castle, Troops and Arms in, [185] 342
Fortifications, Grants for, Motion for a Return, [185] 288
India—Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1015
† Ireland—Waterford Election, [185] 462, 723, 1031
† Jamaica—Major-General O'Connor, [185] 214
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1345
Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 791, 918
† Palliser, Major—Rewards to Inventors, [185] 341
† Paris Exhibition—Munitions of War, [185] 1232
Parliament—Public Business, [188] 778
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 285; *add. cl.* [188] 838
Volunteers, Res. [188] 740

Peel, Mr. A. W., *Warwick*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 493
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1014
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 556; Comm. *add. cl.* Amendt. [188] 1236
Small Tenements Rating Act, [185] 404

Peel, Mr. J., *Tamworth*
India—Banks of Bombay and Bengal, [186] 121
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1235

Peterborough, Bishop of
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 58

Petit Juries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 22 [Bill 46]
Read 2°, after debate *Mar* 18, [186] 95
Committee *; Report *May* 16 [Bill 158]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Peto, Sir S. M., *Bristol*
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [186] 1259; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1416
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1339, 1348
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, Motion for Adjournment, [185] 1857; [186] 353
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. [188] 554; *cl.* 1, 556
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 41

Petty Sessions (Ireland) Act (1851) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland, Lord Naas*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 22 [Bill 87]
Read 2° * *April* 4
Committee *; Report *April* 5
Read 3° * *April* 8
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *April* 9
Read 2ª * *May* 3 (No. 78)
Committee *; Report *May* 6
Read 3ª * *May* 7
Royal Assent *May* 31 [30 *Vict.* c. 19]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. S. Cave, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Resolution; Bill ordered * *May* 1
Read 1° * *May* 3 [Bill 130]
Read 2° * *May* 6
Referred to Select Committee *May* 8
Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Baillie Cochrane (Chairman), Mr. Severne, Mr. Whitworth, Mr. F. M. Williams
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 23
Considered as amended * *May* 24 [Bill 163]
Read 3° * *May* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *May* 28
Read 2ª * *June* 4 (No. 117)
Committee *; Report *June* 6
Read 3ª * *June* 7
Royal Assent *June* 17 [30 *Vict.* c. 33]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Resolution; Bill ordered * *May* 15
Read 1° * *May* 17 [Bill 162]
Read 2° * *May* 20
Committee *; Report *May* 23
Read 3° * *May* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *May* 25
Read 2ª * *June* 4 (No. 115)
Report of Select Committee *June* 28
Committee * *July* 9 (No. 187)
Report * *July* 11
Read 3ª * *July* 15
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 61]

Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Hunt*)

- *c.* Resolution; Bill ordered; read 1º* *June* 6
  - Read 2º* *June* 13 [Bill 192]
  - Committee*; Report *June* 17
  - Read 3º* *June* 18
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Richmond*) *June* 18
  - Read 2ª* *June* 20 (No. 161)
  - Committee* *June* 21
  - Report* *June* 27
  - Read 3ª* *June* 28
  - Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 73]

Pim, Mr. J., *Dublin City*

- Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [187] 1336
- Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 990
- Ireland—Court of Admiralty, [187] 769
  - Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Motion for a Committee, [186] 413, 415
  - Queen's University, [187] 1463
  - Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 13
  - State of, [189] 215
  - Weights and Measures (Dublin), [187] 769
- Irish Peerage—The Royal Prerogative, Motion for an Address, [188] 1134
- Landed Property Improvement and Leasing (Ireland), Leave, [187] 562
- Mauritius—Fever in the, [188] 1192
- Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1125; Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1396
- Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1864
- Railways, Commission on, [185] 404
- Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 29, Amendt. [188] 177, 180; *add. cl.* 810, 1200
- Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1140
- Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), 2R. [187] 1647
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1753

Plantagenets at Fontevrault, Statues of the

- Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 7, [185] 1444; *Mar* 29, [186] 817

Plate River, War in the

- Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 1, [185] 1233

Police

- *Constabulary Reports,* Question, Mr. Whitworth; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *August* 9, [189] 1221
- *Superannuation Funds,* Question, Mr. Howes; Answer, Mr. G. Hardy *August* 15, [189] 1564
  - (See title *Ireland—Fenian Conspiracy —Constabulary*)

Policies of Insurance (*now* **Policies of Assurance**) **Bill**
(*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Serjeant Barry, Mr. Vance, Mr. Pim*)

- *c.* Ordered* *Mar* 21
  - Read 1º* *Mar* 22 [Bill 85]
  - Read 2º* *April* 2 [*cont.*

Policies of Assurance Bill—cont.

- Committee*; Report *April* 4
- Considered as amended* *April* 8
- Read 3º* *April* 9
- *l.* Read 1ª* (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *April* 11 (No. 82)
  - Read 2ª* *May* 9
  - Committee*; Report *May* 31 (No. 126)
  - Committee nominated *June* 4, as follows:—Ld. Chancellor, E. Devon, E. Graham, V. Halifax, L. Somerhill, L. Cranworth, and L. Cairns
  - Report *June* 7 (Nos. 151 & 152)
  - Committee* *June* 18
  - Report* *June* 20
  - Read 3ª* *June* 25
  - Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 144]

Pollard-Urquhart, Mr. W., *Westmeath Co.*

- Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 680
- Financial Statement, [186] 1144
- Ireland—Landed Estates, Res. [188] 1637
  - Pollution of Rivers, [187] 773
  - Railways, Res. [185] 1941
  - Taxation, Res. [188] 1300
- Irish Peerage—The Royal Prerogative, Motion for an Address, [188] 1131
- Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1858
- Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 958
- Supply—National Education (Ireland), [189] 1278
  - Special Missions, [188] 1902
- Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1747
- Thames Embankment (Sheilds' Petition), Motion for a Committee, [186] 802
- Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 1259

Pollution of Rivers—Report of the Commissioners

- Question, Mr. Harvey Lewis; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 21, [186] 280

Poor Law

- *Bethnal Green Workhouse,* Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 13, [189] 1452
- *Consolidation of the Poor Laws,* Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 13, [189] 1448
- *District Metropolitan Lunatic Asylums—Cost of Buildings,* Question, Colonel Hogg; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 13, [189] 1450; *August* 16, 1605
- *Frost, Case of the Pauper,* Question, Sir John Simeon; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 27, [188] 605
- *Holyhead Union,* Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 22, [185] 809, 810; *Mar* 7, 1455—(*Parl. P.* No. 84)
- *Infection—Sanitary Act of 1866—Case of Emanuel Cook,* Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 2, [188] 852
- *Medical Salaries (Ireland),* Question, Sir F. Heygate; Answer, Lord Naas *July* 29, [189] 329

Poor Law—cont.

Metropolitan Common Fund, Question, Lord Charles Bruce; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 6, [189] 957; Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *August* 15, 1571

Metropolitan Poor Law Rating, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Mar* 28, [186] 726

Metropolitan Poor Relief Act—Nominees, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *June* 24, [188] 425

Poor Law Board, New President of the, Question, Colonel French; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 21, [187] 870

Poor Law Guardians—The Guildford Board of Guardians, Petition presented (*The Earl of Carnarvon*) *May* 21, [187] 860

Poor Law (Ireland), Case of Charles Flynn, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *August* 12, [189] 1335

Poor Law (Scotland), Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 19, [185] 586

Poor Relief (Ireland), Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 21, [187] 881

Poplar, Distress in, Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *April* 8, [186] 1266

Public Health Act, Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 26, [186] 565

Rating of Charitable Institutions, Question, Mr. Biddulph; Answer, Mr. Earle *Feb* 22, [185] 811

Rating of Charities and Schools, Question, Mr. J. A. Smith; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 21, [188] 266; Question, Viscount Sydney; Answer, The Earl of Malmesbury *July* 1, 745

Religious Rights in Workhouses, Question, Sir Rowland Blennerhasset; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 26, [189] 170

Vagrancy in the Metropolis, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 21, [189] 1640

Parl. Papers—
19th Report (England) . . [3870]
21st Report (Scotland) . . [3764]
20th Report (Ireland) . . [3877]

Poor Law Board, &c. Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary G. Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *June* 6 [Bill 193]
Read 2° * *June* 20
Committee *July* 11, [188] 1417—R.P.
Committee *; Report *July* 22 [Bill 271]
Question, Mr. T. B. Potter; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *July* 22, 1874
Committee (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 25, [189] 142
Considered as amended * *July* 26
Read 3° * *July* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Devon*) *July* 30 (No. 271)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 2, 752; Bill read 2ª
Committee * *August* 6 (No. 303)
Report * *August* 9
Read 3ª * *August* 12
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 106]

PORTMAN, Lord
Consecration of Churchyards, Comm. [187] 1650; *cl.* 1, Amendt. [188] 1163
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Report, [187] 1370
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [187] 767
Friendly Societies, Motion for Returns, [188] 127, 128
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. [187] 763; *add. cl.* 1196; Report, *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1484
Meetings in Royal Parks, 1R. [187] 1015
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, [185] 374

PORTSMOUTH, Earl of
Consecration of Churchyards, Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 1164; Report, *add. cl.* 1427

Portugal, Commercial Treaty with
Question, Mr. Akroyd; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 26, [186] 564; *June* 3, [187] 1491
Treaty of Commerce between France and Portugal—*Parl. P.* . . . [3948]

Post Office
Thirteenth Report—*Parl. P.* . . [3926]

Arrangements—The 12-Mile Radius, Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 8, [188] 1190

East India, China, and Australian Mails, Observations, The Duke of Montrose *August* 9, [189] 1200; Question, Mr. Laird; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 15, 1561

Foreign Postal Conventions, Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 8, [188] 1186

Holyhead and London Railway Fares, Question, Mr. Verner; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 9, [189] 1221

Money Orders, International System of, Question, Mr. Ewart; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 20, [187] 774

Nassau, &c., Conveyance of Mails to, Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Hunt *June* 27, [188] 603

Postal Communication with the Australian Colonies, Question, The Earl of Carnarvon; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *August* 12, [189] 1329

Postal Communication with the East, Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 11, [185] 212—*Supply—Vote for Post Office Packet Service*, [189] 658

Postal Service with the United States, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 22, [185] 811; Question, Mr. Graves; Answer, Mr. Hunt *August* 6, [189] 960; Convention presented (*The Duke of Montrose*) *August* 9, 1200

Parl Papers—
Contract with Spanish West India Mail Steam Packet Co. . . . 9
Postal Service (Atlantic), Corr. . . 115
India, China, and Australia . 312, 395, 405

Private Postal Service, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 11, [188] 1391

Telegraphic and Postal Systems, Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 15, [188] 1512; Question, Mr. Akroyd; Answer, Mr. Hunt *July* 16, 1621

POTTER, Mr. E., *Carlisle*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 680
Factory Acts Extension, Leave, [185] 1281 ; Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 482, 483
Hours of Labour Regulation, Re-comm. *cl.* 6, [189] 485
Master and Servant, Law of, [185] 1260 ; 2R. Amendt. [187] 1603

POTTER, Mr. T. B., *Rochdale*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 15, [189] 763
Poor Law Board, [188] 1874

POWELL, Mr. F. S., *Cambridge*
Agricultural Gangs — Childrens' Employment Commission, [186] 279
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1017
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 691 ; Comm. [189] 754 ; *cl.* 15, 763
Associations of Workmen, 2R. [186] 1452
Boundary Commissioners, [187] 1939
Courts of Justice, The New, Res. [185] 823
Education, [185] 1160
Education in America and Canada, [187] 879 ; —Rev. J. Fraser's Report, 1024
Educational Grants, Res. [186] 1191
Ireland — Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1901
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [186] 451, 1710 ; Re-comm. [189] 479 ; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 482, 483
Finsbury Estate, 2R. [185] 315
Hours of Labour Regulation, Re-comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. [189] 484
Libel, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [188] 545
Master and Servant, Law of, [185] 1261
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1579, 1924
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1625
Public Houses, &c. Leave, [186] 163
Registration of Voters, 2R. [187] 918
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 624 ; Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 49, 730 ; *cl.* 4, 1174 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1232, 1233, 1240 ; *cl.* 10, 1978 ; *cl.* 12, 1987 ; *cl.* 15, [188] 41 ; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 48 ; *cl.* 18, 50 ; *cl.* 31, 532 ; *cl.* A, 619 ; Amendt. 621 ; *add. cl.* 801 ; Amendt. 806, 810, 811 ; Amendt. 1018, 1021 ; Amendt. 1030 ; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1453 ; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1460
Sanitary Report, [189] 1338
Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1083
Sunday Lectures, 2R. [188] 116
Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 583 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 37
Supply—Department of Science and Art, [189] 1231
  National Education (Ireland), [189] 1275
  Paris Exhibition, Department of Science and Art, [189] 1260
  Poor Law Commissioners, [187] 859
  Public Record Office, [187] 857
  University of London, [187] 1469
Trades Union Commission Act Extension, Comm. [188] 1407 ; *cl.* 1, 1413
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 513 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 995 ; *cl.* 5, 997

POWIS, Earl of
Brown's Charity, 2R. [188] 502
Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1017
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 13, [187] 1195 ; *add. cl.* 1197
Limerick Harbour (Composition of Debt), 2R. [188] 5 ; Comm. 1183
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 38, Amendt. [189] 736 ; Report, *cl.* 4, 829

Prerogative of Mercy— The Commission on Capital Punishment
Question, Mr. Darby Griffith ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 28, [186] 734

PRICE, Mr. W. P., *Gloucester*
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. *cl.* 4, [188] 557
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 884

Princess of Wales, H.R.H.—Birth of a Princess
l. Address of Congratulation to Her Majesty (*The Earl of Derby*) agreed to, *Nemine Dissentiente Feb* 22, [185] 791 ; Her Majesty's Answer reported *Feb* 25, 1002
c. Address of Congratulation to Her Majesty (*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*) agreed to, *Nemine Contradicente Feb* 22, [185] 813 ; Her Majesty's Answer reported *Feb* 26, 1032

Prison Ministers Act
Observations, Mr. MacEvoy ; Reply, Mr. M'Laren *July* 19, [188] 1765

Private Bills
LORDS—
Standing Order Committee on—appointed and nominated *Feb* 21, [185] 719
Board of Trade Reports, Question, Lord Taunton ; Answer, The Duke of Richmond *Mar* 28, [186] 704
Churchyards and Cemeteries—On Motion of The Earl of Belmore, Standing Order 182 amended *Feb* 25, [185] 906
Petitions, Resolution thereon *April* 11, [186] 1477
On the Motion of *The Chairman of Committees* — Ordered, that no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday, the 18th Day of June next ; and other Orders *May* 3, [186] 1928

COMMONS—
Board of Trade Reports, Observations, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 14, [185] 1800

Private Executions Bill
Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee ; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 25, [189] 86

Privilege—Petition of E. Truelove and others—see *Parliament*

Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange Bill (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Pim*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *July* 2 [Bill 224]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 11

Promissory Notes (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. M'Kenna, Mr. Brady*)
c. Resolution; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 25 [Bill 90]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. M'Kenna*) *May* 1, [186] 1853
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Colonel French*); A. 46, N. 70; M. 24; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Prorogation of Parliament Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *July* 16 (No. 228)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 18, [188] 1660; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee*; Report *July* 19
Read 3ª* *July* 22
c. Read 1°* *July* 24 [Bill 277]
Read 2°* *July* 29
Committee*; Report *August* 1
Read 3°* *August* 2
l. Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 81]

Prothonotaries Fee Fund
Question, Mr. Gorst; Answer, Colonel Wilson Patten *July* 26, [189] 172

Public Accounts
Reports of Select Committee [No. 333, 519]

Public Health Act
Question, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 26, [186] 565

Public Health (Scotland) Bill
(*Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Hunt*)
186] c. Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *Mar* 25, 559 [Bill 89]
. Second Reading deferred, after short debate *April* 8, 1317
. Read 2°, after short debate *May* 2, 1925
Committee*; Report *June* 3 [Bill 179]
Re-comm.*; Report *July* 15 [Bill 251]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *July* 26 [Bill 284]
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 2
Considered as amended* *August* 5
Read 3°* *August* 6
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl Graham*) *August* 6
Read 2ª* *August* 8 (No. 306)
Committee*; Report *August* 9
Read 3ª* *August* 12
Royal Assent *August* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 101]

Public Houses, &c. Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Graves, Mr. Horsfall, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Acts read; Moved, "That this House will immediately resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Acts relating to Public Houses, &c." (*Mr. Graves*) *Mar* 19, [186] 160
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "immediately," and insert "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Roebuck*); Question, "That 'immediately,' &c.;" after further short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; Acts considered in Committee; Resolution; Bill ordered; read 1° [Bill 83]
After short debate, Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn *May* 1, 1849

Public Libraries (Scotland) Acts Amendment Bill (*Mr. Ewart, Sir John Ogilvy*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 26 [Bill 92]
Read 2°* *April* 1
Committee*; Report *April* 9
Considered as amended* *April* 10
Read 3°* *April* 11
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Airlie*) *May* 2 (No. 85)
Read 2ª* *May* 28
Committee* *June* 3; Report* *June* 7
Read 3ª* *June* 17 (No. 128)
Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 37]

Public Offices, The New—see title *State Offices—The New Buildings*

Public Records (Ireland) Bill
(*Lord Naas, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered, after short debate *May* 14, [187] 562
Read 1°* *May* 15 [Bill 157]
Read 2°* *May* 23
Committee*; Report *June* 4
Committee* *June* 27—R.P. [Bill 185]
Re-comm.*; Report *June* 28
Considered as amended* *July* 2
Read 3°* *July* 3
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Belmore*) *July* 4
Read 2ª* *July* 8 (No. 204)
Committee* *July* 9 (No. 210)
Report* *July* 12
Read 3ª* *July* 15
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 70]

Public Records (Ireland) [*Salaries, &c.*]
Resolution in Committee* *June* 3; reported* *June* 4

Public Schools Bill
(*The Earl of Derby*)
185] l. Presented; read 1ª *Feb* 7, 80 (No. 4)
. Read 2ª, after short debate *Feb* 14, 333
. Committee *Feb* 25, 1003 (No. 29)
. Report *Mar* 7, 1428
. Read 3ª *Mar* 8, 1546
c. Read 1°* *Mar* 15 [Bill 78]
Question, Viscount Enfield; Answer, Mr. Walpole *July* 29, [189] 330
Order for 2R. discharged *August* 10

Public Works Commissioners (Ireland)
Question, Colonel French; Answer, Mr. Hunt *April* 30, [186] 1784
Parl. Papers—
35th Report . . . . [3875]
Funds 326

Public Works, Harbours, &c. [Advances] Bill (*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Resolution; Bill ordered; read 1° * *May* 28
Read 2 * *May* 30 [Bill 172]
Committee *; Report *June* 3
Read 3° * *June* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *June* 4
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *June* 6
Read 3ª * *June* 7 (No. 137)
Royal Assent *June* 17 [30 *Vict.* c. 32]

Public Works (Ireland) Bill
(*Lord Naas, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. Dick*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 18 [Bill 262]
Read 2° * *July* 24
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Considered as amended * *August* 7
Read 3° * *August* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 8
Read 2ª * *August* 12 (No. 315)
Committee *; Report *August* 13
Read 3ª * *August* 15
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 112]

Pugh, Mr. D., *Carmarthenshire*
Army—Increase Pay, [187] 1938
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [189] 998
Educational Grants, Res. [186] 1198
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 924
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1162

Quarantine at Southampton
Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *April* 4, [186] 1108

Queen Anne's Bounty Office
Question, Mr. Bouverie; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 16, [188] 1623

Quinagh and Parsonstown Drainage Bill (*Mr. Hunt, Lord Naas*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 31 [Bill 294]
Read 2° * *August* 1
Committee *; Report *August* 2
Read 3° * *August* 2
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 5
Read 2ª * *August* 16 (No. 295)
Committee *; Report *August* 17
Read 3ª * *August* 19
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 139]

Railway and Joint Stock Companies' Accounts Bill (*Sir W. Hutt, Mr. Ellice*)
c. Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *June* 4, [187] 1588 [Bill 188]
Read 2° * *July* 10
Committee *; Report *July* 15 [Bill 252]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 19

Railway Bills—"Pre-Preference Capital"
Observations, Lord Redesdale *June* 18, [188] 1
Pre-Preference Shares—Great North of Scotland Railway Bill, Considered as amended, after short debate *May* 29, [187] 1245

Railway Bills—Standing Orders
Resolution (*Mr. Milner Gibson*) *June* 6, [187] 1652; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, Lord Redesdale *June* 17, 1928

Railway Companies Arrangements Bill
Railway Companies Bill }
(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. S. Cave, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 7, [185] 89 [Bill 4]
Question, Mr. Fildes; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 12, 1704
Read 2° * *May* 13, and referred to the Select Committee on "Railway Debenture Holders Bill"
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 27
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *May* 31
Considered as amended *June* 6, [187] 1722
Read 3° * *June* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *June* 17 (No. 159)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Duke of Richmond*) *June* 25, [188] 489; after short debate, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee
And, on *June* 27, Committee nominated as follows:—D. Richmond, D. Devonshire, E. Lucan, E. Romney, L. Redesdale, L. Stanley of Alderley, L. Overstone, L. Westbury, L. Colonsay, and L. Cairns; *June* 28, D. Cleveland, and D. Montrose added
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. S. Cave *July* 16, 1626
Report of Select Committee *July* 22 (No. 249)
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill" (*The Duke of Richmond*) *July* 26, [189] 156; after short debate, House in Committee
Report * *July* 30 (No. 262)
Read 3ª * *August* 5 (No. 276)
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 127]

Railway Companies (Ireland) [Advances] Bill (*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *August* 6 [Bill 304]
Read 2° * *August* 7
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Considered as amended * *August* 9
Read 3° * *August* 9
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Devon*) *August* 9
Read 2ª * *August* 16 (No. 323)
Committee *; Report *August* 17
Read 3ª * *August* 19
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 138]

Railway Companies Relief Bill
(*Sir William Gallwey, Mr. Beresford Hope*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 24 [Bill 279]

Railway Companies (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Duke of Richmond*)
l. Presented; read 1^{a}* *June* 25 (No. 179)
Read 2^{a}* *July* 1, and referred to the Select Committee on "Railway Companies Bill"
Report of Select Committee *July* 22 (No. 250)
Committee* *July* 26 (No. 263)
Report* *July* 30 (No. 277)
Read 3^{a}* *August* 5
c. Read 1°* *August* 7 [Bill 306]
Read 2°* *August* 8
Committee*; Report *August* 13
Considered as amended* *August* 14
Read 3°* *August* 14
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 126]

Railway Companies Winding-up (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Lawson, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Mr. Sullivan*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 29 [Bill 101]
Bill withdrawn* *June* 25

Railway Construction Facilities Act (1864) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. White*)
c. Ordered* *Feb* 25
Read 1°* *Feb* 26 [Bill 57]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Whalley*) *May* 17, [187] 758
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Leeman*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and negatived; Bill put off for six months

Railway Debenture Holders Bill
(*Mr. Watkin, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Mr. Laing*)
c. Ordered *Feb* 12, [185] 297
Read 1°* *Feb* 14 [Bill 20]
Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committe *Feb* 21, 781
And, on *Feb* 25, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Watkin (Chairman), Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Thomas Baring, Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Milner Gibson, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Graves, Sir F. Heygate, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, Mr. Laing, Mr. Leeman, and Mr. Scourfield; *Mar* 7, Mr. Stephen Cave added, Sir Stafford Northcote disch.

Railway Traffic Protection Bill
(*The Lord Redesdale*)
l. Presented; read 1^{a}, after short debate *Mar* 12, [185] 1699 (No. 43)
Read 2^{a} *Mar* 14, 1766
Moved, "That the House do resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill" (*The Lord Redesdale*) *Mar* 19, [186] 111; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Railway Traffic Returns
Question, Mr. Crawford; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 11, [185] 212

Railways
l. *Standing Orders—Parliamentary Deposits*, Observations, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, Lord Redesdale *June* 4, [187] 1552
Select Committee appointed to join with a Committee of the Commons to consider the Act 9th and 10th Vict. Cap. 20. and the Standing Orders of both Houses in relation to Parliamentary Deposits and for securing the Completion of Railways within a prescribed Time, and to report what Alterations it is expedient to make therein for the present and for the ensuing Session: The Lords following were named of the Committee:—D. Richmond, V. Eversley, L. Redesdale, L. Portman, L. Stanley of Alderley; and a Message sent to the Commons (*The Chairman of Committees*) *June* 21, [188] 265
Message from the Commons to acquaint this House, That they have appointed a Select Committee of Five Members to join with the Select Committee appointed by this House *June* 25, 506
c. Moved, "That a Select Committee of Five Members be appointed to join with the Select Committee appointed by the House of Lords, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message of the 21st day of June to consider the Act 9 and 10 Vic. c. 20, and the Standing Orders of both Houses in relation to Parliamentary Deposits, and the completion of Railways within a prescribed time, and to report what alterations it is expedient to make therein for the present and for the ensuing Session" (*Mr. Dodson*) *June* 24, 424; Motion agreed to
Select Committee appointed, and nominated as follows:—Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Milner Gibson, Lord Hotham, Mr. Howes; *July* 23, Colonel Wilson Patten added
Parl. Papers—
l. First Report 213
Second Report 308
c. First Report 432
Second Report 511
Commission on, Question, Mr. Pim; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 15, [185] 404; Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 3, [186] 1935; Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 7, [187] 92; Question, Mr. M. T. Bass; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *August* 12, [189] 1336
(See title *Parliament*)
Irish Lines, The, Question, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Feb* 18, [185] 457; Question, Mr. W. O. Gore; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 18, 459—(See *Ireland—Railways*)
Railway Debentures, Question, Mr. Edwards; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, [186] 289; Question, Sir Thomas Lloyd; Answer, Mr. S. Cave *Mar* 29, 816
Moved, "That it is expedient in the interests of the Public, that in cases where adequate security can be given, the State should assume the responsibility of the Debenture Debt of Railway Companies unable to meet their engagements, upon conditions providing for the eventual acquisition of such Railways by the State, upon terms of mutual advantage to the State and to the Railway Companies" (*Mr. Crawford*) *April* 2, 1025; after long debate, Motion withdrawn

[*cont.*

Railways—cont.
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the provisions made by Parliament for securing the completion of Railways within a prescribed time, and to report whether any and what alterations should be made in the Standing Orders of this House, requiring such provisions, or the Act 9 Vict. c. 20" (*Mr. Dodson*) *April* 11, [186] 1580
And, on *April* 29, Committee nominated as follows:—Colonel Wilson Patten (Chairman), Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Cave, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Goschen, Sir Colman O'Loghlen, Colonel Packe, Mr. Scholefield, Mr. Whitbread, and Mr. Woodd
Report—(*Parl. P.* No. 302)

Railways [*Cancellation of Bonds*]
Resolution in Committee *May* 30

Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication) Bill
(*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan, Sir Patrick O'Brien*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 20 [Bill 39]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*) *May* 1, [186] 1828; Bill read 2°, after short debate
Committee* *June* 18
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [18th June], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *June* 25, [188] 552; after short debate, Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and agreed to; Bill considered in Committee, and reported
Considered as amended * *June* 28
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. H. B. Sheridan*) *July* 1, 847
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Serjeant Gaselee*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 43, N. 5; M. 38; main Question agreed to; Bill read 3°
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 2 (No. 197)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *July* 9, 1257; after short debate, Bill read 2ª: then it was moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee; objected to; and on Question resolved in the affirmative, and Bill referred to a Select Committee accordingly
And, on *July* 11, the Lords following were named of the Committee:—D. Richmond, D. Sutherland, E. Carnarvon, E. Kimberley, V. Sydney, L. Stanley of Alderley; *July* 12, Ld. Steward, E. Lucan, and Lord Ponsonby added
Report of Select Committee *August* 1 (No. 255)
Committee* *August* 2 (No. 278)
Report* *August* 5
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Lord Stanley of Alderley*) *August* 6, [189] 953
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Earl of Lucan*); after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Motion withdrawn; order for 3R. discharged

Railways (Ireland) Bill
(*Lord Naas, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *August* 2 [Bill 298]
Read 2° * *August* 5
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Read 3° * *August* 7
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *August* 8
Read 2ª * *August* 9 (No. 316)
Committee *; Report *August* 12
Read 3ª * *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 104]

Railways (Scotland) Bill
(*Sir Graham Montgomery, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 11 [Bill 122]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Graham Montgomery*) *May* 23, [187] 1011
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Edward Craufurd*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Read 2° * *May* 30
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Considered as amended * *June* 14
Read 3° * *June* 17
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *June* 18
Read 2ª * *June* 25 (No. 162)
Committee * *July* 25
Report * *July* 26
Read 3ª * *July* 29
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 80]

RAVENSWORTH, Lord
Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 152
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1817; Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 311; 3R. 930

RAWLINSON, Sir H. C., *Frome*
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, Motion for an Address, [189] 237
Army—(India and the Colonies), Motion for a Committee, [185] 1048
Egypt—The Suez Canal, [185] 1549
India—The Maharajah of Mysore, [185] 827; [187] 1044

READ, Mr. C. S., *Norfolk, E.*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 508
Agricultural Statistics, [187] 1667
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1019
Cattle Plague, [185] 402, 403; [189] 1105, 1609
Compensation for Slaughtered Cattle, [185] 1702; Res. [186] 2016; [188] 1668
Importation of Foreign Cattle, [187] 879
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 229
Contagious Diseases (Animals), [189] 86; Comm. *cl.* 12, 1002; *cl.* 45, 1423, 1520; *add. cl.* 1525
Dogs, Duty on, 2R. [185] 781; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1196; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1202
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1077
Financial Statement, [186] 1143

[*cont.*

Read, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 908, 910
Land Tenure (Ireland), 2R. [188] 582
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 529
Metropolitan Poor, 3R. [185] 1863
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1429
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 662
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 8, [187] 1334 ; *cl.* 40, [188] 466
Supply—Agricultural Statistics, [188] 1906, 1907
  Inspection of Corn Returns, [188] 1905
  National Education (Ireland), [189] 1282
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1769
Traffic Regulations — Waggons and Drays, [188] 428
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 820
Turnpike Trusts, Leave, [186] 154
Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1673

Real Estate Charges Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Locke King, Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. Headlam*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *June* 3 [Bill 181]
Read 2° * *June* 18
Committee * ; Report *June* 24
Considered as amended * *June* 26
Read 3° * *June* 27
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Cranworth*) *June* 28
Read 2ª * *July* 9 (No. 191)
Committee * ; Report *July* 11
Read 3ª * *July* 15
Royal Assent *July* 25 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 69]

Rearden, Mr. D. J., *Athlone*
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 366
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 884
  Distress in the West, [187] 940 ; [189] 1333
  Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1897
  Poor Relief, [187] 881
  Voting Papers, [186] 1481
Political Prisoners, Motion for an Address, [189] 1514
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), Leave, [185] 553
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1226
United States—The "Alabama" Claims, [189] 958

Rebow, Mr. J. G., *Colchester*
Cattle Plague—Compensation for Slaughtered Cattle, [185] 1702 ;—In the Metropolis, [187] 1292
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 29, [188] 209 ; Consid. *cl.* 42, Amendt. 1462

Recovery of Certain Debts (Scotland) Bill
[H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª * *Feb* 15 (No. 14)
Read 2ª *Mar* 12, [185] 1699
Committee ; Report *Mar* 28, [186] 703
Committee * ; Report *June* 25 (No. 181)
Read 3ª * *July* 1

cont.

Recovery of Certain Debts (Scotland) Bill—cont.
c. Read 1° * *July* 2 [Bill 220]
Read 2° * *July* 4
Committee * ; Report *August* 2 [Bill 296]
Committee * (*on re-comm*); Report *August* 5
Read 3° * *August* 6
l. Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 96]

Recruiting Commission
Moved, " That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for, Return of the Recommendations of the Recruiting Commission of 1866, and the Steps taken thereon" (*The Earl of Dalhousie*) *Mar* 14, [185] 1768 ; after long debate, Motion agreed to
Parl. Papers—
  Report of Commission . . . [3137]
  Paper respecting 83

Redesdale, Lord (Chairman of Committees)
Army—Knightsbridge Cavalry Barracks, [187] 1013, 1470 ;—March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1495
British North America, Commons. Amendts. [185] 1701
Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 155
Colonial Churches, [186] 385
Companies Act (1862) Amendment, 2R. [189] 1545, 1546
Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1016, 1018, 1019 ; Comm. 1649, 1651
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Report, [187] 1370
Galway Harbour (Composition of Debt), 2R. [188] 964, 965 ; Comm. 1256
Government Offices, The New, [186] 978 ; Motion for a Return, 1331, 1334
Increase of the Episcopate, Report, *cl.* 2, [187] 1480 ; 3R. 1551
Local Government Supplemental (No. 5), Comm. [188] 1619
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, [188] 1422, 1424
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (Arrangement), 3R. [189] 1536, 1537, 1538
Meetings in Royal Parks, 1R. [187] 1013, 1015 ; 2R. [188] 1425, 1709
New Palace Yard and the Houses of Parliament, [187] 766
North British Railway (Carlisle Deviation), 3R. [189] 524
Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for Returns, [188] 139;—Notice of Questions, 1254
Parliamentary Reform—Borough Qualification, Res. [185] 718
Private Bills—Board of Trade Reports, [186] 704
Privilege—Mr. R. S. France, [185] 119 ; Explanation, 370, 452, 453 ; Res. 1627
Railway Bills—Standing Orders, [187] 1928 ; —Pre-preference Capital, [188] 1
Railway Companies, 2R. [188] 491 ; Comm. [189] 156, 162
Railway Deposits—Standing Orders, [187] 1553
Railway Traffic Protection, 1R. [185] 1699 ; 2R. 1767 ; Comm. [186] 116, 120
Representation of the People, 3R. [189] 935, 939

[cont.

REDESDALE, Lord—*cont.*
  Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [187] 862, 864
  Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1442
  Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Comm. [185] 1910
  Turnpike Acts Continuance, Report, *cl.* 3, Amendt. [189] 1327

Reigate Borough Election
  Report of Bribery Commissioners . [3774]

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
  Question, Mr. Candlish; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 24, [188] 426

Reformatory Schools Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Marquess Townshend*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 19 (No. 245)
  Order for 2R. discharged *August* 12

Reform League — Proposed Meeting in Hyde Park—see *Metropolis—Hyde Park*

Registration of Voters Bill
(*Viscount Amberley, Mr. Baines*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 7 [Bill 136]
  Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Viscount Amberley*) *May* 21, [187] 915; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn

Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites) Bill
(*Mr. Hadfield, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Akroyd, Mr. Leeman*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Mar* 1, [185] 1283
  Read 2° * *Mar* 6 [Bill 64]
  Committee *; Report *Mar* 20
  Considered as amended *Mar* 28, [186] 798
  Read 3° * *Mar* 29
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Cranworth*) *April* 1
  Read 2ª, after debate *April* 5, 1167 (No. 68)
  Committee * *May* 3 (No. 87)
  Order for Report of Amendments discharged *May* 9

Representation of the People — Parliamentary Reform
LORDS—
  Borough Qualification, Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, in any further scheme to amend the Reform Act of 1832 and increase the body of Electors, it is not desirable or necessary that all Boroughs should return Members by the same qualification" (*Lord Campbell*) *Feb* 21, [185] 701; after debate, Motion withdrawn
  Electors in Cities and Boroughs, Motion for Papers (*Earl Russell*) *Mar* 11, [185] 1633; after debate, Motion agreed to
  Metropolitan Boroughs, Address for Returns (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*) *April* 8, [186] 1264; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to [*cont.*

Representation of the People—LORDS—cont.
  Petition of Electors of Wolverhampton presented (*Earl Grey*) *Mar* 15, [185] 1890; after long debate, Petition ordered to lie upon the table
  Resignation of Members of the Cabinet—Ministerial Explanations, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 4, [185] 1284
  Statistics, Question, Earl Granville; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 11, [185] 1626; Observations, Earl Stanhope; Reply, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 22, [186] 372

COMMONS—
  Paragraph of the Queen's Speech read *Feb* 11
[185] Moved, "That on the 25th of February this House will resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to take into consideration the 2 & 3 *Will.* IV. c. 45" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*), 214; after long debate, Motion agreed to
  Resolutions, The, Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 14, 337; Question, Mr. Sclater-Booth; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 18, 465; Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 480; long debate thereon; Resolutions referred to by The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Appendix*)
  Order for Committee to consider the Act 2 & 3 *Will.* IV. c. 45, read
  Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Feb* 25, 937; after long debate, Motion withdrawn; Committee deferred till Thursday
  Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 26, 1021
  Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Gladstone*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
  Order for Committee to consider the Act 2 & 3 *Will.* IV. c. 45, read, and, after short debate, discharged *Feb* 28, 1203

  Course of Proceeding, Question, Mr. Bright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 25, [186] 472; Question, Mr. Gladstone *Mar* 29, 819; Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 1, 907; Question, Mr. Morrison; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 4, 1104; Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, [187] 94; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 14, 525

Borough Franchises
  Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, [185] 1306; *Mar* 22, [186] 396; *Mar* 25, 469
  Compound Householders, Clause 3, Question, Mr. Warner; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, [186] 1479; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 2, 1875; *May* 3, 1939; *May* 6, [187] 6 [*cont.*

Representation of the People—Commons—cont.

Joint Occupiers, Question, Sir Francis Goldsmid; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 7, [187] 90; Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 9, 261; Question, Mr. Thomson Hankey; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 16, 614

Lodger Franchise, The, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 28, [188] 667

Ratepaying Clause, The, Question, Mr. Denman; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 2, [188] 854

Rating and Rentals, Question, Mr. Bass; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 12, [185] 284

Residence, Ministerial Statement (*The Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 3, [186] 1939

Small Tenements Rating Act, Question, Mr. A. Peel; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 15, [185] 404

Working Classes, The, and the Borough Register, Question, Mr. Lowther; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 25, [186] 470

Disfranchised Boroughs—Lancaster, Reigate, Totnes, Yarmouth, Question, Mr. Serjeant Gaselee; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, [185] 1548; Question, Mr. Russell Gurney; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 4, [186] 1104

Dual Vote, Questions, Mr. Bright, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 19, [186] 124

Elections, Corruption at—The Reform Resolutions, Question, Sir Arthur Buller; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 15, [185] 405

Elective Franchise—Reduction of the Qualification, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, [185] 886

Electoral Franchises, Question Mr. Baines; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 18, [185] 467; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Feb* 22, 886

Forty Shilling Freeholders, Question, Mr. Hussey Vivian; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, [186] 283; Questions, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 284

Lords Amendments, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 5, [189] 852; Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 6, 1003; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *August* 8, 1105

Mr. Hibbert's Amendment—Mr. Dillwyn's Memorandum, Observations, Mr. Osborne, Mr. Dillwyn; discussion thereon *April* 12, [186] 1587, 1697; Explanations, Mr. Dillwyn, Mr. Owen Stanley *April* 29, 1706; Explanation, Mr. Osborne *May* 6, [187] 7

[*cont.*

Representation of the People—Commons—cont.

Polling Places, Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 23, [187] 935; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 24, 1023

Proposed Alterations, Question, Sir William Hutt; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 4, [186] 1105

Reform Bill, Question, Mr. White; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 1, [185] 1235; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, 1646

Registration Clauses, Question, Mr. Liddell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 18, [188] 18

Resignation of Members of the Cabinet—Ministerial Explanations, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, [185] 1309, 1339; Question, Mr. Ayrton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 8, 1573

Returning Officers—Fees of, Question, Mr. Kekewich; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, [186] 1481

Schedule D, Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 28, [188] 666

Special Franchises, Question, Mr. Thomas Cave; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 28, [186] 730

Statistics, Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 11, [185] 1648; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Horsman*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Question, Mr. Lowe; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 12, [185] 1702; Observations, Mr. Locke; Reply, Mr. Gathorne Hardy; long debate thereon *Mar* 14, 1809; Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 27, [188] 608

Suffrage to Women, Question, Mr. Denman; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 25, [186] 467

Voting Papers, Question, Mr. Synan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 5, [186] 1174; Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, 1481

Re-distribution

Area of the New Boroughs, Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 1, [188] 774

Boundary Commissioners, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 18, [188] 17; Question, Sir Edward Buller; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 20, 176; *June* 21, 266

Hundreds of Offlow, Question, Mr. Foley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 11, [186] 1482

Lindsey, Parts of, Question, Mr. Banks Stanhope; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, [186] 293; Question, Mr. Heneage; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 16, [187] 618

[*cont.*

Representation of the People—Commons—cont.

Re-distribution of Seats, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 9, [188] 1263

Tower Hamlets, Question, Mr. Butler; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 27, [187] 1129

Wednesbury and West Bromwich, Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 22, [186] 394; *Mar* 25, 469

Representation of the People Bill

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Secretary Lord Stanley*)

186] Ordered, That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relative to the Representation of the People (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *March* 18, 5

c. Motion for leave (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); after long debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° *Mar* 18, 6 [Bill 79]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Hunt*) *Mar* 25, 472; after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Mar* 26, 569

After long debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Order for Committee read *April* 8, 1268

After short debate, Instruction to the Committee that they have power to alter the Law of Rating (*Mr. Coleridge*), 1270

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to make provision for the prevention of Bribery and Corruption at Elections" (*Sir Rainald Knightley*); after debate, Motion withdrawn

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "all Parliamentary Boroughs having a less population than 10,000 persons, according to the Census of 1861, and from which the second seat be taken, shall be increased by adding either from the immediately surrounding district, or from one or more neighbouring Boroughs or Towns, a sufficient number of inhabitants to give to every such Parliamentary Borough a population of not less than 10,000 persons" (*Captain Hayter*), 1278; after further debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to

Original Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" after further long debate, Motion, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Gorst*), put, and negatived; main Question put, and agreed to

Committee—R.P.

Clause 3, Notice (*Mr. Gladstone*) *April* 9, 1338;

Amendments (*Mr. Gladstone*), 1416

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair"

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Earl Grosvenor*) *April* 11, 1486; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Committee; Preamble postponed

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to

[*cont.*

Representation of the People Bill—cont.

Clause 3 (Occupation Franchise for Voters in Boroughs); Amendt. in page 2, lines 3 and 4, after "and 2," to insert "whether he in person or his landlord be rated to the relief of the poor" (*Mr. Gladstone*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Committee—R.P.

186] Committee *April* 12, 1599

Clause 3, Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted;" after long debate, A. 289, N. 310; M. 21; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1699; Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 2, 1879

Amendt. Clause 3, page 2, leave out lines 4, 5, 6, and 7, and insert "is on the last day of July then last past, and has during the whole of the two years immediately preceding, been the occupier as owner or tenant of any house, warehouse, counting-house, shop, or other building being either separately or jointly with any land within such borough of a rateable value of or exceeding five pounds" (*Earl Grosvenor*); after short debate, Amendt. negatived

Amendt. in page 2, line 5, to leave out "two years," and insert "twelve calendar months" (*Mr. Ayrton*); after long debate, A. 197, N. 278; M. 81; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1908

Question, "That the words 'twelve calendar months' be there inserted" (*Mr. Ayrton*); Committee—R.P.

187] Committee *May* 6, 15
Clause 3; after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 9, 266
Clause 3; after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 13, 442
Clause 3; after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 17, 694
Clause 3; after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 20, 779
Clause 3; Clause, as amended, agreed to
Clause 4 (Occupation Franchise for Voters in Counties); after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 23, 991
Clause 4; after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 27, 1135
Clause 4; after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 28, 1200
Clause 35 (First Registration of Occupiers); after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 30, 1296
Clause 8 (Disfranchisement of Certain Boroughs); after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *May* 31, 1387
Clause 9 (Certain Boroughs to return one Member only); after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *June* 3, 1500
Clause 9; after long time, Committee—R.P.

Committee *June* 13—R.P.

[*cont.*

Representation of the People Bill—cont.
187] Committee *June* 17, 1942
Clause 10 (New Boroughs to return One Member each)
. Clause 11 (Registers of Voters to be formed for new Boroughs), 1987
Clause 12 (Division of the Tower Hamlets)
. Clause 13 (Registers of Voters to be formed for the Tower Hamlets), 1989
Clause 14 (Divisions of certain Counties)
. Clause 15 (To give a Representative to the University of London), 1992 ; after long time, Committee—R.P.

188] Committee *June* 18, 18
Clause 15 (University of London to return One Member)
Clause 16 (Electors for Members of the University of London)
Clause 17 (Successive Occupation)
Clause 18 (Joint Occupation in Counties)
Clause 19 (Registration of Voters)
Clauses 20 and 21 omitted
Clause 22 (Courts for the Election for Members for Counties)
Clause 23 (Provision for increasing Polling Places in Counties)
Clause 24 (Rooms to be hired wherever they can be obtained) ; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *June* 20, 176
Clause 24 (Rooms to be hired wherever they can be obtained)
Clause 25 (Vice Chancellor of the University of London to be the Returning Officer)
Clauses 26, 27, and 28, agreed to
Clause 29 (Electors may Vote by Voting Papers) ; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *June* 21, 269
Clause 30 (Returning Officer in a New Borough), agreed to
Clause 31 (Inclosure Commissioners to appoint Assistant Commissioners to examine Boundaries of New Boroughs, and report if Enlargement necessary)
Clause 32 (Polling Booths, at which certain Voters are to Poll), struck out
Clause 33 (Repeal of Proviso to 6 *Vict.* c. 18)
Clauses 34 and 35, struck out
. Clause 36 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as bribery), 290
. Clause 37 (Members holding Offices of Profit from the Crown are not required to vacate their Seats on Acceptance of other Offices), 300
. Clause 38 (Provision in Case of Separate Registers) postponed, 302
. Clause 39 (Temporary Provisions consequent on Formation of New Boroughs) agreed to, 303
Clause 40 (General Saving Clause) ; Committee —R.P.

. Committee *June* 24, 430
Clause 40 (General Saving Clause)
Clause 41 (Writs, &c., to be made conformable to this Act), agreed to
. Clause 42 (Construction of Act) ; Committee —R.P. 486

. Committee *June* 25, 508
Clause 42 (Construction of Act)
. Clause 43 (Interpretation of Terms), 509
[*cont.*

Representation of the People Bill—cont.
188] Clause 31 (Inclosure Commissioners to appoint Assistant Commissioners to examine Boundaries of new Boroughs, and report if Enlargement necessary) ; Committee—R.P. 522

. Committee *June* 27, 609
Clause 31 (Inclosure Commissioners to appoint Assistant Commissioners to examine Boundaries of New Boroughs, and report if Enlargement necessary)
. New Clause (Members not to Vacate their Seats on Transfer to another Office), 612
. Clause A (Provision for increased Polling Places), 616
. Clause B (Rooms to be hired wherever they can be obtained), 647
Clause C (Amendment as to time for delivery of Lists and commencement of Register of Voters)
Clause D (Amendment of Oath to be taken by Poll Clerk)
. Clause E (Receipt of Parochial Relief) ; Committee—R.P. 648

. Committee *June* 28, 668
. New Clause (Mode of demanding Rates) ; Committee—R.P. 668

. Committee *July* 1, 792
. New Clause (No elector who has been employed for reward at an Election to be entitled to vote), 798
. New Clause (Certain Boroughs to return Three Members) ; Committee—R.P. 813

. Committee *July* 2, 857
New Clause (Certain Boroughs to return Three Members)
New Clause (Payment of expenses of conveying Voters to the Poll illegal) ; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *July* 4, 990
. New Clause (No Committee of any Candidate to meet in any Hotel, &c.), 1019
. New Clause (Power to distribute Votes) ; Committee—R.P. 1042

. Committee *July* 5, 1068
New Clause (Power to distribute Votes) ; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *July* 8, 1193 ; Committee—R.P.

. Committee *July* 9, 1264
. New Schedule (A) (Boroughs to return One Member only in future Parliaments), 1279
. New Schedule (B) (New Boroughs to return One Member each), 1281
. New Schedule (C) (New Boroughs formed by Division of the Borough of the Tower Hamlets), 1285
. New Schedule (D) (Counties to be divided), 1285
. Schedule E (Form of Claim for Lodgers), 1289
Schedule X (Notice to Occupants in respect of Poor Rates) ; Preamble agreed to
. Report *July* 9, 1291 [Bill 237]

. Bill, as amended, considered *July* 12, 1439
. New Clause (Voting to be by printed papers placed in a glass urn or box), 1443 ; A. 112, N. 161 ; M. 49, 1447
. New Clause (Definition of "Expenses of Registration"), 1447
[*cont.*

Representation of the People Bill—cont.

New Clause (Copy of Reports of Commissioners to be evidence)

New Clause (Convictions for felony and certain other offences to disqualify persons from voting)

188] New Clause (No under sheriff, acting under sheriff, &c. to act as agent in the election of any Member for a City or Borough), 1451

. New Clause (Issue of Writs to County Palatine of Lancaster), 1452

New Clause (Overseers to make out a list of Persons in arrear of Rates)

Clause 2 (Application of Act)

Clause 3 (Occupation Franchise for Voters in Boroughs)

. Clause 5 (The Occupier to be rated in Boroughs and not the owner), 1458

. Clause 10 (Persons reported guilty of Bribery in Lancaster disqualified as Voters for County of Lancaster in respect of Qualification arising in said Borough), 1459

. Clause 21 (Electors for Members of the University of London), 1460

Clause 23 (Joint Occupation in Counties)

Clause 27 (Provision for Increased Polling-Places)

. Clause 29 (Payment of Expenses of conveying Voters to the Poll illegal), 1461

. Clause 42 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery), 1462

Clause 46 (General Saving Clause)

. New Schedule (F) brought up; read 1° and 2°, 1475

. Schedule B (New Boroughs), 1477

. Schedule C (New Boroughs formed by Division of the Borough of the Tower Hamlets), 1479

. Schedule D (Counties to be divided), 1481

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *July* 15, 1526; Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°; Bill passed [Bill 250]

188] *l.* Read 1ª (*The Earl of Derby*) *July* 16, 1615 (No. 227)

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Derby*) *July* 22, 1774

. Amendt. to leave out from ("That") to the end of the Motion, and insert ("The Representation of the People Bill does not appear to this House to be calculated in its present Shape to effect a permanent Settlement of this important Question, or to promote the future good Government of the Country; but the House, recognizing the urgent Necessity for the passing of a Bill to amend the existing system of Representation, will not refuse to give a Second Reading to that which has been brought to it from the House of Commons, in the hope that in its future stages it may be found possible to correct some of its Faults, and to render it better fitted to accomplish the proper Objects of such a Measure") (*The Earl Grey*), 1803; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*The Earl of Shaftesbury*); further debate adjourned

. Order for resuming adjourned Debate read, *July* 23, 1916; after long debate, on Question,

[*cont.*

Representation of the People Bill—cont.

Whether the words proposed to be left out shall stand part of the Motion? resolved in the affirmative; original Motion agreed to; Bill read 2ª

The Debate of July 22, Personal Explanation, The Earl of Carnarvon *July* 23, [188] 1916

189] Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill" (*The Earl of Malmesbury*) *July* 29, 256

Amendment moved to resolve, "That for the Purpose of effecting a Settlement of the Question of the Redistribution of Seats the proposed Scheme is inadequate, and that it is expedient to provide the Means of giving more Representatives to large and important Constituencies than are given by this Bill" (*Viscount Halifax*)

After long debate, on Question; Cont. 59, Not-Cont. 100; M. 41; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 301

Resolved in the negative; original Motion agreed to

House in Committee

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to

. Clause 3 (Occupation Franchise for Voters in Boroughs), 302

. Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs), 304

. Clause 5 (Property Franchise in Counties), 324

. Clause 6 (Occupation Franchise in Counties), 327

Committee *July* 30

. Clause 7 (The Occupier to be rated in Boroughs, and not the Owner: Provisoes), 405

. Clause 8 (First Registration of Occupiers) agreed to, 421

. New Clause (Restriction as to Number of Votes in certain Counties and Boroughs), 441

. New Clause (And in the City of London), 468

. Clause 9 (No Elector who has been employed for Reward at an Election to be entitled to Vote), 468

. Clause 10 (Disfranchisement of certain Boroughs) agreed to, 469

. Clauses 12 to 14 agreed to, 473

. Committee *August* 1, 526

Clause 15 (Certain Boroughs to return one Member only)

. Clause 16 (Certain Boroughs to return Three Members), 595

. Clauses 17 to 27, inclusive, agreed to, 595

Committee *August* 2

. New Clause (Power to Vote by Voting Papers), 705

. New Clause (Regulations as to Voting Papers), 732

. Clauses 28 to 32, as amended, agreed to, 735

. Clause 33 (Payment of Expenses of Conveying Voters to the Poll illegal), 735

. Clauses 34, 35, 36, agreed to, 735

. Clause 37 (Receipt of Parochial Relief), 735

. Clauses 38 to 42, as amended, agreed to, 736

. Clause 43 (Residence for Electors of the City of London extended to twenty-five miles), 736

. Clauses 44 and 45, as amended, agreed to, 737

. Clause 46 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery), 737

[*cont.*

Representation of the People Bill—cont.

Clause 47 agreed to

189] New Clause (Returning Officer, &c. acting as Agent, guilty of Misdemeanour), 737

. New Clause (Demise of the Crown not to dissolve Parliament), 737

Clauses 48 and 49 agreed to

. Clause 50 (Temporary Provisions consequent on Formation of New Boroughs), 749

Clause 51 agreed to.

. Clause 52 (General Saving Clause), 749

. Clause 53 agreed to, 751

. Clause 54 (Construction of Act), 750

. Clause 55 agreed to, 751

. New Clause (Saving Clause as to Dissolution of Parliament), 751

. Clause 55 (Interpretation of Terms), 751

Schedules agreed to with Amendts. (No. 282)

Amendments reported *August* 5

. Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs), 821

. Clause 5 (Occupation Franchise in Counties), 831

. Clause 17 (Certain Boroughs to return Three Members), 837

. Clause 29 (Power to vote by Voting Papers), 838

. New Clause (Regulations as to Voting Papers), 839

. Schedule F (Voting Paper Forms) agreed to, 842

. Clause 49 (Payment of Rates to be punishable as Bribery), 842 (No. 293)

. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Earl of Derby*) *August* 6, 930; after debate, on Question, agreed to; Bill read 3ª accordingly

On Question, That the Bill do pass? Bill passed, and sent to the Commons

. Protest of Earls of Ellenborough and Selkirk, 952

. *c.* Lords' Amendts. to be considered upon Thursday *August* 6, 1002 [Bill 302]

. After short debate, Lords' Amendts considered *August* 8, 1108

. Clause 3 (Occupation Franchise of Voters in Boroughs), 1114; after short debate, Lords' Amendts. disagreed to

. Clause 4 (Lodger Franchise in Boroughs), 1118; after short debate, Lords' Amendts. disagreed to

. Clause 5 (Property Franchise in Counties), 1123

Lords' Amendt. (to leave out Clause 5); after short debate, A. 235, N. 188; M. 47; Amendt. disagreed to

. Clause A (Restriction as to Number of Votes in certain Counties and Boroughs), 1126; after long debate, A. 204, N. 253; M. 49; Amendt. agreed to

. Clause B (Restriction as to Number of Votes in the City of London), 1183; A. 188, N. 252; M. 64; Amendt. agreed to

. Clause C (Power to Vote by Voting Paper), 1185; Amendt. after "County" to leave out "or Borough" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); Question, "That the words 'or Borough' stand part of the Clause;" after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.;" put, and negatived

[*cont.*

Representation of the People Bill—cont.

189] Moved, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Clause as amended" (*Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens*), A. 258, N. 206; M. 52; Division List, Ayes and Noes

. Clause 46 (Corrupt Payment of Rates to be punishable as bribery), 1197; after short debate, Amendt. disagreed to

Clause I (Returning Officer, &c., acting as Agent guilty of Misdemeanour), 1197; after short debate, on Question, Amendt. agreed to

. Clause 54 (Construction of Act), 1197

(Occupation of Chambers in Colleges); after short debate, A. 188, N. 164; M. 24; Lords Amendt. disagreed to

. Clause L (Saving Clause as to Dissolution of Parliament), 1198; Clause amended, and agreed to

Committee appointed to draw up Reasons

. *l.* Commons Reasons, &c., to be taken into consideration on Monday *August* 9, 1199 (Nos. 317 & 318)

. Commons Amendts. and Reasons considered, *August* 12, 1306

Moved, "To agree to the Amendments made by the Commons to the Amendments made by the Lords" (*The Earl of Derby*); after short debate, agreed to

. Moved not to insist upon the Amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed as far as Page 29; on Question? agreed to, 1326

Moved, To insist upon the Amendments made by the Lords to which the Commons have disagreed in page 29, line 20, and page 31, line 21; on Question, resolved in the affirmative; a Committee appointed to prepare Reasons, &c.

Royal Assent *August* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 102]

Parl. Papers—

COMMONS—

Bill as introduced	Bill	79
As amended in Committee . . .	„	237
As amended on Consideration . .	„	250
Lords' Amendments	„	301

LORDS—

Bill as sent up	No.	227
As amended in Committee . . .	„	282
As amended on Report	„	293
Commons' Reasons	„	317
Commons' Amendments	„	318

(For Returns and Papers, &c.—see the Official Lists of Papers for Sale)

Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill

Question, Mr. Brady; Answer, Lord Naas *Feb* 19, [185] 585; Question, Mr. Chichester Fortescue; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, [186] 289; Question, Mr. Esmonde; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 29, 818

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 28, To leave out from "That," and add "this House considers it essential to the satisfactory settlement of the Question of Parlia-

[*cont.*

Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill—cont.
mentary Reform that there should be an amendment of the Law relating to the Representation of the People in Ireland as well as in the other portions of the United Kingdom; and considers it desirable that, in accordance with the promise of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Government should introduce their Bill upon that subject during the present Session" (*Mr. Chichester Fortescue*), [188] 703; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Question, Mr. Esmonde; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 6, [187] 5; Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 20, 778; Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 17, 1936; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 18, [188] 17

Representation of the People (Ireland) Bill (*Colonel French, Mr. Marsh*)
c. Ordered; after debate, read 1° *April* 9, [186] 1349 [Bill 115]
Bill withdrawn * *June* 28

Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill
Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, [186] 288
Additional Representation (Scotland), Question, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; debate thereon *Mar* 1, [185] 1262; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 1801
Members for Scotland, Question, Captain White; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 22, [186] 396; Observations, Mr. Moncreiff; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 3, 2020; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 9, [187] 266
New Members, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 16, 620; Question Mr. Bouverie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 17, 694; Question, Mr. Moncreiff; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *June* 3, 1499
Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 5, [188] 1067; Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, 1897
Questions, Sir John Ogilvy, Colonel French, Mr. M'Laren; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir James Fergusson *July* 29, [189] 331
Representation of the People Bill—Course of Proceeding, Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 22, [188] 1897
Scotch and Irish Reform Bills, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 30, [186] 1785

Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Sir James Fergusson*)
c. Motion for leave (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *May* 13, [187] 399; after long debate, Motion agreed to
Bill ordered; read 1° [Bill 146]
Read 2° * *July* 22
Bill withdrawn * *August* 15

Repton, Mr. G. W. J., *Warwick*
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1235

Richmond, Duke of (President of the Board of Trade)
Companies Act (1862) Amendment, 2R. [189] 1544
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [188] 849
Metropolis—London Water Supply, [188] 1496
Oaths Commission, [186] 560
Private Bills—Board of Trade Reports, [186] 704
Railway Companies, 2R. [188] 489; Comm. [189] 157; *cl.* 4, 163
Railway Deposits — Standing Orders, [187] 1554
Railway Traffic Protection, 2R. [185] 1766, 1768
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [188] 1259, 1261; 3R. [189] 955
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1960; Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 412; *add. cl.* 423
Vice President of the Board of Trade, 2R. [187] 873, 874; 3R. [189] 327

Ridley, Sir M. W., *Northumberland, N.*
Army Estimates — Barrack Establishment, [187] 1749
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 5, [185] 1612; *cl.* 7, 1615
Representation of the People, Comm. [187] 1782; *cl.* 15, 2005; [188] 22, 24, 35; *cl.* A, 618, 633, 1024
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [188] 1700

Ripon, Bishop of
Clerical Vestments, [187] 75
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 10, [187] 385

Ritualism—The Royal Commission on—see *Church of England*

Robertson, Mr. D., *Berwickshire*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1168; *cl.* 40, [188] 456; *add. cl.* 806

Roebuck, Mr. J. A., *Sheffield*
British North America, Comm. *cl.* 69, [185] 1318, 1319; *cl.* 91, *ib.*; *cl.* 145, 1320, 1322
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, Comm. [185] 1328
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 3, [185] 1761
Egypt—Viceroy of, Visit of the, [188] 854

[cont.

ROEBUCK, Mr. J. A.—*cont.*
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 952, 953, 958, 971
Libel, 2R. [185] 1734
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1324
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1100
Public Houses, &c. Leave, [186] 160 ; Amendt. 162, 165
Representation of the People, Comm. [185] 991; Leave, [186] 17, 65 ; 2R. 539, 656 ; Comm. 1285 ; *cl.* 3, Motion for Adjournment, 1573, 1599 ; [187] 337, 342 ; *cl.* 4, 847, 1011 ; *cl.* 10, 1985 ; *cl.* 15, [188] 43 ; *cl.* 31, 288 ; *cl.* 36, 291, 295, 296, 297, 299 ; *cl.* 40, 437, 450, 452, 455 ; *add. cl.* 669, 670, 672, 673, 676, 678, 806 ; Motion for Adjournment, 857, 874, 876
Swansea Vale Railway, 2R. [185] 1089
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 194 ; 2R. 518 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, 994, 995, 996 ; Amendt. 997, 998 ; *cl.* 5, 999, 1000
Trades Unions Commission—Mr. Conolly, [188] 1438
Unjust Weights and Measures Convictions, [186] 1337

ROLT, Sir J., *see* ATTORNEY GENERAL, The

Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, and Glebes (Ireland) Bill
(*Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Murphy*)
c. Ordered ; read 1°* *April* 30 [Bill 127]
Second reading deferred *June* 5
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Colman O'Loghlen*) *July* 3, [188] 941
Amendt. to leave out "now" and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Newdegate*) ; Question, "That 'now,' &c. ;" after short debate, A. 75, N. 119 ; M. 44 ; words added ; main Question agreed to ; Bill put off for three months

ROMILLY, Lord
Admiralty Court (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 1215
Court of Appeal Chancery (Despatch of Business), 2R. [188] 1433
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188] 493, 494 ; Comm. *add. cl.* 765
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 251
Lis Pendens, 2R. [185] 699
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, [188] 1423
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [189] 469 ; *add. cl.* 734
Sale of Land by Auction, 2R. [185] 700

ROMNEY, Earl of
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1093
County Courts Acts Amendment, Comm. [187] 1550 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1929
Ireland—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1429
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 290 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 304 ; *cl.* 7, 410
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Report, *cl.* 3, [189] 1327

ROSSE, Earl of
Brown's Charity, 2R. Amendt. [188] 498

Royal Irish Academy
Observations, Mr. Gregory ; Reply, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 8, [185] 1596

Royal Military Canal Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Longford*)
l. Presented ; read 1ª* *July* 30 (No. 269)
Read 2ª* *August* 2
Committee* ; Report *August* 5
Read 3ª* *August* 6
c. Read 1°* *August* 14 [Bill 313]
Read 2°* *August* 15
Committee* ; Report *August* 15
Considered as amended* *August* 16
Read 3°* *August* 16
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 140]

ROYSTON, Right Hon. Viscount (Comptroller of the Household), *Cambridgeshire*
Address in Answer to the Speech—Her Majesty's Reply, [185] 144
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 210
Princess of Wales—Her Majesty's Reply to Address, [185] 1032

RUSSELL, Earl
Address in Answer to the Speech, [185] 26
British North America, 2R. [185] 578
Brown's Charity, 2R. [188] 502
Canada Railway Loan, 3R. [186] 1458
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1087
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance, 2R. [185] 913
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 1115, 1123, 1127
Hyde Park, Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 227, 232, 233
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [187] 86 ; Comm. *add. cl.* 1195 ; 3R. [188] 257
*Ireland—Established Church, Motion for an Address, [188] 354, 368, 378, 419 ; Explanation, 506
Jamaica—Charge of the Lord Chief Justice—Mr. Purcell, [188] 1717
Lord Chief Baron—Petition of R. Wason, Esq. [185] 257, 271, 272
Luxemburg—Grand Duchy of, [186] 1868; [187] 214 ; [188] 144, 157
  The Collective Guarantee, [188] 974, 976
Mexico — Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 979, 1710
Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 264
Parliamentary Reform—Borough Qualification, Res. [185] 717
Princess of Wales—Address to Her Majesty, [185] 792
Representation of the People — Electors in Cities and Boroughs, Motion for Papers, [185] 1633, 1638, 1643
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1786, 1865, 2008 ; Comm. [189] 290 ; *cl.* 4, 304, 317, 323 ; *cl.* 7, 411 ; *add. cl.* 424, 444 ; *cl.* 15, 556 ; Report, *cl.* 4, Amendt. 821 ; *cl.* 29, 839 ; 3R. 941, 942 ; Commons' Amendts. 1324

[*cont.*

Russell, Earl—*cont.*
- Ritualism—The Royal Commission, [188] 121
- Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 71
- "Tornado," Case of the, [186] 1263 ; [188] 1717
- Turkey—Turkish Provinces in Servia, [185] 1890
- United States—The "Alabama" Claims, [187] 862
- Volunteers—Employment of, in Civil disturbances, [185] 929 ; [188] 755

Russell, Colonel Sir C., *Berkshire*
- Army — Distinguished Service Promotions, [187] 1935
  - Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1674
  - Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1976
  - Promotion in the, [189] 1105
  - Recruiting, Res. [187] 683
  - Supplementary Estimates, [187] 264
  - Transport and Supply Departments, [187] 1690
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1504
  - Martial Law, [187] 1750
  - Military Education, [187] 1719
  - Military Store Establishment, [187] 1706, 1708
  - Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1712
- Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1935
- Ireland—Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1895
- Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-Comm. [189] 386
- Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 921
- Representation of the People, Lords' Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1146

Russia—Eastern Policy of
- Question, Mr. Layard ; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 7, [185] 1447

Russian America, Cession of, to the United States
- Question, Mr. Watkin ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 1, [186] 910 ; Question, The Earl of Clarendon ; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *April* 2, 979 ; Question, Sir Andrew Agnew ; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 4, 1108

Rutland, Duke of
- Hyde Park—Meeting in, Motion for an Address, [187] 252
- Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1828 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 313

St. Albans, Duke of
- Ireland—Military at Elections, Motion for Papers, [185] 1213
- Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 67

St. Davids, Bishop of
- Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 13, [187] 1194 ; *add. cl.* 1197 ; Report, *cl.* 13, 1485

St. Leonards, Lord
- Church of England in the Colonies, Address for Papers, [185] 393
- Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1085
- Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), Comm. [185] 1431
- Lis Pendens, 2R. [185] 698, 699
- Lord Chief Baron—Petition of R. Wason, Esq. [185] 261, 268
- Masters and Operatives, 1R. [185] 79 ; 2R. 696, 697 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, 930
- Sale of Land by Auction, 2R. [185] 700 ; Commons' Amendts. [188] 4
- Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1435 ; Comm. 1765 ; *cl.* 2, [186] 270 ; *cl.* 4, 273
- Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil disturbances, [185] 919

Sale and Purchase of Shares Bill
(*Mr. Leeman, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie, Mr. Goldney*)
- *c.* Ordered ; read 1° *Feb* 20, [185] 690 [Bill 38]
- Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Leeman*) *Feb* 27, 1134
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Fildes*) ; Question, "That 'now,' &c. ;" debate adjourned
- Debate resumed *Mar* 5, 1397 ; after further debate, A. 86, N. 41 ; M. 45 ; Bill read 2°
- Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Leeman*) *Mar* 18, [186] 96
- Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Mr. Grenfell*) ; after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; Bill considered in Committee—R.P.
- Committee *Mar* 20, 267—R.P.
- Committee ; Report *April* 2, 1063 [Bill 103]
- Considered as amended * *April* 4
- Read 3° * *April* 5
- *l.* Read 1ª * (*The Lord Redesdale*) *April* 8
- Read 2ª *May* 21, [187] 862 (No. 74)
- Committee * *May* 23 ; Report * *May* 24
- Read 3ª * *May* 27
- Royal Assent *June* 17 [30 *Vict.* c. 29]

Sale of Land by Auction Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord St. Leonards*)
- *l.* Presented ; read 1ª * *Feb* 12 (No. 10)
- Read 2ª *Feb* 21, [185] 700
- Committee * ; Report *Feb* 25
- Read 3ª * *Mar* 1
- *c.* Read 1° * *Mar* 11 [Bill 70]
- Read 2°, after debate *Mar* 26, [186] 568
- Committee * ; Report *Mar* 27 [Bill 94]
- After short debate, Bill considered in Committee ; Committee *May* 15, [187] 600—R.P.
- Committee ; Report *May* 21, 919
- Considered as amended * *May* 23
- Read 3° * *May* 24 [Bill 202]
- *l.* Commons' Amendments considered *June* 18, [188] 4 (No. 116)
- Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to the Amendments made by the Lords to the Amendments made by the Commons considered *July* 2, 848 (No. 184)
- On Question, whether to insist ? Cont. 9, Not-Cont. 50 ; M. 41
- Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 48]

Sale of Liquors on Sunday Bill
(*Mr. John Abel Smith, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Baines*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 27 [Bill 96]
Question, Sir Henry Edwards; Answer, Mr. J. A. Smith *June* 7, [187] 1740
Bill withdrawn *July* 31, [189] 522

Sale of Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. O'Reilly, Lord Cremorne, Mr. Pim*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 27 [Bill 95]
Read 2° *June* 5, [187] 1645
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 2 [188] 918
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the Order for the said Committee be discharged" (*Mr. Murphy*)
Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, A. 71, N. 92; M. 21; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to
Order discharged; Bill committed to a Select Committee

Salisbury, Marquess of
Militia—Address for a Return, [186] 804, 810
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 705, 732, 734; Report, *cl.* 29, 838; Commons' Amendts. 1316

Salmon Fishery Act (Ireland), 1863
Petition presented (*Lord Cranworth*) *June* 21, [188] 260; after short debate, Petition ordered to lie on the table

Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Cranworth*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 21 (No. 168)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Lord Chancellor*) *July* 1, [188] 761
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Six Months") (*Lord Stanley of Alderley*); after short debate, on Question, "That ('now,') &c.;" Cont. 29, Not-Cont. 22; M. 7; Bill read 2ª
List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 764
Committee * *July* 2 (No. 199)
Report * *July* 4 (No. 205)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Lord Cranworth*) *July* 5, 1063
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Six Months") (*The Lord Abinger*); after short debate, on Question, "That ('now,') &c.;" Cont. 17, Not-Cont. 24; M. 7; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 3ª this Day Six Months
List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 1064

Salomons, Mr. Alderman D., *Greenwich*
Army Estimates — Barrack Establishment, [187] 1748
Danubian Principalities—Treatment of Jews, Motion for an Address, [188] 1140, 2071
Limited Liability Acts, Motion for a Committee, [185] 1382
Liverpool—Sanitary Condition of, [185] 1307
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1607
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 769
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 664
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [187] 1847
Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1048
[*cont.*

Salomons, Mr. Alderman D.—*cont.*
Railway Debenture Holders, 2R. [185] 784
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 23, [188] 54; *cl.* A, 619, 623; *add. cl.* 1015
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1140, 1416
Scurvy at Sea, [187] 1130
Supply—Cultivation of Flax (Ireland), [188] 1906
Labuan, [188] 1770
Royal Parks, &c. [188] 1692

Samuda, Mr. J. D'A., *Tavistock*
Army—Artillery—Rifled Cannon, Res. [189] 1508
Army Estimates—Military Store Department, [187] 1710
Fortifications (Provision for Expenses), Comm. [189] 1290
Meetings in Royal Parks, 2R. [188] 1895
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 917
Naval Review, The, [188] 1627, 1724
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 636
Navy Estimates—Dockyards, &c. [187] 1845, 1847
Men and Boys, [185] 1856; [186] 346, 355, 356
Naval Stores, [187] 1854, 1857
New Works, [187] 1858
North British Railway (Carlisle Deviation), Consid. [187] 1288
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, [187] 1405; Schedule B, [188] 1283
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 687

Samuelson, Mr. B., *Banbury*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 511
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. [189] 761
Factory Acts Extension, Re-comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 482, 483
Ireland—Trinity College, Dublin, Res. [188] 56
Master and Servant, 2R. [187] 1605
Nantlle Railway Company, [186] 562
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 522; Comm. *cl.* 2, 996
Trades Unions Commission — Mr. Conolly, [188] 1437, 1438

Sandford, Mr. G. M. W., *Maldon*
Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [187] 58
Law, Administration of the, [185] 877
Libel, Re-comm. *add. cl.* [188] 546, 548
Luxemburg—Grand Duchy of, [186] 909; [187] 1925
Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 983
Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1823
Representation of the People, Leave, [186] 77; Comm. 1284; *cl.* 3, [187] 739, 748; *cl.* 8, Motion for Adjournment, 1243; *cl.* 36, [188] 296; *cl.* 40, 450; *cl.* 31, 529, 530; *add. cl.* 823, 842, 1010, 1015, 1017; Consid. Schedule C, Amendt. 1479; Schedule D, Amendt. 1481; 3R. 1587, 1607
South Eastern of Portugal Railway, [188] 1436
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1162, 1726, 1781

Sanitary Report of Medical Officer of Privy Council
Question, Mr. Powell; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *August* 12, [189] 1338

Sat First
Feb 5—The Marquess Camden, after the Death of his Father
The Earl of Chesterfield, after the Death of his Father
Feb 7—The Marquess of Exeter, after the Death of his Father
Feb 8—The Lord Tyrone, after the Death of his Father
Feb 22—The Duke of Brandon, after the Death of his Father
Mar 14—The Lord Feversham, after the Death of his Father
Mar 21—The Earl of Rosslyn, after the Death of his Father
Mar 29—The Earl of Eldon, after the Death of his Father
April 2—The Earl of Camperdown, after the Death of his Father
May 2—The Lord Rivers, after the Death of his Brother
May 17—The Earl of Brownlow, after the Death of his Brother
The Lord Northbrook, after the Death of his Father
May 24—The Lord Vernon, after the Death of his Father
July 22—The Lord Kingston, after the Death of his Brother
August 16—The Lord Willoughby d'Eresby, after the Death of his Father

New Peers Introduced
Feb 5 — Charles Stanley Baron Monck of Ballytrammon in the County of Wexford
Gustavus Frederick Baron Brancepeth of Brancepeth in the County Palatine of Durham
Mar 1 — The Right Honourable Duncan McNeill, Baron Colonsay of Colonsay and Oronsay in the County of Argyll
The Right Honourable Sir Hugh McCalmont Cairns, Knight, Baron Cairns of Garmoyle in the County of Antrim

Schools Inquiry Commission
Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 4, [186] 1102
Parl. Paper—
Report of Rev. J. Fraser . . [3857]
Report on Technical Education [3898]

SCHREIBER, Mr. C., *Cheltenham*
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1097; Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1387
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 52, 462, 814; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1506, 1523; *cl.* 19, [188] 53; *cl.* 23, 54; *cl.* 40, 482; *add. cl.* 675, 873, 883; Lords Amendts. *cl.* 4, [189] 1122
Scotland, Representation of, [185] 1270
Sunday Trading, Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 36
Volunteers — Capitation Grant, [187] 1732; [189] 1566

Sciences, Central Hall of Arts and—the Charter
Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, Mr. Bruce *August* 1, [189] 596
(See titles *National Art Collections — Paris Universal Exhibition*, 1867)

SCLATER-BOOTH, Mr. G. († Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners), *Hampshire, N.*
District Metropolitan Lunatic Asylums, [189] 1451
Frost, Case of the Pauper, [188] 606
Metropolis—Bethnal Green Workhouse, [189] 1453
Metropolitan Common Fund, [189] 1571
Metropolitan Poor Law Act—Nominees, [188] 425; [189] 957, 1605
Poor Law Board, &c. Comm. [188] 1417, 1420, 1874; Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 142
Poor Laws, Consolidation of the, [189] 1448
Religious Rights in Workhouses, [189] 170
† Representation of the People—The Resolutions, [185] 465
Roman Catholic School Children, Removal of, [189] 1224
Turnpike Trusts, Leave, [186] 155

Scotland
Annual Judicial Returns, Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Graham Montgomery *August* 15, [189] 1564
Annuity Tax (*Edinburgh*), Question, Mr. Moncreiff; Answer, Sir Graham Montgomery *May* 17, [187] 693
Canongate Church, Edinburgh, Question, Mr. Moncreiff; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 12, [185] 1704
Collection of Fees by Stamps, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Sir Graham Montgomery *July* 1, [188] 768
Collectors of Taxes, Question, Mr. E. Craufurd; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 26, [185] 1028
Education, Report of Commission, Question, Sir Edward Colebrooke; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 21, [185] 725; Observations, Mr. Grant Duff; Reply, Lord Robert Montagu *June* 21, [188] 303
Parl. Paper—
Second Report . . . . . [3845]
Appendix to First Report . . [3858]
Game Laws, Question, Mr. Fordyce; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 28, [185] 1145
Granton and Burntisland Steam Ferries, Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 4, [188] 981; Question, Mr. Waldegrave-Leslie; Answer, Sir Graham Montgomery *July* 11, 1389
Gunpowder at Leith Fort and Blackness Castle, Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, Sir John Pakington *May* 7, [187] 91
Poor Law, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 19, [185] 586
Road Reform, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 1, [185] 1231
Sanitary Laws, Question, Sir Robert Anstruther; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 18, [185] 461
Scotch and Irish Reform Bills, Question, Mr. Stacpoole; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 30, [185] 1785

[*cont.*

SCOTLAND—*cont.*

Scotch Business in Parliament, Conduct of, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 12, [185] 283; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 21, 721; Question, Mr. Baxter *Mar* 22, [186] 397; discussion thereon; Answer, Mr. Walpole, 408; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 20, [188] 166

Southerness Lighthouse, Question, Mr. Mackie; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 20, [187] 774

Under Secretary of State for, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 20, [188] 166

Scott, James, Case of

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a Copy of the Correspondence and Memorial relating to the case and conviction of James Scott of Birmingham, who was convicted of the wilful murder of John Pryse at the Assizes holden at Warwick on the sixteenth day of July last, and was sentenced by Mr. Baron Pigott" (*Mr. Newdegate*) *August* 13, [189] 1509; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

SCOTT, Lord H. J. M. D., *Selkirkshire*

Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 29, [188] 233

SCOURFIELD, Mr. J. H., *Haverfordwest*

Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 229
Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 996
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 755
National Debt Acts, 2R. [187] 657
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 634
Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1050
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 813; *cl.* 40, [188] 443, 465; *cl.* A, 642; *add. cl.* 787; Lords Amendts. *cl.* A, [189] 1143
Supply — Paris Exhibition, Department of Science and Art, [189] 1261
  Rates for Government Property, [188] 1705
  Universal Exhibition at Paris, Report, [185] 688
Turnpike Trusts, Leave, [186] 153
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil disturbances, [185] 1576

SCROPE, Mr. G. Poulett, *Stroud*

Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1285, 1286; *cl.* 3, [187] 701, 781, 814; *cl.* 35, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1231
Valuation of Property, Leave, [185] 255

Scurvy at Sea

Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 12, [185] 282; Question, Mr. Alderman Salomons; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 27, [187] 1130

Parl. Paper—
Correspondence 126
Dietary in Merchant Ships . 263

Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
(*Mr. Blake, Colonel Tottenham, Mr. Brady*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 22 [Bill 50]
Read 2°, after debate *April* 3, [186] 1093
Committee; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *May* 8, [187] 211
Amendt. to leave out from "That" and add "the Bill be committed to a Select Committee" (*Sir Henry Winston-Barron*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *May* 15; after short debate, Question put, and negatived; Bill committed to a Select Committee
And, on *May* 21, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Blake (Chairman), Colonel Annesley, Sir Henry W. Barron, Mr. Bonham-Carter, Mr. Clive, Mr. Cooper, Lord Dunkellin, General Dunne, Sir James Fergusson, Sir John Gray, Lord Claud John Hamilton, Mr. Ion Trant Hamilton, Lord John Hay, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Maguire, Mr. Malcolm, Sir Graham Montgomery, Colonel Tottenham, and Colonel Vandeleur
Report presented *July* 19 [Bill 268]
Bill withdrawn * *August* 5

Sea Fisheries Bill (*Mr. Stephen Cave, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Shaw Lefevre*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 2 [Bill 222]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Sea Fisheries—Convention with France

Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *May* 9, [187] 262

Sea—Loss of Life at

Question, Mr. Holland; Answer, Mr. Corry *May* 27, [187] 1128; Question, Mr. Holland; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 20, [188] 170

Parl. Papers—
Memorials 266
Wrecking in the Hebrides . . 264
Wrecks and Casualties, 1866 . [3901]
Channel Islands . . . . . [3902]

SEELY, Mr. C., *Lincoln*

Navy—Constitution of the Board of Admiralty, [188] 980
  Contract for Gunboats, [188] 1512
  Dockyard Accounts, [188] 1190
  Dockyards, Res. [185] 588, 648
  Greenwich Hospital, Res. [189] 853, 857, 869
  Greenwich Hospital Accounts, [186] 736
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [186] 955;—Dockyards, &c. [187] 1847, 1848
Supply — Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 908

Select Committees, Expense of

Select Comm. on Protection from Fire nominated; Observations, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 27, [186] 703
(See title *Fire Protection*)
See also title *Witnesses* (*House of Commons*)

Select Vestries
l. Bill, *pro formâ*, read 1ª* *Feb* 5

Selkirk, Earl of
Hypothec Amendment (Scotland), 2R. [185] 1141, 1224
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1863

Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. H. J., *Essex, S.*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 675
Representation of the People, 3R. [188] 1599

Selwyn, Mr. C. J., *Cambridge University*
Army Estimates — Military Education, [187] 1717, 1718
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1565
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1203; Comm. 1329, 1335
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1981
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, 2R. [187] 1629
Prisons and Convict Establishments, [187] 1094
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, [188] 484
Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 59
Sale of Land by Auction, Re-comm. [187] 600; *cl.* 5, 919, 921; Preamble, 923
Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1087
Supply—New Courts of Justice, [186] 1827
  Printing and Stationery, [187] 929
  Volunteers, Report, [188] 845
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. [186] 1432, 1446; 3R. [188] 84
Uniformity Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [187] 1253; Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 963

Servia—Jews in
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 29, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of any Correspondence between Her Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs and Her Consul General in Servia, respecting the condition and treatment of the Jews of that Principality" (*Sir Francis Goldsmid*), [186] 838; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn—(See *Moldavia*)
Parl. Papers—
Treatment of Jews . . . . [3829]
Affairs of Servia . . . . . [3803]

Servia — Turkish Fortresses in — see *Turkey*

Sewage Bill (*Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered* *July* 16
Read 1º* *July* 18 [Bill 260]
Read 2º* *July* 22
Committee*; Report *July* 30
Committee* (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 1
Considered as amended* *August* 1
Read 3º* *August* 1

[*cont.*

Sewage Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Clinton*) *August* 2
Read 2ª* *August* 8 (No. 285)
Committee* *August* 9
Report* *August* 12 (No. 328)
Read 3ª* *August* 13
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 113]

Seymour, Mr. A., *Totnes*
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, Motion for an Address, [188] 1158
Totnes Elections, Res. [186] 1360

Seymour, Mr. H. D., *Poole*
Abyssinia—Coast of, [189] 1337
  English Consul at Massowah, [189] 1222
  Imprisonment of British Subjects, Motion for an Address, [189] 232, 1107
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1500
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1206
Crete—English Vice Consul at Khanea, [189] 1222
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [189] 1372
Increase of the Episcopate, [189] 84; Comm. *add. cl.* 1078, 1079
India—Maharajah of Mysore, [187] 1057;—Famine in Orissa, [188] 1515; Motion for an Address, [189] 770
Luxemburg—Grand Duchy of, [187] 1926
Merchant Shipping Laws, Res. [189] 1493
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [185] 1857
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 9, Amendt. [187] 1428, 1429; *add. cl.* [188] 891; Preamble, 1290, 1291; 3R. 1571
Supply—Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1898, 1899
  British Museum, [189] 350
  Education, Public, [189] 363
  Houses of Parliament, [188] 1701, 1702, 1703
  Paris Exhibition, Department of Science and Art, [189] 1260
Valuation of Property, 2R. [185] 1662

Shaftesbury, Earl of
Agricultural Employment, 2R. [188] 1661, 1666
Agricultural Gangs, [185] 906; [186] 1465, 1477
British North America, Comm. [185] 804, 806
Bunhill Fields Burial Ground, 2R. [187] 1477
Clerical Vestments, 1R. [185] 1624; [186] 703; [187] 77
* Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 478, 506; [189] 1631
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1168, 1180, 1181
Criminal Lunatics, 2R. [186] 975
Ecclesiastical Courts, [189] 1558
Factory Acts Extension, 2R. [189] 1208; 3R. 1436
Glossop Convent, [187] 377, 378, 931, 932
Hours of Labour Regulation, 2R. [189] 1595
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *add. cl.* [187] 1195; Report, *cl.* 2, 1480; *cl.* 13, 1485; 3R. Amendt. [188] 245
Ireland—Disturbances in, [185] 371
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. [186] 389; 3R. 465

[*cont.*

SHAFTESBURY, Earl of—*cont.*
  Parliament—Public Business, [187] 1928;—Business of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 262
  Representation of the People, Metropolitan Boroughs, Motion for Returns, [186] 1264, 1265
  Representation of the People, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, [188] 1872, 1917, 1923, 2023; Comm. *cl.* 3, [189] 302; *cl.* 4, 318; Amendt. 323; Report, *cl.* 4, 827
  Ritualism—The Royal Commission, [188] 121, 122, 1168, 1180, 1181
  Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 11, [185] 1910, 1911, 1912; *cl.* 22, 1913

SHERIDAN, Mr. H. B., *Dudley*
  Financial Statement, [186] 1151
  Fire Insurance, Res. [186] 128, 138
  India Office—State Entertainment to the Sultan, [188] 1668, 1726, 1727; Motion for an Address, 1759
  Investment of Trust Funds, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1654
  Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1487; Motion for Adjournment, 1589, 1591
  Metropolis—Ornamental Waters in the Parks, [185] 584
  National Debt, [186] 1787
  National Debt Acts, [187] 373; 2R. Amendt. 623, 655
  Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [186] 1828; Comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 556; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 557, 558; *add. cl.* 559; 3R. 847
  Representation of the People—Wednesbury and West Bromwich, [186] 394, 469
  St. Edmunds, Dudley, [189] 1591
  Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1413
  Sunday Trading, Comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 36

Shipping Local Dues Bill
(*Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Cave, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Considered in Committee; after short debate, Resolution agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° *Feb* 7, [185] 108 [Bill 5]
  Read 2° * *Feb* 21
  Committee *; Report *Mar* 7
  Considered * *Mar* 8
  Read 3° * *Mar* 11
l. Read 1ª * (*The Duke of Richmond*) *Mar* 12
  Read 2ª * *Mar* 15 (No. 41)
  Committee *; Report *Mar* 26 (No. 64)
  Read 3ª * *Mar* 28
  Royal Assent *April* 12 [30 *Vict.* c. 15]

Shipping Returns
  Observations, Mr. Candlish; Reply, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 15, [185] 1934

Ships, Inspection of
  Question, Mr. J. A. Smith; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *June* 7, [187] 1731

SHREWSBURY, Earl of
  Jamaica—Case of Mr. Eyre, [189] 1437, 1446
    Charge of the Lord Chief Justice—Mr. Purcell, [188] 1722
  Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 464

Sierra Leone
  Trial by Jury, Question, Sir Patrick O'Brien; Answer, Mr. Adderley *April* 4, [186] 1106
  Law Courts, Question, Sir J. Gray; Answer, Mr. Adderley *August* 7, [189] 1042
  The Supreme Court, Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Adderley *August* 16, 1611 (*Parl. P.* No. 197)

SIMEON, Sir J., *Isle of Wight*
  Frost, Case of the Pauper, [188] 605
  Hall, Mr. J. M., and the Royal Bounty Fund, [188] 392
  Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 43, [185] 1676; *cl.* 79, 1695
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 40, [188] 483
  Turkish Bonds, [189] 1220
  Utilization of Sewage Act, [186] 908

Simla Court Martial
  Question, Mr. Brett; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 27, [188] 606; Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 1, 770
  Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to re-consider the sentence of the Court Martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis, with a view to reinstate that Officer in his rank in the Army and in his Regiment" (*Mr. Brett*) *August* 6, [189] 1004; after long debate, Motion withdrawn
  Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give effect to the recommendation to mercy contained in the sentence of the Court Martial held at Simla on Captain Jervis" (*Mr. Otway*); after further short debate; A. 48, N. 66; M. 18; Notice, Mr. Darby Griffith; Observations, Mr. Brett *August* 8, 1100—(*Parl. P.* Proceedings of Court Martial, 464, 464-I)

SIMMONDS, Mr. W. B., *Winchester*
  Army Estimates—Volunteer Corps, [187] 1759

Sir John Port's Charity Bill
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Adderley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 144]
  Read 2° * *May* 30
  Referred to a Select Committee * *May* 30
  And, on *June* 17, Committee nominated as follows:—Lord Robert Montagu (Chairman), Mr. Colvile, Mr. Denman, Mr. Evans, Mr. Henley, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Paget
  Report *July* 2 [Bill 217]
  Re-comm.*; Report *July* 4
  Considered * *July* 5
  Read 3° * *July* 5
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *July* 8
  Read 2ª * *July* 19 (No. 206)
  Committee * *July* 22
  Report * *July* 23
  Read 3ª * *July* 25
  Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 99]

SKELMERSDALE, Lord
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, [189] 473

Skipton Grammar School Bill
c. Presented; read 1°* *July* 29 [Bill 290]

Slave Trade, African
Question, Sir T. F. Buxton; Answer, Mr. Corry *May* 16, [187] 614—*On the Nile*, Question, Sir T. F. Buxton; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 4, [188] 980—*Zanzibar*, Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 8, [189] 1106

SMITH, Mr. A., *Hertfordshire*
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 79, [185] 1697
Public Houses, &c. Regulation, 2R. [186] 1851

SMITH, Mr. J. A., *Chichester*
Charities and Schools, Rating of, [188] 266
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. [189] 997
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [188] 1650; Comm. [189] 1069
Inspection of Ships, [187] 1731
Mauritius—Yellow Fever in the, [187] 1292; [189] 1044
Sale of Liquors on Sunday, [187] 1740; 2R. Amendt. [189] 522
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, [189] 703

SMITH, Mr. J. B., *Stockport*
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Leave, [185] 292; 2R. [186] 685
Cattle Plague, [185] 403
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [189] 1387
India—The Budget, [185] 86;—Metric System of Weights and Measures, [188] 856
Ireland—Railways, Res. [185] 1948; [189] 615
Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1420
Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1049
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 321, 737; *cl.* 35, 1224, 1230, 1231; *add. cl.* [188] 998, 1211; Lords' Amendts. *cl.* 3, [189] 1118
Sugar Duties, Comm. [185] 472

SMOLLETT, Mr. P. B., *Dumbartonshire*
India—Famine in Orissa, [186] 1582; [187] 264; Motion for an Address, [189] 784
Maharajah of Mysore, [187] 1040
Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1368
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 34, 37, 48; *cl.* 9, 1513; *add. cl.* [188] 818, 883

Society of Engineers, Charter to
Question, Mr. Hughes; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *August* 5, [189] 851

SOLICITOR GENERAL, The (Sir J. B. KARSLAKE), *Andover*
Bankruptcy Acts Repeal, Comm. [187] 1774
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1209
Criminal Law, Comm. *cl.* 2, [185] 1757
Execution of Deeds, Comm. [185] 1418
Jurymen (Metropolis), [185] 1230
[*cont.*

SOLICITOR GENERAL, The—*cont.*
Law, Administration of the, [185] 883
Libel, 2R. [185] 727; Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [188] 543; *cl.* 4, 544; *add. cl.* 547
Railway Companies, Consid. *cl.* 4, [187] 1726
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 545; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1525, 1905; [187] 449; *cl.* 8, 1337; *cl.* 36, [188] 293; *cl.* 37, 302; *cl.* 43, 515; *add. cl.* 613; *cl.* A, Amendt. 624, 625; *add. cl.* 676, 1207
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1140; *cl.* 1, [186] 101
Special Jurors, [185] 931, 932
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1219
Totnes Elections, Res. [186] 1373
Trades Unions, Comm. *cl.* 5, [185] 1000
Volunteers, Res. [188] 740

SOMERSET, Duke of
Navy—Motion for Returns, [185] 120, 133; [186] 813
Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 62

SOMERSET, Col. P. G. H., *Monmouthshire*
Swansea Vale Railway, 2R. Amendt. [185] 1089

SONDES, Lord
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, Amendt. [189] 469

South Australia—Mr. Justice Boothby
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Adderley *June* 3, [187] 1494

South Eastern of Portugal Railway
Question, Mr. Sandford; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 12, [188] 1436

South Kensington Museum (National Gallery Pictures)
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a Copy of the Report of the Committee appointed by the Science and Art Department, to inquire into the alleged deterioration of the Pictures belonging to the National Gallery deposited at the South Kensington Museum" (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *June* 25, [188] 539; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Spain—Relations with—Cases of the "Tornado," "Victoria," and "Mermaid"
185] Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 7, 88; Question, Mr. Crum-Ewing; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 19, 586; Question, Mr. Hanbury-Tracy; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 28, 1145; Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 4, 1306; *Mar* 5, 1338; Postponement of Motion (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) *Mar* 8, 1544:—Question, Sir Robert Collier;
[*cont.*

Spain—Relations with—cont.

186] Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 21, 281;
Mar 25, 469; Notice of Motion for Papers
(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*) postponed
Mar 26, 560; Question, Mr. Osborne;
Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 4, 1109; Post-
ponement of Notice; Question, The Earl of
Malmesbury; Answer, The Marquess of
Clanricarde *April* 8, 1260; short debate
thereon; Question, Mr. Osborne; Answer,
Lord Stanley *April* 8, 1267; *April* 11,
1482; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer,
Lord Stanley *April* 12, 1586; Postponement
of Motion (*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)
May 2, 1870; Observations, Lord Stanley,
Mr. Baillie Cochrane, 1876: — Question,
The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer,
187] The Earl of Derby *May* 10, 364; *May* 31,
1368; Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer,
Lord Stanley *June* 6, 1662: — Question,
The Marquess of Clanricarde; Answer, The
188] Earl of Malmesbury *July* 1, 765; Observa-
tions, Mr. Gregory; Reply, Sir Roundell Pal-
mer *July* 23, 2034

"*Tornado*" *and the* "*Mermaid*"—*Case of the*—*Petition*, Observations, The Marquess of Clanricarde; Reply, The Earl of Derby *July* 19, 1714; short debate thereon

"*Mermaid*," *Case of the*, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, stating that, in the opinion of this House, the demand for compensation from the Spanish Government made in respect of the destruction of the Ship 'Mermaid' was just and right, and that there is nothing in the Correspondence laid before this House which would sanction Her Majesty's Government in withdrawing from the demand that has been made" (*Mr. Headlam*), 1743; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn; Question, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 13, [189] 1447

Parl. Papers [3772, 3801, 3813, 3815, 3820, 3825]

Spain and Chile

Question, Mr. Horsfall; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 14, [185] 340

SPEAKER, The (Right Hon. J. E. Denison) *Nottinghamshire, N.*

Question proposed, "That the (*Metropolis Gas Bill*) be read a second time on Monday, the 29th April;" Amendment proposed, "That the Bill be read a second time this day six months;" Question put, "That the words '29th April' stand part of the Question." But it was now the 2nd May. Mr. Speaker proposed to get over the difficulty, by negativing the Question; then the Amendment "this day six months" would become the original Motion: that being negatived, the Question, "That the Bill be now read the second time," can with propriety be put, [186] 1922

Adjournment of the House—Right of Reply—The rule with regard to Motions for Adjournment of the House is this:—If the Motion for Adjournment is made while another Motion is before the House, and during the progress of the debate, there is no reply; but if the Motion for Adjournment is a substantive Motion, the right of reply has been admitted, [186] 1505

Adjournment of the House—the formal Motion—Sir John Pakington having made an Explanation of an Answer given by him on a former occasion, and being followed by Captain Vivian, who said he would, if necessary, put himself in order by moving the adjournment of the House—Mr. Speaker said, the House had permitted a personal explanation to be made; but the right of moving the adjournment of the House was reserved for occasions on which questions of gravity were brought before it.—*March of Troops to Hounslow*, [188] 1526

Amendments—Amendment on Amendment—It is not competent to move an Amendment to the Amendment of an hon. Member unless the latter Amendment should have been first adopted by the House.—*Fortifications* (*Provision for Expenses*) *Bill*, [189] 1289

Amendments—Order of putting Questions—Mr. Speaker explains the order in which he will put the Questions, in order to take the decision of the House on a second Amendment to the Motion, "That the (*Tenants Improvements Ireland*) *Bill* be now read the second time," [186] 1780

Amendment on the Address—Time for moving—Report of Address in answer to the Queen's Speech brought up, and read; Moved, to agree to the Address. Mr. Hadfield moved an addition to the Address to the effect that this House represents to Her Majesty its regret that no allusion is made in the Speech from the Throne to the subject of Church Rates—Mr. Speaker said, the hon. Member for Sheffield was in order in his remarks, but not in his Motion—The time for moving an Amendment to the Address is while it is under discussion for the Second Reading; but after Motion put, "That the House do agree with the Committee in the said Resolutions," the opportunity has passed, [185] 78

Amendment on Committee of Supply—Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" an Amendment moved, and negatived. No other Amendment can be proposed.—*Representation of the People Bill*, [186] 884, 887, 1201, 1285

Bills—Reprints of Bills during consideration in Committee. Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer said, the House had no power to order a Bill still in Committee to be re-printed with the Amendments—Mr. Speaker said, he would see what could be done to meet the wish of the House. — *Representation of the People Bill*, [187] 1363

Debate—A Member cannot speak twice on the same Question — *Motion for Committee of Supply*, [186] 316

The House will, perhaps, give permission to an hon. Member to address it a second time on

[*cont.*

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

the same Question, so far as may be necessary to clear up any point of moment; but to enter into any general statement would be irregular.—*Ireland—The Fenian Prisoners,* [186] 1990

Debate—Questions—On Questions of which notice has been given, another Member is in order in asking a further Question; but not in entering into any discussion on the subject. —*Representation of the People Bill,* [186] 124

Debate—Latitude of speaking in presenting a Petition—An hon. Member is in order in stating the contents and prayer of a Petition he presents.—*Ireland—Fenianism—Petition,* [186] 1930

Debate—Latitude of speaking in putting a Question — Mr. Newdegate having put a Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, of which he had not given notice, respecting the appointment of the Committee on the *Ecclesiastical Titles Act,* was proceeding with some observations—Mr. Speaker said, the hon. Gentleman might ask the Question; but was not entitled to enter into the consideration of the construction of the Committee, [186] 292; [187] 1496

Debate—It is not in order to discuss a Question which is not properly before the House—*Tyrone Magistrates,* [186] 393

Debate—Proper time for discussing a Bill on its merits—Moved, That the Order for the Second Reading (of the *Ecclesiastical Titles Bill*) be postponed until that day fortnight: Sir George Bowyer rose to address the House — Mr. Speaker suggested that that was not the time for discussing the Bill on its merits—that discussion would be more proper on the Motion, "That the Bill be now read the Second Time," [187] 571

Debate—Proper time for discussing the whole subject—Order for Committee read. An Instruction moved:—after that Motion is disposed of, there will still remain the Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," on which the whole subject will be open to discussion. — *Representation of the People Bill,* [186] 1272

Debate—It is not strictly in order to discuss a Bill on Consideration as amended.—*Religious, &c. Buildings (Sites) Bill,* [186] 798

Debate—Premature discussion of a Bill or Motion—A Member cannot, by moving the adjournment of the House, raise a discussion on a Bill which is set down to be discussed on a future occasion, [185] 886; [187] 775; [189] 91, 96, 1338

A Member may ask a Question as to the form of proceeding on a Motion standing for a future day; but is not in order in entering into that Motion. — *Representation of the People Bill,* [185] 886

Debate — Premature discussion of Votes in Supply—The rule is, that on going into Committee of Supply you cannot discuss the particular items of Votes which are set down to be discussed in the Committee, [189] 857

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*

Debate—Discussion of a postponed Motion—It having been suggested that the *Factory Acts Extension Bill* should be now read the second time, and its further consideration postponed to a distant day: and Mr. Fawcett having expressed an intention of moving in the interval a Resolution which would raise the whole question—Mr. Speaker said, that proceeding would not be in accordance with the Rules of the House, [186] 451

Debate—The Question may be put again—The Question that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the Acts relating to Public Houses having been put under unusual circumstances, in consequence of which Mr. Roebuck was too late to move an Amendment—Mr. Speaker suggested that as there had been a misunderstanding, the better course would be that the Mover should make his statement, and that the Question should be put again.—*Public Houses, &c. Bill,* [186] 160

Debate—Right of Reply — An hon. Member who has moved an Instruction to a Committee is not entitled to a reply.— *Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill,* [186] 1443

Motion for adjournment of the House. The rule with regard to Motions for Adjournment of the House is this:—If the Motion for Adjournment is made while another Motion is before the House, and during the progress of the debate, there is no reply; but if the Motion for Adjournment is a substantive Motion, the right of reply has been admitted, [186] 1505

Debate—Reference to a past debate is not in order, [185] 1124; [189] 895

Debate—Reference to a debate in the House of Lords—Mr. Speaker: He would remind the noble Lord (Lord Elcho) that he was precluded from quoting anything which had been said in the other House during the present Session in reference to these particular measures.—*Army of Reserve—Resolution,* [189] 91, 92; *Ireland—Habeas Corpus Suspension Act,* [189] 895

Debate — Relevancy of Debate, [185] 1268; [186] 858, 860, 864, 880; [188] 955, 1309

Debate—Unparliamentary Expressions—When an hon. Member has been duly returned to this House, to say that he is returned by the refuse of a large constituency is an expression not in order.—*Meetings in Royal Parks Bill,* [188] 1895

Debate— Unparliamentary Expressions—"The statements which have been made in the course of this debate are malicious and calumnious"—Mr. Speaker said, these words should not have been used.—*Pension to Mr. Young,* [186] 441

Debate — Unparliamentary Expressions—The terms "a more foul calumny," "a more gigantic falsehood," "a glaring falsehood," though not addressed to any particular Member of this House, or pointed at any particular allegation, are hardly such as should be used in this House.—*Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland), &c. Bill,* [187] 953

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Debate — Unparliamentary Expressions — An hon. Member having described some remarks made by another hon. Member on a person not of the House, as "wanton and cowardly" attacks — Mr. Osborne rose to order; the word "cowardly" is quite unknown in this House. Mr. Speaker said, the hon. Member would no doubt withdraw that word.—*Case of Mr. Churchward,* [186] 173

Debate—Unparliamentary Expressions — After the terms in which Fenianism has been described by this House—"a conspiracy adverse alike to authority, property, and religion, and condemned alike by all who are interested in their maintenance"—for an hon. Gentleman to say that the Roman Catholic clergy are the originators of Fenianism, is a statement which cannot but be offensive in this House, and cannot be allowed to pass.—*Offices and Oaths Bill,* [185] 1122

Debate — Unparliamentary Expressions — An hon. Member having said that "the Orangemen had as much right to have their opinions represented in that House as the Fenians had;" and afterwards explained that "he had simply meant the sympathizers with the Fenians"—it was moved that the words be taken down. Mr. Speaker said, it was most improper to apply such expressions to any Members of the House, after the terms in which the House had stigmatized Fenianism—*Administration of Justice (Ireland),* [186] 884

Debate — Unparliamentary Expressions — Motion made for a Select Committee to inquire into transactions of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company: Notice of Amendment to add "and also into the means adopted" by certain Members of this House "for raising money." These words do not necessarily imply an imputation of fraud, and there is nothing in the Notice that can be considered a violation of order.—*London, Chatham, and Dover Railway,* [186] 1343

Instructions to Committee — The course the hon. Member (Mr. Fawcett) proposes to take is not in order, because the Committee has power already to make the alteration in the Bill to which the Instruction points—Where a thing can be done voluntarily, it should not be done in a mandatory form.—*Increase of the Episcopate Bill,* [189] 1069

An hon. Member who has moved an Instruction to a Committee is not entitled to a reply, [186] 1443

Members' Seats in this House—Mr. Speaker explains the rule and practice in regard to retaining seats in the House—The House has laid down the rule that no card placed upon a seat can command or secure that seat in the absence of the hon. Member placing it there; but as Members attending Committees are placed under a disadvantage by that rule, an understanding exists that an hon. Member, coming down to the House in the morning to attend a Committee, and placing his hat upon a seat as an indication of his personal attendance in the performance of his duties, shall be entitled to retain that seat, [188] 163

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

Motion—Motion which expresses an opinion in reference to a Bill before the House—Mr. Speaker having read Lord Elcho's Motion as far as the words "inconvenience to the people," said he must stop there; because the next Resolution of the noble Lord called on the House to express an opinion, and, indeed, to arrive at a decision, on Bills before they had been discussed or read a second time in that House.—*Army of Reserve—Resolutions,* [189] 96

Motion—Withdrawal of a Motion—A Motion having been proposed to the House cannot be withdrawn without the consent of the House—Some hon. Members objecting, the Question must be put.—*Administration of Justice (Ireland),* [186] 887

Notices—Alteration of Notices of Questions—See Questions

Order—The Appropriation Bill—Mr. Darby Griffith called attention to the fact that a Bill (*The Appropriation Bill*) had been read a first time on Saturday without any Notice that it was about to be introduced — Mr. Speaker said, it had always been customary to introduce the Appropriation Bill as soon as the House had agreed to the last Vote in Supply, [189] 1340

Order—Use of the Rooms of this House—A meeting having been held in the Tea-Room, attended by other gentlemen than Members of the House, at which speeches were made by such gentlemen relating to proceedings on the progress of a Bill (the *Representation of the People Bill*) through the House—Mr. Speaker said, this proceeding is not in accordance with the established rules of the House: the rooms of this building must be reserved for the use of Members only, and for such purposes as may be permitted. And Mr. Speaker made some further explanation, [189] 766

Order — Orders of the Day — Morning and Evening Sittings—Supply being fixed for a Morning Sitting and not then concluded, it was placed at the head of the list of Orders for the Evening Sitting in the Notices printed for the Evening—Mr. Darby Griffith objected that as private Members could not give notice between the Morning and Evening Sitting, it was not competent for the Government to do so—Mr. Speaker said, it was no Notice of any individual Member; it was an Order of the House, Supply not being concluded, that it should stand at the head of the list for the Evening Sitting, [189] 1299

Order—Counting the House—It is competent for any hon. Member to take notice that there are not forty Members present, and he need not remain in the House afterwards if he does not think fit to do so.—*Trinity College (Dublin),* [188] 56

Orders of the Day—Order for Second Reading (of the *Municipal Corporations Charities Bill*) read — Viscount Galway moved that the Order be discharged—Mr. Speaker said, it was an unusual course to move the discharge of an Order in the absence of the Member who had charge of the Bill; and,

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

in this case, the hon. Member (Mr. R. Young) had arranged for the postponement of the Second Reading, [187] 208

Order—Formal Motion of Adjournment of the House—The rule with regard to Motions for Adjournment of the House is this:—If the Motion for Adjournment is made while another Motion is before the House, and during the progress of the debate, there is no reply; but if the Motion for Adjournment is a substantive Motion, the Right of Reply has been admitted, [186] 1505

Petitions—Time for Presenting—Petitions in reference to a Bill may not be presented after the Second Reading has been moved—Petitions may be presented after the Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.—*Offices and Oaths Bill,* [185] 1093

Petitions—Custody of Petitions—Mr. Speaker explains the practice in respect of Petitions referred to a Committee.—*Select Committee on Ecclesiastical Titles Act,* [189] 1047

Privilege—Time for objecting to a Petition—A Petition having been presented, and objection taken to its terms, an hon. Member moved that it be rejected; but afterwards withdrew his Motion. On a subsequent evening, Mr. Darby Griffith rose, as a Question of Privilege, to call attention to certain expressions in the Petition—Mr. Speaker said, the claim of privilege could not be admitted. When he put the Question, "That the Petition do lie on the table," no objection was raised—the House received the Petition. If any hon. Member wished to take further action on the Petition, he must do so by Notice.—*Fenianism—Petition,* [187] 13

Privilege of Members—The subject of the accommodation provided for Members of the House on occasion of the Naval Review is not a question of Parliamentary Privilege.—*The Naval Review,* [188] 1519

Privilege—Members' Seats in this House—See that Title

Privilege—Alteration of Notices of Questions—See Questions

Privilege—Amendment affecting the Incidence of Rating—On Report of the *Representation of the People Bill* Clause 5, an addition moved to the Clause, providing that where premises are let for less than a year, &c., the owner, as well as the occupier, shall be liable to the rates, notwithstanding any contract—Mr. Speaker said, that the proposal imposing a charge not at present existing, should have been submitted in Committee, [188] 1458

Question—A Question which has reference to proceedings before a Select Committee which has not yet made a Report to the House, is irregular.—*Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts,* [189] 604

Questions—Alteration of Notices of Questions—Mr. Whalley having stated that he had yesterday handed to the Clerk at the table Notice of a Question; and that that Notice as published with the Votes was materially altered in terms—Mr. Speaker said, the House was aware that it was continually the

[*cont.*

Speaker, The—*cont.*

duty and practice of the Clerks at the table to amend and alter in some degree the Notices that are given, some of which are not in form, and others open to various objections—a difficult duty which, Mr. Speaker said, in his judgment, the Clerks have performed with great discretion, and generally with great advantage to the conduct of the business of the House, [188] 1066

Select Committees—Evidence—The usual time for the return of Evidence sent to witnesses for correction is three days. The period was, however, sometimes extended.—*Ecclesiastical Titles Act,* [189] 1223

Supply—Amendment on Committee of Supply—One Amendment to the Motion for going into Committee of Supply having been negatived, it is not competent for an hon. Member to move another Amendment, [186] 884, 887, 1201, 1285

Special and Common Juries

Questions, Mr. Whatman, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, The Solicitor General *Feb* 25, [185] 931

Select Committee appointed, "to inquire and take evidence as to the law and practice relating to the summoning, attendance, and remuneration of Special and Common Juries, and to report to this House as to any alterations which ought to be made therein" (*Viscount Enfield*) *June* 4, [187] 1587; Motion agreed to; Select Committee appointed

And, on *June* 7, Committee nominated as follows:—Viscount Enfield (Chairman), Mr. Brett, Mr. Denman, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Headlam, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Alderman Lusk, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Alderman Salomons, Colonel William Stuart, Mr. Turner, Mr. Whatman, and Mr. Charles Wynn

Report presented *July* 8—(*Parl. P.* No. 425)

Speer, Captain, Alleged Murder of

Question, Mr. Cubitt; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 9, [189] 1220

Speirs, Captain A. A., *Renfrewshire*

Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 903

Scotland—Members for, [186] 396

West Indies—Mortality in the Harbour of St. Thomas, [185] 722

Quarantine in the, [185] 721

Spencer, Earl

Army—Proof of Fire Arms, [187] 1728

Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 449

Spirits, Beer, and Wine Licences

Question, Mr. Pease; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 4, [185] 1307

Spiritual Destitution Bill

(*Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Beresford Hope*)

c. Ordered; read 1° * *Feb* 15 [Bill 27]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Ayrton*) *April* 3, [186] 1069

[*cont.*

Spiritual Destitution Bill—cont.
  Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Howes*); after long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 78, N. 173; M. 95; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Stacpoole, Mr. W., *Ennis*
  Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 596
  Irish Reform, [186] 1785
  Navy—Claim of Assistant-Commissary-General Swan, [186] 1873
  Representation of the People (Ireland), [187] 525, 1936
  Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 958

Stalybridge Railway Station
  Question, Mr. Cheetham; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Mar* 12, [185] 1703

Stanhope, Earl
  British Museum, [185] 1626
  Christ Church (Oxford) Ordinances, 2R. [188] 1426
  Clerical Vestments, [187] 76
  Colonial Churches, [186] 387
  Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1180
  Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Address for a Return, [186] 715
  Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 11, [187] 386, 763, 765; Report, *cl.* 13, 1486
  Metropolis—Hyde Park, [189] 77
  Oaths Commission, [186] 560
  Public Schools, 2R. [185] 333
  Representation of the People—Statistics, [186] 372
  Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [189] 451; *cl.* 15, 574; *add. cl.* 738, 740; Commons Amendts. 1308, 1317
  Tests Abolition (Oxford and Cambridge), 2R. [189] 69
  Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 456

Stanhope, Mr. J. Banks, *Lincolnshire, N.*
  Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 497
  Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1369
  Representation of the People—Parts of Lindsey, [186] 293
  Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 534; Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1007; *cl.* 36, [188] 297; *cl.* 40, 462

Stanley, Right Hon. Lord (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Lynn Regis*
  Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, [185] 1336; [187] 524; [188] 1723;—Motion for an Address, [189] 249, 1107;—English Consul at Massowah, 1222;—Coast of, 1337
  Agriculture of Austria and Denmark, [186] 1485
  Austria—Commercial Treaty with, [189] 1448
  Brazil—British Claims on, [187] 1128;—War in the River Plate, [185] 1233

[*cont.*

Stanley, Right Hon. Lord—*cont.*
  Canada—Extradition of M. Lamirande, [185] 467, 1339
  "Cestus," Case of the, [189] 1611
  Cholera Congress at Constantinople, [186] 732
  Cochin China—British Consulate, [188] 427
  Columbian States—British Commerce with the, [188] 667
  Crete—Address for Papers, [185] 445, 587
    Affairs of, [188] 173
    "Arkadi," Case of the, [188] 1188, 2073, 2074
    English Vice Consul at Khanea, [189] 1223
    Insurrection in, [185] 214; [187] 1499; [188] 269, 420
    Treatment of Christians, [189] 850
  "Cyclone," Owners of the, [186] 731
  Danubian Principalities—Persecution of Jews, [187] 1497; Motion for an Address, [188] 1140, 2072
  Declaration of Paris, 1856, [189] 886
  Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1596
  Education, Technical, Abroad, [188] 1723; [189] 598
  Egypt—English Workmen, [189] 1338
    Suez Canal, The, [185] 1549
    Viceroy of, Visit of the, [188] 665, 853, 854
  Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 986, 991
  Foreign Decorations, [188] 2071
  France, Prussia, and Denmark, [189] 331
  Holy See and Russia, [185] 147
  International Currency Conference, [186] 1479
  Ionian Islands—State of the, [186] 816
  Italy—The Ministry, [186] 1175
  Japan—European Troops at Yokuhama, [186] 1107
  Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [186] 909, 1253, 1257, 1705, 1786; [187] 259, 397, 1916
  "Mermaid," Destruction of the Ship, Motion for an Address, [188] 1750
  Mexican Bondholders, [185] 1548; [186] 280
  Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 984, 1393, 1394;—State of, [187] 1495
  Ministerial Explanations, [185] 1364
  Moldavia — Persecution of Jews, [189] 173, 1100
  Money Orders, International System of, [187] 774
  Muscat—Imaum of, [186] 1478
  Naval Review, The, [188] 1627
  Navy—Commodore Wiseman and the Turkish Navy, [188] 1622, 1873
  Patagonia—Welsh Colony in, [189] 599
  Plantagenet Statues at Fontevrault, [185] 1445; [186] 817
  Portugal—Commercial Treaty with, [186] 564; [187] 1491
  Representation of the People, [186] 908; Comm. 1502; *cl.* 3, 1575
  Russia—Eastern Policy of, [185] 1447
  Russian America—Cession of, to the United States, [186] 911, 1109
  Salt, Admission of, into France, [185] 1444
  Servia—Fortresses in, Address for Papers, [185] 445, 933; [186] 288
    Jews in, Motion for Papers, [186] 843
  Slave Trade on the Nile, [188] 981
  Slave Trade, The, [189] 1107
  South Eastern of Portugal Railway, [188] 1436
  Spain and Chile, [185] 340

cont.

STANLEY, Right Hon. Lord—*cont.*
Spain—Relations with, [186] 1109, 1110, 1267, 1268, 1482, 1586
Speer, Captain, Alleged Murder of, [189] 1220
Sumatra—The Dutch in, [185] 1645
Supply—Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1773, 1899
Consuls Abroad, [188] 1900, 1901
Coolie Emigration, [188] 1771, 1772
Ministers at Foreign Courts, [188] 1902
Niger Expedition, [188] 1771
Services in China, &c. [188] 1901
Special Missions, [188] 1903
"Tornado," Seizure of the, [185] 88, 586, 1145, 1307, 1338; [186] 282, 1876; [187] 1662; [188] 2065
Turkey—Cholera at Constantinople, [186] 283; —Christian Subjects of the Porte, 284
Turkish Bonds, [189] 1220
United States—The "Alabama" Claims, [186] 471; [188] 769; [189] 958
Venezuela—Government of, [187] 396
"Victoria," Case of the, [186] 469

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, Lord
Army—Militia Reserve, [187] 880
Chatham and Sheerness Stipendiary Magistrate, 2R. [188] 3
Chester—Apprehended Disturbances at, [185] 273
Consecration of Churchyards, 2R. [187] 1019; Comm. 1651
Increase of the Episcopate, 2R. [187] 85; Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 380, 381; *cl.* 13, 1194; Report, *cl.* 13, 1486
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [187] 379
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [188] 851
Parliament—Business of the House, Motion for a Committee, [188] 264
Private Bills—Board of Trade Reports, [186] 705
Railway Bills—Standing Orders, [187] 1927
Railway Companies, 2R. [188] 490; Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 163
Railway Deposits—Standing Orders, [187] 1552, 1554, 1555
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 2R. [188] 1257, 1260, 1261
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [189] 312; *cl.* 47, 746; *cl.* 54, 750
Salmon Fishery (Ireland) Act Amendment, 2R. Amendt. [188] 762; 3R. 1064
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [185] 277; Comm. *cl.* 11, 1911; Report, [186] 110
Vice President of the Board of Trade, 2R. [187] 873; 3R. [189] 327

STANLEY, Hon. Captain F. A., *Preston*
Army—Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1804
Duchy of Lancaster (Prothonotaries Fees), [189] 1102

STANLEY, Hon. W. Owen, *Beaumaris*
Army—Household Cavalry, [186] 732
Militia Courts Martial, [187] 775, 776
Militia Deserters, [187] 1023
Chester—Apprehended Disturbances at, [185] 287
Troops and Arms at, [185] 342
Easter Holydays, Adjournment for the, [186] 1589, 1594

[*cont.*

STANLEY, Hon. W. Owen—*cont.*
Explanation—Mr. Osborne and Mr. Dillwyn, [187] 11
Metropolis—Buckingham Palace Gardens, [186] 1482
Footpaths bounding Crown Property, [187] 770, 771
Street Outrages, [187] 1664, 1666, 1860, 1861
Plantagenet Statues at Fontevrault, [185] 1444; [186] 817
Private Communications, Explanation, [186] 1708
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1009
Special Jurors, [185] 932
Volunteers, Employment of in Civil disturbances, [185] 1579
Wales—Holyhead Union, [185] 810
Sanitary Condition of Holyhead, [185] 1445

STANSFELD, Mr. J., *Halifax*
India—Famine in Orissa, Motion for an Address, [189] 803
Maharajah of Mysore, [187] 1059
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 615, 622
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [186] 357; Motion for Adjournment, 362, 935, 936, 938
Naval Stores, [187] 1853, 1854
Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1821

State Offices—The New Buildings
Notice, Lord Redesdale *April* 2, [186] 978
Moved, "That there be laid before the House, Return of Property purchased in Parliament and King's Streets for the extension of the new State Offices" (*The Lord Redesdale*) *April* 9, 1331; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Statute Law Consolidation
Motion for an Address for "Copy of all Letters addressed to the Lord Chancellor in 1853-4, containing proposals for a plan to consolidate the Statutes, which are not contained in the printed copy of Mr. Bellenden Ker's Reports" (*Colonel French*) *June* 4, [187] 1594; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Statute Law Revision
Question, Mr. Hadfield; Answer, The Attorney General *May* 7, [187] 89

Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *May* 21 (No. 106)
Read 2ª, after short debate *May* 28, [187] 1198
Committee *; Report *May* 31
Read 3ª * *June* 3
c. Read 1° * *June* 6 [Bill 194]
Read 2° * *June* 13
Committee *; Report *June* 24
Read 3° * *July* 1
l. Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 59]

STIRLING-MAXWELL, Sir W., *Perthshire*
Cattle Plague, Res. [186] 2017
Game Preservation (Scotland), 2R. [187] 908
Representation of the People, Comm. [185] 991
Scotland—Representation of, [185] 1262
Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 437

STOCK, Mr. O., *Carlow Bo.*
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 981

STONE, Mr. W. H., *Portsmouth*
Navy—Royal Marines, [186] 1102;—Greenwich Hospital, [187] 254

Storm Signals of the Board of Trade
Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 15, [185] 401; *Feb* 26, 1029; Question, Colonel Sykes; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *April* 5, [186] 1173; *June* 7, [187] 1731; *June* 24, [188] 426; *July* 8, 1187
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "it is inexpedient, in consequence of the suspension of 'Storm Warnings,' to continue the present arrangement with the Committee of the Royal Society, at an expense of £10,000 per annum, the average cost of the Meteorological Department of the Board of Trade having been £4,300 per annum" (*Colonel Sykes*), 1728
Parl. Papers—
Memorials 206 206-I
Letter 388
Papers 240

STRADBROKE, Earl of
Agricultural Employment, 2R. [188] 1664
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 10, [189] 473

Straits Settlements—New Appointments
Observations, Mr. O'Reilly; Reply, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 8, [185] 1603; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Sir James Fergusson *Mar* 11, 1646; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 21, [186] 280

STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE, Viscount
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, [188] 239, 242
Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 150
Crete—Insurrection in, Motion for an Address, [189] 1547, 1557
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [188] 155;—The Collective Guarantee, 977
Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 1252, 1253, 1709, 1710
Moldavia—Persecution of Jews, Motion for an Address, [188] 746, 751
Parliament—Notice of Questions, [188] 1254
Representation of the People, 2R. [188] 1826; Comm. [189] 297; *add. cl.* 465

STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL, Lord
Adjutant of Volunteers, 3R. [188] 1385, 1387
British North America, 3R. Amendt. [185] 1011, 1020
Canning, Mr., Statue of, Motion for an Address, [189] 147, 155, 156
Ireland—Inland Fisheries, Address for Returns, [188] 1430, 1431
Parliamentary Reform—Borough Qualification, Res. [185] 701, 719
Representation of the People, Report, *cl.* 5, Amendt. [189] 831, 836; 3R. *add. cl.* 944, 949

STRATHNAIRN, Lord
Army—Transport and Supply Departments, [188] 598

STUART, Colonel W., *Bedford*
Army—Increase Pay, [187] 1938
Cattle Plague in the Metropolis, [187] 1292
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [187] 1365; Motion for Adjournment, [188] 652
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1087
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), Comm. [188] 553; *cl.* 4, 557
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1240, 1241

STUCLEY, Sir G. S., *Barnstaple*
Army—Sanitary Committee, [186] 282;—Rewards to Military Inventors, 283, 1103
Cattle Plague, [188] 16;—Importation of Foreign Cattle, 666
Metropolis—Ventilation of Sewers, [187] 1661

Sugar, Drawback on
Question, Mr. Crum-Ewing; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 22, [185] 812

Sugar Duties
Considered in Committee (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); after long debate, Resolutions agreed to *Feb* 14, [185] 344
Resolutions [February 14] reported; and, after short debate, agreed to *Feb* 15, 450
Sugar Duties considered in Committee; after short debate, Resolution agreed to *Feb* 18, 472

Sugar Duties Bill
(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Bill ordered; read 1°* *Feb* 20 [Bill 37]
Read 2°* *Feb* 21
185] Committee; Report *Feb* 22, 904
. Consideration, as amended, deferred *Feb* 28, 1202
. Question, Mr. Gladstone; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 1, 1237
. Re-committed *Mar* 4, 1325
. Considered as amended *Mar* 11, 1698
Read 3°* *April* 1
l. Read 1ª* (*The Earl of Belmore*) *April* 2
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; 3ª* *April* 4 (No. 70)
Royal Assent *April* 5 [30 *Vict.* c. 10]

Sullivan, Mr. Serjeant E., *Mallow*
Court of Chancery (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1859
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 869, 874
Life Sentences, [185] 1931
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1777
Toomer, John, Case of, Motion for Papers, [186] 1222
Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 444, 445

Sultan of Turkey—Visit of the

188] *Naval Review*, Observations, Colonel Knox; Reply, Mr. Corry *July* 15, 1519; Question, Colonel Gilpin; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 16, 1626
India Office—State Entertainment, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 16, 1624; Question, Mr. H. B. Sheridan; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *July* 18, 1668; *July* 19, 1726
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 19, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, a List of the Persons invited to meet the Sultan at the State Entertainment to be given to His Majesty by the Indian Government" (*Mr. Henry B. Sheridan*), 1759; after short debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to
Volunteer Review at Wimbledon, Question, Lord Elcho; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 15, 1518

Summary Convictions—Minutes of Evidence—The Cornish Magistrates

Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answers, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Kendall *July* 15, [188] 1513
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *August* 1, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, in all cases of summary convictions before justices of the peace, it is desirable that Minutes of the Evidence on which the conviction was founded should be recorded, and preserved for future reference in case of need" (*Mr. Taylor*), [189] 644; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Sunday Lectures Bill
(*Viscount Amberley, Mr. S. Mill, Mr. Coleridge*)

c. Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *April* 2, [186] 998 [Bill 106]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Viscount Amberley*) *June* 19, [188] 89
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Kinnaird*); after debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and negatived; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for six months

Sunday Trading Bill
(*Mr. Thomas Hughes, Lord Claud Hamilton, Sir Brook Bridges*)

c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 19, [185] 653
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Thomas Hughes*) *May* 15, [187] 576
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Freshfield*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 34]
Committee—r.p. *July* 24, [189] 35

SUPPLY, 1867

Queen's Speech consid. *Feb* 7; Motion, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty;" Committee thereupon to-morrow
Committee on Motion, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty;" Queen's Speech referred; Motion considered *Feb* 8
Resolved, "That a Supply be granted to Her Majesty"
Resolution reported, and agreed to *Nem. Con.* *Feb* 11—Committee appointed for Wednesday
Considered in Committee *Feb* 18—Supplementary Civil Services 1866-7 — (1.) £45,721, Purchase of the Blacas Collection of Coins and Antiquities for the British Museum; after debate, Vote agreed to.—(2.) £165,309, Royal Palaces; after debate, Vote agreed to.—(3.) £101,300, Anglo-Chinese Flotilla; after short debate, Vote agreed to —Resolutions reported *Feb* 20—Vote £600
185] Houses of Parliament, 681; after short debate, Vote agreed to.—Vote £50,000, Universal Exhibition at Paris, 683; after short debate, Vote agreed to—Resolutions agreed to
Considered in Committee — Excesses on Grants *Mar* 1—£56,788 5*s*. 6*d*., for sums to make good Excesses on Grants for certain Civil Services, 1271—Resolution agreed to —Resolution reported
Considered in Committee *Mar* 7—Army Estimates—Statement of the Secretary of State for War (*General Peel*) on moving First Resolution, 1448; after long debate, Resolution agreed to—Resolution reported *Mar* 8
Considered in Committee *Mar* 14—Navy Estimates—Statement of the Secretary of the Navy (*Lord Henry Lennox*) in moving Vote 1, 1824; after long debate, Committee report Progress
Considered in Committee *Mar* 15—Army Estimates (on account), 1991—Navy Estimates —(28.) £1,000,000, Wages, &c., to Seamen and Marines (on account), 1992; after short debate, Resolution agreed to—Civil Service Estimates £1,924,000 (on account), 1992; Resolution agreed to—Resolution reported *Mar* 18
186] Considered in Committee *Mar* 21—Navy Estimates—After long debate, Committee report Progress, 321
Considered in Committee *Mar* 22—Navy Estimates—After short debate, Committee report Progress, 448
Considered in Committee *April* 1—Navy Estimates—Resolutions reported *April* 2
Considered in Committee *Mar* 29—Civil Service Estimates—£2,000, Special Rewards to certain members of the Irish Constabulary

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

Force, 894; after short debate, Resolution agreed to—Resolution reported *April* 1

Considered in Committee — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — £402,000, Advances for New Courts of Justice and Offices *April* 30, 1826; after short debate, Resolution agreed to—Resolution reported *May* 1

Considered in Committee *May* 16—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolution reported *May* 17

187] Considered in Committee *May* 20 — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments, 853—Resolutions reported *May* 21

Considered in Committee *May* 21—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments;—Class III.—Law and Justice, 924 — Resolutions reported *May* 23

Considered in Committee *May* 24—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class III.—Law and Justice — Revenue Departments — Resolutions reported *May* 27

Considered in Committee *May* 31—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — University of London—Resolutions reported *June* 3—Proviso struck out; Report agreed to

Considered in Committee *June* 6—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *June* 7

Considered in Committee *June* 7—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *June* 13

Considered in Committee *June* 13—NAVY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *June* 14

Considered in Committee *June* 14—R.P.

188] Considered in Committee *June* 21 — POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE, 351 — Resolution reported *June* 24

Report [13th June] *July* 1, 844—Postponed Resolution—THE VOLUNTEER FORCE—Considered; after short debate, Resolution agreed to

Considered in Committee *July* 12—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class VI.—Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c. 1487—Resolutions reported *July* 15

Considered in Committee — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Class VI.—Superannuation and Retired Allowances, &c.—Class I.—Public Works and Buildings *July* 18, 1672—Resolutions reported *July* 19

Considered in Committee — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — Class V.—Colonial, Consular, and other Foreign Services *July* 19, 1769—Resolutions reported *July* 22

Considered in Committee — CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES — Class V.—Colonial, Consular, and other Foreign Services—Miscellaneous, Special, and Temporary Objects *July* 22, 1897—Resolutions reported *July* 25

SUPPLEMENTAL VOTES, 1866-7.

DEFICIENCIES CIVIL AND INLAND REVENUE SERVICES, 1866—VIZ.:

COMMITTEE *Mar* 1—REPORT *Mar* 6.

				Total of Vote.		
CLASS II.	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
Office of Public Works, Ireland ...	747	6	0			
Postage of Public Departments ...	8,522	14	5			
CLASS III.						
Law Charges, &c., England	6,007	9	10			
Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions, Ireland ...	7,722	19	5			
Maintenance, &c., of Prisoners	11,293	5	3			
CLASS V.						
Special Missions, &c.	3,266	15	7			
St. Helena	1,571	4	0			
CLASS VII.						
Miscellaneous Expenses	1,012	4	3			
				40,143	18	9
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS—Inland Revenue				16,644	6	9
Total ...				£56,788	5	6

SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR CIVIL SERVICES 1867—VIZ.:

COMMITTEE *Feb* 18—REPORT *Feb* 20.

CLASS I.	£	*s.*	*d.*
Royal Palaces	212	0	0
Public Buildings	905	0	0
Royal Parks and Pleasure Grounds	11,805	0	0
Houses of Parliament	600	0	0
Holyhead and Portpatrick Harbours	7,181	0	0
Burlington House Designs ...	1,575	0	0
Wellington Monument	2,800	0	0
Franklin Monument	817	0	0
South Kensington Roads ...	1,286	0	0
CLASS IV.			
British Museum	45,721	0	0
Universal Exhibition at Paris ...	50,000	0	0
CLASS V.			
Special Missions	12,479	0	0
CLASS VII.			
Subsidies to Telegraph Companies	792	0	0
Miscellaneous Expenses formerly defrayed from Civil Contingencies	65,676	0	0
Anglo-Chinese Flotilla Compensation	101,300	0	0
Drawbacks on Sugar Experiments	9,181	0	0
Total ...	£312,330	0	0

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1867-8.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 14.

Statement of Lord Henry Lennox, Secretary of the Admiralty, on moving the First Vote, "That 67,300 Men and Boys, including 16,200 Marines, be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Service for the year 1867-8" ... ... [185] 1824

After long debate, Committee report Progress

COMMITTEE *Mar* 21.

Vote again proposed *Mar* 21, [186] 321

Motion, "That 65,300 Men and Boys, &c." (*Mr. Childers*); after long debate, Committee report Progress

COMMITTEE *Mar* 22.

Vote and Amendment again proposed; after short debate, Committee report Progress ... ... [186] 448

COMMITTEE *April* 1—REPORT *April* 2.

Vote and Amendment again proposed; after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn; original Question put, and agreed to ... ... [186] 935 — *Numbers.* 67,300

COMMITTEE *April* 1—REPORT *April* 2. — Total of Vote. £

(1.) Wages to Seamen and Marines ... 2,900,952

After short debate, Vote agreed to [186] 971

(2.) Victuals and Clothing for ditto ... 1,241,614

COMMITTEE *Mar* 9—REPORT *Mar* 12.

(3.) Admiralty Office [186] 971 — 176,018

After debate, Vote agreed to

COMMITTEE *June* 13—REPORT *June* 14.

(4.) Coast Guard Service, Royal Naval Coast Volunteers, and Royal Naval Reserve ... [187] 1813 — 267,067

After long debate, Vote agreed to

(5.) Scientific Branch [187] 1839 — 65,106

After short debate, Vote agreed to

(6.) Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad [187] 1841 — 1,375,368

After short debate, Vote agreed to

(7.) Victualling Yards and Transport Establishments at Home and abroad — 86,395

After short debate, Vote agreed to [187] 1848

(8.) Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad 62,686

(9.) Marine Divisions 17,448

(10.) Naval Stores for the Building, Repair, and Outfit of the Fleet and Coast Guard, Steam Machinery and Ships built by Contract:

Section I. Storekeeper General of the Navy 855,511

Section II. Controller of the Navy ... [187] 1858 — 860,559

After short debate, Vote agreed to [*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote. £

(11.) New Works, Buildings, Machinery, and Repairs 888,588

(12.) Medicines and Medical Stores ... 80,664

(13.) Martial Law and Law Charges... 21,332

(14.) Miscellaneous Services ... 168,450

Total for the Effective Service ... 9,067,758

(15.) Half Pay, Reserved Half Pay, and Retired Pay to Officers of the Navy and Royal Marines ... 704,937

(16.) Section I. Military Pensions and Allowances 528,667

Section II. Civil Pensions and Allowances 218,915

Total for the Naval Service ...10,520,277

FOR THE SERVICE OF OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT. £

(17.) Army Department (Conveyance of Troops) 405,976

Total £10,926,253

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

COMMITTEE *July* 25—REPORT *July* 26.

Increase Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Men, Royal Marine Corps... ... [189] 138 — 50,000

After debate, Vote agreed to

Grand Total, Navy Services...£10,976,253

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1867-8.

COMMITTEE *Mar* 7.

Statement of the Secretary of State for War (*General Peel*) on moving Resolution (A) [185] 1448

NUMBERS. — *Numbers.*

(A.) General Staff, Regimental and Military Educational Establishments — 139,163

(B.) *Native Indian Troops employed on the British Establishment*

After long debate, Resolution agreed to

Resolutions reported *Mar* 8

I.—REGULAR FORCES.

COMMITTEE *June* 7—REPORT *June* 13.

(1.) General Staff and Regimental Pay, Allowances and Charges ... £ 5,422,700

(2.) Commissariat Establishment, Services, and Movement of Troops ... 1,290,000

(3.) Clothing Establishments, Services and Supplies 570,000

(4.) Barrack Establishment, Services and Supplies ... [187] 1750 — 646,000

Motion, "That item £2,000 for Billiard Rooms be omitted" (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Comm. divided: A. 12, N. 72; M. 60; Vote agreed to [*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote. £
(5.) Divine Service	42,000
(6.) Martial Law ... [187] 1750	21,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(7.) Medical Establishment, Services and Supplies ... [187] 1750	275,600
After short debate, Vote agreed to	

II.—AUXILIARY FORCES.

(8.) Disembodied Militia [187] 1751	841,600
After debate, Vote agreed to	
(9.) Yeomanry	88,000
(10.) Volunteers ... [187] 1751	361,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(11.) Enrolled Pensioners and Army...	48,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [187] 1765	

III.—STORES.

COMMITTEE *June* 6—REPORT *June* 7.

(12.) Manufacturing Departments [187] 1701	1,162,500
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(13.) Warlike Stores [187] 1703	393,000
After debate, Vote agreed to	

IV.—WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

COMMITTEE *June* 6—REPORT *June* 7.

(14.) Superintending Establishment of, and Expenditure for, Works, Buildings and Repairs, at Home and Abroad ... ... [187] 1711	843,400
Motion, "That item £3,000 for Billiard Rooms be omitted" (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Motion put, and negatived; Vote agreed to	

V.—OTHER SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *June* 6—REPORT *June* 7.

(15.) Military Education [187] 1715	165,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(16.) Surveys of the United Kingdom	88,300
(17.) Miscellaneous Services [187] 1720	149,200
Motion, "That item £26,624, Contagious Diseases, be omitted" (*Mr. Candlish*); after short debate, Motion put, and negatived; Vote agreed to	

COMMITTEE *June* 6—REPORT *June* 7.

(18.) Administration of the Army ...	218,600
After long debate, Vote agreed to [187] 1721	
Total Effective Services	£12,625,900

VI.—NON-EFFECTIVE SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *June* 6—REPORT *June* 7.

(19.) Rewards for Military Service ...	26,100
(20.) Pay of General Officers ...	72,000
(21.) Pay of Reduced and Retired Officers	462,800
(22.) Widows' Pensions and Compassionate Allowances	158,600

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.

	Total of Vote. £
(23.) Pensions and Allowances to Wounded Officers	25,200
(24.) In-Pension	35,800
(25.) Out-Pension	1,186,800
(26.) Superannuation Allowances, &c.	136,000
(27.) Disembodied Militia	23,000
Total Non-Effective Services	£2,126,300

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

COMMITTEE *May* 16—REPORT *May* 17.

Increase Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Men ... [187] 687	416,750
After short debate, Vote agreed to	

COMMITTEE *July* 25—REPORT *July* 26.

Increase Pay to Non-Commissioned Officers and Men, Militia [189] 118	63,250
After debate, Vote agreed to	
Increase Pay to Army Reserved Force	20,000

RECAPITULATION.

Total Effective Services	13,125,900
Total Non-Effective Services ...	2,126,300
Grand Total, Army Services ...	£15,252,200

EXCHEQUER BONDS.

COMMITTEE *May* 24—REPORT *May* 27.

EXCHEQUER BONDS	1,700,000

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1867-8.

*** The Votes marked † are "to complete sums" for the several Services named.

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

COMMITTEE *July* 18—REPORT *July* 19.	Total of Vote.
(1.) † £35,945, Royal Palaces ...	41,945
After short debate, Vote agreed to [188] 1681	
(2.) † £95,805, Public Buildings ...	120,805
(3.) † £10,500, Furniture of Public Offices	13,500
(4.) † £100,326, Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens [188] 1690	125,326
Moved, "That the Vote for Hyde Park be reduced by £18,407" (*General Dunne*); after debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
(5.) † £45,137, New Houses of Parliament ... [188] 1695	55,137
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(6.) British Embassy Houses, Paris and Madrid ... [188] 1704	1,670
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(7.) † £36,000, New Foreign Office ...	49,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [188] 1704	
(8.) † £31,000, Public Offices, Site (Re-vote)	46,000
(9.) † £13,260, Probate Court and Registries (Re-vote)	21,260

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
	£
(10.) † £420, Public Record Repository (Re-vote)	3,420
(11.) National Gallery Enlargement ...	32,000
Committee *May* 31—Report *June* 3.	
(12.) † £20,000, University of London Buildings ... [187] 1463	25,000
Motion, "To add Proviso" (*Mr. Layard*); A. 52, N. 46, M. 6; words added; Motion, as amended, agreed to	
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Bentinck*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
Committee *July* 18—Report *July* 19.	
(13.) † £7,000, Chapter House, Westminster	10,000
Committee *July* 18—Report *July* 19.	
(14.) New Palace of Westminster, Acquisition of Lands...	30,000
Committee *May* 31—Report *June* 3.	
(15.) Burlington House	15,000
Committee *July* 18—Report *July* 19.	
(16.) † £16,000, Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland	21,000
(17.) † £20,000, Rates for Government Property ... [188] 1705	27,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(18.) † £3,000, British Consulate and Embassy Houses, Constantinople ...	4,000
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,000, &c." (*Mr. Monk*); Motion withdrawn	
Moved, "That the Vote be reduced by £350 for Iron Shutters at Therapia" (*Mr. Monk*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [188] 1705	
(19.) † £7,000, Metropolitan Fire Brigade	10,000
(20.) † £56,700, Harbours of Refuge	76,700
(21.) † £21,475, Holyhead and Portpatrick Harbours, &c.	29,475
(22.) † £55,837, Public Buildings, Ireland	74,837
(23.) Queen's University, Ireland, Buildings ... [188] 1707	7,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(24.) † £5,500, Ulster Canal ...	7,500
(25.) † £36,360, Lighthouses Abroad ...	41,360
(26.) Isle of Man Lunatic Asylum ...	3,600
Total Civil Services—Class I. ...	£892,535

Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments.

Committee *May* 20—Report *May* 21.	
(1.) † £55,491, Two Houses of Parliament, Offices [187] 853	73,491
Motion, "That Item £8,300, Fee Fund, House of Lords, be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Mr. Lusk*); after debate, Motion withdrawn	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
Moved, "That the Item of £1,000 for the Librarian be reduced by £200" (*Mr. Darby Griffith*), 855; after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	£
(2.) † £38,836, Treasury	52,836
(3.) † £20,308, Home Office ...	27,308
(4.) † £51,410, Foreign Office ...	67,410
(5.) † £24,250, Colonial Office ...	33,250
(6.) † £23,423, Privy Council Office	30,423
After short debate, Vote agreed to [187] 855	
(7.) † £59,386, Board of Trade, &c.	68,386
After short debate, Vote agreed to [187] 855	
(8.) † £1,938, Privy Seal Office ...	2,938
(9.) † £6,091, Civil Service Commission	9,091
(10.) † £14,200, Paymaster General's Office	20,200
(11.) † £28,000, Exchequer and Audit Department [187] 856	38,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(12.) † £23,463, Office of Works and Public Buildings [187] 856	32,463
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(13.) † £18,744, Office of Woods, Forests, and Land Revenues [187] 857	25,744
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(14.) † £15,383, Public Record Office	21,383
After short debate, Vote agreed to [187] 857	
(15.) † £287,798, Poor Law Commissions [187] 858	312,798
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(16.) † £32,158, Mint, including Coinage	44,158
(17.) † £29,622, Inspectors of Factories, Fisheries, &c.	39,622
(18.) † £3,989, Exchequer, and other Offices in Scotland [187] 860	5,989
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Lusk*); Motion negatived; original Question put, and agreed to; Vote agreed to	
(19.) † £4,413, Household of Lord Lieutenant, Ireland [187] 860	6,413
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Candlish*); Motion negatived; Vote agreed to	
(20.) † £11,733, Chief Secretary, Ireland, Offices	15,733
(21.) † £17,620, Office of Public Works, Ireland	24,620
Committee *May* 21—Report *May* 23.	
(22.) † £14,101, Copyhold, Tithe, and Inclosure Commission [187] 924	20,101
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(23.) † £8,600, Inclosure and Drainage Acts, Imprest Expenses ...	11,600
(24.) † £52,025, General Register Offices, England, Ireland, and Scotland	69,025
(25.) † £11,424, National Debt Office	15,424
(26.) † £3,349, Public Works Loan Commission and West India Relief Commission	4,349
(27.) † £10,144, Lunacy Commissions and Inspection, &c., of Lunatic Asylums [187] 924	14,144
After short debate, Vote agreed to	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote. £

(28.) † £223, Superintendent of Roads, South Wales 1,223
(29.) † £1,414, Registrars of Friendly Societies 2,414
(30.) † £13,115, Charity Commission 18,115
After short debate, Vote agreed to [187] 925
(31.) † £5,041, Local Government Act Office, and Inspection of Burial Grounds 7,041
(32.) † £1,724, Landed Estates Record Offices 2,724
(33.) † £444, Quarantine Expenses ... 1,444
Moved, "That the Vote be reduced by £443, 10*s.*" (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to ... [187] 927

(34.) † £24,000, Secret Service ... 32,000
(35.) † £294,020, Printing and Stationery [187] 928 384,020
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(36.) † £129,350, Postage of Public Departments 167,350

Total Civil Services Class II. ... £1,703,230

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

ENGLAND.

COMMITTEE *May* 21—REPORT *May* 23.

(1.) † £24,440, Law Charges, England... 33,440
(2.) † £141,035, Criminal Prosecutions, &c. 189,035
(3.) † £200,925, Police, Counties and Boroughs, Great Britain ... 266,925
(4.) † £8,625, Admiralty Court Registry 12,625
(5.) † £2,236, Late Insolvent Debtors Court [187] 930 3,236
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to
(6.) † £66,467, Probate Court ... 88,467
(7.) † £107,127, County Courts ... 144,127
(8.) † £3,440, Land Registry Office 5,440
(9.) † £16,103, Police Courts, Metropolis 22,103
(10.) † £123,848, Metropolitan Police 164,848
(11.) Revising Barristers, England and Wales 17,850
(12.) Divorce Court Compensations 658
(13.) † £10,292, Bankruptcy Court Compensations 14,292
(14.) † £39,381, Common Law Courts, including Crown Office, Queen's Bench 52,381

SCOTLAND.

(15.) † £54,447, Criminal Proceedings 72,447
(16.) † £36,850, Courts of Law and Justice 48,850
(17.) † £11,486, Register House, Edinburgh, Salaries and Expenses ... 16,486

[*cont.*

Supply—cont. — Total of Vote. £

IRELAND.

(18.) † £65,314, Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions 77,314
(19.) † £4,522, Court of Chancery ... 6,522
(20.) † £10,852, Court of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer 14,852
(21.) † £2,407, Officers of the Judges on Circuit 4,407
(22.) † £1,025, Manor Court Compensations 2,025
(23.) † £1,869, Registry of Judgments 2,869
(24.) † £10,051, Registry of Deeds ... 14,051
(25.) High Court of Delegates ... 100
(26.) † £4,899, Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency 6,899
(27.) † £7,673, Court of Probate ... 10,673
(28.) † £9,492, Landed Estates Court 12,492
(29.) † £5,500, Process Servers, Civil Bill Courts 8,500
(30.) Revising Barristers 420

COMMITTEE *May* 24—REPORT *May* 27.

(31.) † £37,600, Dublin Metropolitan Police and Police Justices ... 50,600
(32.) † £641,513, Constabulary ... 851,513
(33.) † £1,724, Four Courts Marshalsea Prison 2,724

(34.) † £15,400, Inspection and General Superintendence of Prisons ... 20,400
(35.) † £245,677, Prisons and Convict Establishments at Home [187] 1094 328,677
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(36.) † £215,099, Maintenance of Prisoners in County Gaols, &c., and Removal of Convicts 287,099
(37.) † £15,709, Transportation of Convicts [187] 1095 21,709
After short debate, Vote agreed to
(38.) † £113,886, Convict Establishments in the Colonies 151,886

Total Civil Services Class III. ... £3,028,942

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

COMMITTEE *July* 29—REPORT *July* 30.

(1.) † £531,865, Public Education, Great Britain ... [189] 361 705,865
After long debate, Vote agreed to

COMMITTEE *August* 9—REPORT *August* 10.

(2.) † £162,387, Science and Art Department ... [189] 1226 221,387
After short debate, Vote agreed to

COMMITTEE *August* 5—REPORT PROGRESS.

(3.) † 259,700, Public Education, Ireland ... ... [189] 908
After debate, Committee report Progress

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
COMMITTEE *August* 9—REPORT *August* 10.	£
Vote again proposed; Amendment "That a sum, not exceeding £236,195, &c." (*Sir John Gray*) After debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [189] 1262	344,700
COMMITTEE *August* 9—REPORT *August* 10.	
(4.) Commissioners of Education, Ireland	730
(5.) † £5,711, University of London	8,711
(6.) † £13,918, Universities, &c. in Scotland ... [189] 1241	18,918
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(7.) † £1,515, Queen's University in Ireland ... [189] 1241	2,515
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(8.) † £2,265, Queen's Colleges, Ireland ... ... [189] 1241	4,265
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(9.) Royal Irish Academy [189] 1242	700
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(10.) National Gallery of Ireland ...	2,183
After short debate, Vote agreed to [189] 1242	
(11.) † £1,500, Belfast Theological Professors ... [189] 1242	2,500
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
COMMITTEE *July* 29—REPORT *July* 30.	
(12.) † £74,621, British Museum ...	99,621
After debate, Vote agreed to [189] 342	
COMMITTEE *August* 9—REPORT *August* 10.	
(13.) † £11,895, National Gallery ...	15,895
After short debate, Vote agreed to [189] 1243	
(14.) British Historical Portrait Gallery	1,650
(15.) † £11,215, Scientific Works and Experiments	13,215
(16.) † £2,600, Board of Manufactures, Scotland	3,600
(17.) Universal Exhibition at Paris ...	53,799
After short debate, Vote agreed to [189] 1245, 1260	
(18.) Learned Societies, Great Britain	2,300
After short debate, Vote agreed to [189] 1246	
Total Civil Services Class IV. ...	£1,502,544

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

COMMITTEE *July* 19—REPORT *July* 22.	
(1.) † £1,500, Bermudas [188] 1769	2,500
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Whalley*); Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
(2.) † £2,038, Clergy, North America	3,038
(3.) † £16,678, Governors and others, West Indies, &c.	22,678
(4.) † £4,300, Justices, West Indies	6,300
(5.) † £13,500, Western Coast ...	18,500

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote. £
(6.) † £2,230, St. Helena ...	4,230
(7.) Orange River Territory ...	500
(8.) Heligoland	1,100
(9.) † £3,836, Falkland Islands ...	5,836
(10.) † £1,183, Labuan [188] 1770	2,183
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(11.) † £8,036, Emigration ...	11,036
(12.) Niger Expedition [188] 1771	1,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(13.) Coolie Emigration from India ...	1,100
After short debate, Vote agreed to [188] 1771	
(14.) † £2,000, Treasury Chest ...	3,000
(15.) † £24,000, Captured Negroes, Bounties on Slaves, &c. [188] 1772	
After short debate, Committee report Progress	
COMMITTEE *July* 22—REPORT *July* 25.	
Vote again proposed [188] 1897 Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £19,000, &c." (*Mr. Lusk*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	32,000
(16.) † £6,450, Commissions for Suppression of Slave Trade [188] 1900 Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,450" (*Mr. Childers*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,750, &c." (*Mr. Childers*); Question put, and agreed to ...	8,750
(17.) † £124,188, Consuls Abroad ...	166,188
After short debate, Vote agreed to [188] 1900	
(18.) † £103,983, Services in China, Japan, and Siam [188] 1901	135,983
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(19.) † £26,000, Ministers at Foreign Courts, Extraordinary Expenses ...	35,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to [188] 1901	
(20.) † £26,000, Special Missions, Outfits, &c. [188] 1902	35,000
Moved, "That Item £1,728 9*s.* 9*d.*, Cholera Commission at Constantinople, be omitted from the proposed Vote" (*Sir J. Clarke Jervoise*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to	
(21.) † £1,658, Third Secretaries to Embassies	2,658
Total Civil Services Class V. ...	£498,580

CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES.

COMMITTEE *July* 12—REPORT *July* 15.	
(1.) † £150,035, Superannuation and Retired Allowances	197,035
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Lusk*); A. 3, N. 69; M. 66; original Question put, and agreed to [188] 1487	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
	£
(2.) Toulonese and Corsican Emigrants, &c., and American Loyalists	638
(3.) Refuge for the Destitute ...	325
(4.) † £1,580, Polish Refugees, and Distressed Spaniards [188] 1482	2,580
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Whalley*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; original Question put, and agreed to	
(5.) † £38,040, Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c.	52,040
(6.) † £27,400, Relief of British Distressed Seamen	35,400
(7.) † £2,710, Miscellaneous Charges, formerly on Civil List [188] 1490	3,710
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(8.) † £1,183, Public Infirmaries, Ireland ... ... [188] 1490	2,183
Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress" (*Mr. Lusk*); Motion put, and negatived; Vote agreed to	
(9.) † £11,845, Hospitals in Dublin and Board of Superintendence ...	15,845
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,845, &c.;" after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [188] 1490	
(10.) † £5,323, Concordatum Fund, and other Charities and Allowances, Ireland	8,323

Committee *July* 18—Report *July* 19.

(11.) † £30,479, Non-Conforming and other Ministers, Ireland [188] 1672	41,479
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £366, &c." (*Mr. Hadfield*); after debate, Comm. divided; A. 33, N. 106; M. 73	
Moved, "That item £346 3*s*. 4*d*. for New Congregations be omitted from the Vote" (*Mr. Lusk*); after debate, Comm. divided; A. 41, N. 78; M. 37; original Question put, and agreed to; Vote agreed to	
Total Civil Services Class VI. ...	£359,558

Class VII.—Miscellaneous, Special, and Temporary Objects.

Committee *July* 22—Report *July* 25.

(1.) † £23,000, Temporary Commissions	31,000
(2.) † £23,410, Patent Law Expenses	31,410
(3.) † £11,667, Fishery Board Scotland	15,667
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £5,895 5*s*. &c." (*Mr. Lamont*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn; Vote agreed to [188] 1904	
(4.) † £39,948, Local Dues on Shipping under Treaties of Reciprocity	53,948
(5.) † £1,700, Inspectors of Corn Returns ... [188] 1905	2,700
After short debate, Vote agreed to	

[*cont.*

Supply—cont.	Total of Vote.
	£
(6.) Boundary Survey, Ireland ...	550
(7.) Brehon Laws, Ireland ...	416
After short debate, Vote agreed to [188] 1905	
(8.) Flax Cultivation in Ireland ...	2,000
Moved, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,000 &c." (*Mr. Lusk*); Motion negatived; Vote agreed to [188] 1905	
(9.) Malta and Alexandria Telegraph, and Subsidies to Telegraph Companies	780
(10.) Agricultural Statistics, Great Britain ... [188] 1906	10,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	
(11.) † £791, Household of the late King of the Belgians	1,791
(12.) † £13,592, Miscellaneous Expenses from Civil Contingencies ...	33,592
After short debate, Vote agreed to [188] 1907	

Committee *August* 9—Report *August* 10.

(13.) Entertainment of Foreign Potentates ... ... [189] 1246	25,000
After debate, Vote agreed to	
Total Civil Services Class VII. ...	£208,854

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS, 1867-8.

Committee *May* 24—Report *May* 27.

	£
Vote I. Customs (Salaries and Expenses)	801,623
Vote II. Inland Revenue (Salaries and Expenses)	1,332,707
After short debate, Vote agreed to [187] 1096	
Vote III. Post Office (Salaries and Expenses)	2,438,929
Vote IV. Superannuations	471,741
Total of Revenue Departments ...	£5,045,000

POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE.

Committee *August* 1—Report *August* 2.

£507,428, Post Office Packet Service	£
After short debate, Vote agreed to ... [189] 658	807,428

Committee *April* 30.

	£
Advances for New Courts of Justice and Offices ... [186] 1826	402,000
After short debate, Vote agreed to	

Committee *August* 5—Report *August* 6.

	£
Advances for Greenwich Hospital and Schools ... ... [189] 898	
Amendt. to omit £821, Salary of Inspector General of Hospitals (*Mr. Candlish*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn—Vote agreed to ...	128,635

[*cont.*

SUMMARY.

WAYS AND MEANS.

SCHEDULE OF WAYS AND MEANS REFERRED TO IN SECTION 5 OF THE CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) ACT—VIZ.:

1866-7.	£	s.	d.
Granted per Act 30 *Vict.* c. 4, for the Service of the Years ending 31st March 1866 and 31st March 1867	369,118	5	6
1867-8.			
Granted for the Service of the Year ending 31st March 1868—viz.:			
Per Act 30 *Vict.* c. 7 ...	7,924,000	0	0
Per Act 30 *Vict.* c. 30 ...	14,000,000	0	0
Per Section 1 of this Act	19,106,591	2	0
Per Section 4 of this Act (being Surplus Ways and Means granted for the Service of preceding Years)	1,475,177	18	0
TOTAL GRANTS OF WAYS AND MEANS to meet the following Supplies:—			
1866-7 £369,118 5 6 1867-8 42,505,769 0 0	£42,874,887	5	6

SUMMARY.

SUMS VOTED IN SUPPLY, SESSION 1867.

1865-6. (Supplemental Votes.)		£	s.	d.
Deficiencies on Grants for Civil Services		40,143	18	9
Deficiency on Grant for Inland Revenue		16,644	6	9
Supplementary Grants for Year ending 31st March 1867 ...		312,330	0	0
1867-8.				
NAVY SERVICES		10,976,253	0	0
ARMY SERVICES		15,252,200	0	0
EXCHEQUER BONDS		1,700,000	0	0
CIVIL SERVICES—viz.:	£			
I. Public Works and Buildings... ...	892,535			
II. Salaries, &c. Public Departments...	1,703,230			
III. Law and Justice	3,028,942			
IV. Education, Science, and Art ...	1,502,554			
V. Colonial and Consular Services ...	498,580			
VI. Superannuation, &c.	359,558			
VII. Miscellaneous ..	208,854			
		8,194,253	0	0
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ...		5,045,000	0	0
POST OFFICE PACKET SERVICE ...		807,428	0	0
ADVANCES FOR NEW COURTS OF JUSTICE AND OFFICES ...		402,000	0	0
ADVANCES FOR GREENWICH HOSPITAL AND SCHOOL		128,635	0	0
TOTAL OF SUPPLIES CHARGEABLE UPON THE ABOVE WAYS AND MEANS—		£42,874,887	5	6

SURTEES, Mr. C. F., *Durham, S.*
Army—Batteries at Hartlepool, [187] 772

SURTEES, Mr. H. E., *Hertfordshire*
Cattle Disease, [186] 731
Malt Tax, Motion for a Committee, [187] 542
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1211

Swansea Vale Railway Bill
c. Read 2°, after short debate *Feb* 27, [185] 1089

SYDNEY, Viscount
Charities, Assessment of, [188] 745
Chatham and Sheerness Stipendiary Magistrate, 2R. [188] 4

SYKES, Colonel W. H., *Aberdeen City*
Abyssinia—Imprisonment of British Subjects, Motion for an Address, [189] 253
Army—Colour Sergeant Connell, Case of, [186] 467; [188] 852
Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1802

[*cont.*

SYKES, Colonel W. H.—*cont.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1506
Manufacturing Departments, [187] 1701, 1702
Works, Buildings, &c. [187] 1712
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Leave, [185] 293; 2R. [186] 690
Board of Works, [188] 666
British North America, Comm. [185] 1312
Cattle Plague—Compensation for Slaughtered Cattle, [186] 1230; Res. 2014
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 45, [189] 1518
Corrupt Practices at Elections, Comm. [187] 66
East India Revenue Accounts, Comm. [189] 1364, 1376, 1381
Education, [185] 1163
Financial Statement, [186] 1152
Fortifications, Grants for, Motion for a Return, [185] 288
Fortifications (Provisions for Expenses), 3R. [189] 1300
Houses of Parliament, Leave, [186] 166
India—Maharajah of Mysore, [187] 1049
Revenues of, [189] 340
Simla Court Martial, Motion for an Address, [189] 1039

[*cont.*

Sykes, Colonel W. H.—*cont.*
Meteorological Department of the Board of Trade, [185] 401
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1918
Metropolis—Statue of Canning, [189] 1298
Metropolitan Improvement, [188] 1877
Municipal Corporations (Metropolis), Leave, [187] 890
Mutiny, Comm. Preamble, [186] 934
Navy—Dockyards, Res. [185] 643
Greenwich Hospital, Res, [189] 865
Naval Arsenals and Dockyards, [189] 1568
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [186] 943; Report, [187] 1861, 1863
Oxford and Cambridge Universities Education, Leave, [185] 1707
Public Health (Scotland), 2R. [186] 1926
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 35, [187] 1204, 1782, 1785; *cl.* 10, 1981; *add. cl.* [188] 806, 867, 1226
Scotch Judicial Annual Returns, [189] 1564, 1565
Scotland—Management of Scotch Business in Parliament, [186] 400
Representation of the People, [185] 1801
Spain—Relations with, [186] 1586
Storm Signals of the Board of Trade, [185] 1029; [186] 1173; [187] 1731; [188] 426, 1187; Res. 1728
Supply—Anglo-Chinese Flotilla, [185] 512
Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1772
British Museum, [189] 351, 353
Department of Science and Art, [189] 1235, 1236
Labuan, [188] 1770
Niger Expedition, [188] 1771
Post Office Packet Service, [189] 699
Public Education, [189] 362
Royal Palaces, [185] 500, 506
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), 2R. [189] 1531

Synan, Mr. E. J., *Limerick Co.*
Abyssinia—Expedition to, [188] 1511
Army—Medical Officers, [186] 281; Res. [188] 1141, 1146, 1147; —Medical Warrant of 1858, 1390
Bridges (Ireland), 2R. [186] 797
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Re-comm. *cl.* 35, [188] 1250
Grand Juries (Ireland), 2R. [187] 596
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 984
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1746; Comm. [188] 117
Ireland—Established Church, Res. [187] 146
Fenian Prisoners, [186] 1951
Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Motion for a Committee, [186] 414
Railways, Res. [185] 1948
Taxation, Res. [188] 1312
Libel, 2R. [185] 1740; Re-comm. *add. cl.* [188] 545
Offices and Oaths, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1398
Promissory Notes (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1863
Representation of the People—Voting Papers, [186] 1174
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 29, [188] 213
Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2R. [188] 959
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1162, 1737

Talbot de Malahide, Lord
Brown's Charity, 2R. [188] 501

Tancred's Charities Bill
(*Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. Adderley*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 9 [Bill 143]
Read 2° * *May* 23, and referred to a Select Committee
And, on *May* 31, Committee nominated as follows:—Lord Robert Montagu (Chairman), Viscount Cranborne, Mr. Dent, Mr. Henley, Mr. Lowe, Sir George Stucley, and M. Woodd
Re-comm. *; *July* 4—R.P. [Bill 207]
Committee * (*on re-comm.*) *July* 25—R.P.
Question, Mr. Dent; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *July* 25, [189] 86
Bill withdrawn * *August* 1
Report of Mr. Martin—(*Parl. P.* No. 139)

Taunton, Lord
Church of England in the Colonies, Address for Papers, [185] 388, 393
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [189] 1092
Colonial Churches, [186] 387
Convocation and the Commission on Ritualism, [188] 1170
France, Mr., Pamphlet of, Res. [185] 1628
Galway Harbour (Composition of Debt), 2R. [188] 965
Private Bills—Board of Trade Reports, [186] 704, 705
Representation of the People, Comm. [189] 293; *cl.* 47, 744

Taylor, Colonel T. E., *Dublin Co.*
Explanation—Mr. Osborne and Mr. Dillwyn, [187] 10

Taylor, Mr. P. A., *Leicester*
Churchward, Mr., Appointment of, [185] 1914, 1915;—Case of, [186] 5, 123; Motion for an Address, 167, 174; [187] 1907
Fulford and Wellstead, Case of, [188] 166; Motion for an Address, 1147, 1156, 1263
Hyde Park—Reform Meeting, [186] 1983
Meetings in Royal Parks, [187] 778; [188] 1626; 2R. Amendt. 1884, 1894; Re-comm. Preamble, Motion for Adjournment, [189] 1453, 1586
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 670; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1457
Summary Convictions—The Whortleberry Case, [188] 1543; Res. [189] 644, 648

Telegraph Lines, Government Superintendence of
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 22, [185] 813

Tenants Improvements (Ireland) Bill
(*Lord Naas, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 18, [185] 530 [Bill 29]
186] Question, Mr. Bryan; Answer, Lord Naas *Mar* 21, 290
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Lord Naas*) *April* 4, 1159

[*cont.*

Tenants Improvements (Ireland) Bill—cont.

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Candlish*); after short debate, Motion agreed to; Debate adjourned

186] Question, Sir Frederick Heygate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *April* 12, 1585

Debate resumed *April* 29, 1710

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "without prejudging the second reading of this Bill, this House is of opinion that no enactment for the settlement of the Landlord and Tenant question in Ireland can be deemed satisfactory which does not provide for the encouragement of leases in that Country" (*Mr. Gregory*); Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Graves*), 1778; Motion withdrawn

Question, "That the words, &c.," negatived

Question, "That the words 'without prejudging the second reading of this Bill, this House is of opinion that no enactment for the settlement of the Landlord and Tenant question in Ireland can be deemed satisfactory which does not provide for the encouragement of leases in that Country,' be there added"

Amendt. proposed to proposed Amendt. by leaving out all after "opinion," and add "no property should be charged with the repayment of loans advanced for the purpose of making improvements except such improvements be made with the consent of the landlord" (*Mr. Sandford*)

Question, "That the words, &c.;" A. 104, N. 108; M. 4

Question, "That the words 'no property, &c.,' be there added"

Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dick*); A. 115, N. 97; M. 18; Debate adjourned

Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 3, 1934; Question, The O'Donoghue; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *May* 10, [187] 373; Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Lord Naas *May* 21, 881

Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Tenure of Land (Ireland) Bill

(*The Marquess of Clanricarde*)

l. Presented; read 1ª *Feb* 27, [185] 1089

Read 2ª, after short debate *April* 9, [186] 1323 (No. 23)

And, on *May* 23, Committee nominated as follows:—D. Devonshire, M. Bath, E. Devon, E. Clarendon, E. Lucan, E. Rosse, E. Grey, E. Stradbroke, E. Kimberley, V. Lifford, L. Somerhill, L. Clandeboye, L. Churston, L. Westbury, L. Meredyth, and L. Cairns

Report of Select Committee *August* 2 (No. 196)

Report * *August* 2 (No. 281)

Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill

(*Mr. Coleridge, Mr. Grant Duff*)

c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° *Feb* 12, [185] 296 [Bill 16]

Read 2° *Mar* 6, 1419 [*cont.*

Tests Abolition (Oxford) Bill—cont.

Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *April* 10, [186] 1431

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee, that they have power to extend the provisions of the Bill to the University of Cambridge" (*Mr. Fawcett*); after long debate, A. 253, N. 166; M. 87; Division List, Ayes and Noes, 1443

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," agreed to

Committee *; Report *April* 10

Considered as amended *May* 8, [187] 213

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Coleridge*) *June* 18, [188] 83

After short debate, Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Henley*); A. 80; N. 95; M. 15; Moved, "That the Debate be adjourned" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); Debate adjourned

Adjourned debate *July* 16, 1655

Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Sir Michael Hicks-Beach*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°

l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 18 (No. 235)

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 25, [189] 43

Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Lord President*); after debate, on Question, "That ('now,') &c.;" Cont. 46, Not-Cont. 74; M. 28; resolved in the negative; and Bill to be read 2ª on this Day Three Months

List of Cont. and Not-Cont. *July* 25, 75

Thames Embankment and Metropolis Improvement [Loans] Bill

(*Mr. Dodson, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)

c. Ordered * *Feb* 22

Read 1° * *Feb* 26 [Bill 56]

Read 2° * *August* 14

Bill withdrawn * *August* 15

Thames Embankment—Sheilds' Petition

Moved, "That the Petition of Francis Webb Sheilds' C.E. [presented 8th March], relative to the Thames Embankment, be referred to a Select Committee to inquire into the allegations thereof and to report their opinion to the House" (*Mr. Lowe*) *Mar* 21, [186] 371; Moved, "That the debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Hunt*); A. 6, N. 28; M. 22

Debate resumed *Mar* 28, 798; A. 29, N. 49; M. 20

Theatres and Places of Public Amusement—Regulation of

Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 18, [185] 468

THYNNE, Lord H. F., *Wiltshire, S.*
  Corrupt Practices at Elections—Removal of Magistrates, [186] 121
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 34, [187] 1189
  Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1779

Tipperary Election
  House informed, that the Committee had determined,—That the Honourable Charles White is duly elected a Knight of the Shire to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Tipperary. And the said Determination was ordered to be entered in the Journals of this House. House further informed of certain Resolutions of the Committee *April* 5, [186] 1171
  Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee to be laid before this House (*Sir Philip Egerton*)—(*Parl. P.* No. 211)
    (See *Waterford and Tipperary Elections*)

TITE, Mr. W., *Bath*
  Burlington House Site, [186] 1244
  National Gallery, The New, Motion for Papers, [186] 833
  Supply—University of London, [187] 1467

TOLLEMACHE, Mr. J., *Cheshire S.*
  Cattle Plague in Cheshire, [185] 586
  Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, [185] 1336
  Salt, Admission of, into France, [185] 1443

Toomer, John, Case of
  Question, Sir Robert Collier; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 1, [186] 904; Observations, Sir Robert Collier *April* 5, 1203; long debate thereon

"*Tornado,*" *Case of the*—see *Spain*

TORRENS, Mr. W. T. McCullagh, *Finsbury*
  Army—Sale of Commissions, [187] 1663
  Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Leave, [185] 290; 2R. [186] 666; Comm. [189] 757; *cl.* 9, 762; *cl.* 15, 763; Amendt. 1535
  Austria—Commercial Treaty with, [189] 1448
  Canada—Extradition of M. Lamirande, [185] 467, 1339
  Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 961, 991
  Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1478, 1481
  Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1615
  Parliament—Business of the House, [188] 1877
  Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [187] 28, 49, 53, 454, 464, 467; *cl.* 19, Amendt. [188] 52; *cl.* 29, 180; Amendt. 183, 206; Lords Amendts. *cl.* C, [189] 1189
  Roman Catholic School Children, Removal of, [189] 1224

Totnes Election Commission Report
  Question, Mr. Morrison; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 28, [186] 725
   Moved, "That before proceedings be taken against any of the Parties convicted of Bribery at the Totnes Election, a list of those about to be prosecuted be laid upon the Table of this House" (*Sir Lawrence Palk*) *April* 9, 1353; after debate, Motion withdrawn
    Report of Commissioners *Parl. P.* [3776]

TOTTENHAM, Colonel C. G., *New Ross*
  Bridges (Ireland), 2R. [186] 797

TOWNSHEND, Marquess of
  Industrial Schools, 2R. [188] 1711, 1713
  Morewood, Mr. J. J., Case of, Motion for a Committee, [188] 660

TRACY, Hon. C. R. D. HANBURY-, *Montgomery*
  Navy Estimates — Coastguard Service, &c. [187] 1829
    Scientific Departments, [187] 1839
  Navy—Henwood's, Mr., Sea-going Monitors, [189] 869
    Naval Officers' Leave, [187] 1924
    Promotions in the, [185] 343; Res. [186] 293, 300, 309, 311
  Scurvy—Mercantile Navy, [185] 282
  "Tornado," The, [185] 1145

Trades Unions Bill (*Mr. Secretary Walpole, Lord John Manners, Sir Stafford Northcote*)
185] *c.* Ordered *Feb* 8, 179
  Read 1° * *Feb* 12 [Bill 18]
  . Read 2° *Feb* 18, 513
  . Committee; Report *Feb* 25, 993 [Bill 58]
  Considered as amended * *Feb* 28
  Read 3° * *Mar* 1
  Lords Amendts. [Bill 93]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *Mar* 4
  . Read 2ª *Mar* 7, 1432 (No. 31)
  . Committee; Report *Mar* 14, 1765 (No. 44)
  Committee (*on re-comm.*) *Mar* 21, [186] 268
  Report * *Mar* 22 (No. 57)
  Read 3ª * *Mar* 25
  Royal Assent *April* 5 [30 *Vict.* c. 8]

Trades Union Commission Act (1867) Extension Bill
(*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 3 [Bill 227]
  Read 2° * *July* 8
  Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *July* 11, [188] 1398; after debate, Bill considered in Committee, and reported
  Read 3° * *July* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *July* 15
  Read 2ª * *July* 18 (No. 225)
  Committee * *July* 19 (No. 243)
  Report * *July* 22
  Read 3ª * *July* 23
  Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 74]

Trades Unions—The Royal Commission—Mr. Conolly
Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 12, [188] 1437
Parl. Papers—
First Report of Commission. . [3873]
Second Report . . . . . . [3893]
Third Report . . . . . . [3910]
Fourth Report . . . . . . [3952]

Traffic Regulation (Metropolis) Bill
(*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Feb* 7 (No. 5)
Read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee *Feb* 12, [185] 274
And, on *Feb* 15, Committee appointed as follows:—Ld. Privy Seal, Ld. Steward, E. Tankerville, E. Graham, E. Lucan, E. Belmore, E. De Grey, E. Granville, E. Kimberley, L. Methuen, L. Stanley of Alderley, and L. Houghton; *Feb* 18, The Marquess of Westmeath, The Earl of Airlie, and The Earl Stanhope added; *Feb* 19, The Lord Portman and The Lord Ebury added
Report of Select Comm. *Mar* 8 (No. 21, 35)
Committee *Mar* 15, 1909 (No. 46)
Report *Mar* 19, [186] 110
Clause 9, Amendt. moved, after ("Notice") to insert ("except in such form and manner as may be approved of by the Commissioner of Police" (*The Earl of Denbigh*); Cont. 24, Not-Cont. 16; M. 8; Amendt. agreed to; List of Cont. and Not-Cont. 111 (No. 52)
Read 3ª * *Mar* 25
c. Read 1° * *Mar* 27 [Bill 97]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Gathorne Hardy*) *August* 14, [189] 1527
Amendt. to leave out ("now,") and add ("upon this Day Three Months") (*Mr. Alderman Lawrence*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question agreed to; Bill read 2°
Committee *; Report *August* 15
Considered as amended * *August* 16
Read 3° * *August* 17
Commons Amendts. (No. 345)
l. Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 134]

Tramways (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill (*Mr. Monsell, Mr. Sherriff*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 29 [Bill 125]
Read 2°, after debate *May* 6, [187] 68
Committee * *July* 11—R.P.
Committee * *July* 23—R.P.
Bill withdrawn * *July* 29

Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition Bill
(*Sir C. O'Loghlen, Mr. Cogan, Sir J. Gray*)
c. Committee; after short debate; Resolution agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° *Feb* 7, [185] 109 [Bill 6]
Read 2° *Feb* 27, 1091
Committee; Report *April* 9, [186] 1408
Considered as amended * *April* 11
Read 3°, after debate *May* 14, [187] 574
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *May* 16
Read 2ª, after debate *May* 31, 1380 (No. 101)
[*cont.*

Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition Bill—cont.
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee on the said Bill" (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 11, [188] 1379
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Six Months") (*The Marquess of Westmeath*); after short debate, Question, "That ('now') &c.," put, and agreed to; Bill considered in Committee
Moved, That the Bill be now reported
Amendt. to leave out ("now") and insert ("this Day Three Months") (*The Marquess of Westmeath*); on Question, "That ('now') &c.," resolved in the affirmative; Bill reported
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Earl of Kimberley*) *July* 16, 1617; Bill read 3ª
Royal Assent *July* 25 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 62]

TREEBY, Mr. J. W., *Lyme Regis*
Metropolitan Board of Works, [186] 1336
Representation of the People, Consid. *add.* [188] 1452

TREVELYAN, Mr. G. O., *Tynemouth*
Army—Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1787, 1824
The 13th Hussars, [188] 1393
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1074
Navy—The "Greenwich Sixpence," [185] 936; [187] 1733
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 15, Amendt. [188] 37, 43

TROLLOPE, Right Hon. Sir J., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 1009, 1149; *cl.* A, [188] 618
Supply—Poor Law Commissioners, [187] 859

Trusts (Scotland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *July* 1 (No. 195)
Read 2ª * *July* 12
Committee *; Report *July* 15
Read 3ª * *July* 16
c. Read 1° * *July* 19 [Bill 266]
Read 2° * *July* 25
Committee *; Report *July* 26
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 2
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *August* 5
Read 3° * *August* 6 [Bill 297]
l. Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 97]

Turkey
Appointment of Sir William Wiseman, Question, Mr. J. Stuart Mill; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 16, [188] 1621; *July* 22, 1873
"*Arkadi*," *The*, Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 8, [188] 1188; *July* 23, 2072
Cholera Congress at Constantinople, Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 21, [186] 283; *Mar* 28, 732
[*cont.*

Turkey—cont.

185] *Crete, Affairs of,* Question, Sir Harry Ver-
ney; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 19, 587—
Insurrection in, Question, Mr. Gregory; An-
swer Lord Stanley *Feb* 11, 214; Motion for
Papers (*The Duke of Argyll*) *Mar* 8, 1512;
after long debate, Motion withdrawn:—Ques-
tion, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Stanley
187] *June* 3, 1429:—Question, The Duke of
Argyll; Answer, The Earl of Derby *June* 20,
188] 158; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer,
Lord Stanley, 172; Question, Mr. Monk;
Answer, Lord Stanley *June* 21, 269; Ques-
tion, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord
Stanley *June* 24, 429

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for such further Correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments in alliance with Her Majesty, as may have occurred since the date of the 5th February this year, respecting the Insurrection of Candia, the Means employed for its Pacification, and the Assistance afforded to the Insurgents, either by the Greeks, the Greek Government, or the Natives or Governments of any other Countries" (*The Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe*) *August* 15, [189] 1547; after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Correspondence . . . . [3771]

Crete—Christian Subjects of the Porte, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 21, [186] 284; Question, The Earl of Denbigh; Answer, The Earl of Derby *Mar* 28, 718; *June* 24, [188] 353; Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 5, [189] 849

Despatch—*Parl. P.* . . . . [3807]
Report . . . . . [3854] [3944]

English Vice Consul at Khanea, Questions, Mr. Henry Seymour, Mr. Baillie Cochrane; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 9, [189] 1222

Servia—The Turkish Fortresses, Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Feb* 15, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House, Copies of any Correspondence between the Foreign Office and Foreign Governments on the subject of the insurrection in Crete and the Turkish Fortresses in Servia; and of any Reports from our Consular Agents on these subjects" (*Mr. Gregory*), [185] 406; Question, "That the words, &c.;" Amendt. and Motion withdrawn

Evacuation of the Fortresses, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *Feb* 25, [185] 932; Notice of Motion (*Earl Russell*) withdrawn *Mar* 15, 1888; Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 21, [186] 218

Affairs of—*Parl P.* [3803]

Jews in Servia—Treatment of—Motion for an Address—(see *Servia*)

Correspondence—*Parl. P.* [3829]

Turkish Bonds, Question, Sir John Simeon; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 9, [189] 1220

Visit of the Sultan—see *Sultan of Turkey, Visit of the*

TURNER, Mr. C., *Lancashire, S.*
Sale and Purchase of Shares, Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 267

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 232]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *July* 22, [188] 1909; after short debate, Bill read 2°
Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 1, [189] 604
Committee; Report *August* 2, 819
Considered as amended * *August* 5
Read 3° * *August* 6
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *August* 6
Read 2ª * *August* 9 (No. 307)
Committee; Report *August* 12, 1327
Read 3ª * *August* 13 (No. 332)
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 121]

Turnpike Expenditure
Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 9, [189] 1224

Turnpike Trusts
Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 11, [185] 210; Question, Mr. Hardcastle; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 8, [186] 1268; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *August* 8, [189] 1103; Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Sir James Fergusson *August* 12, 1332

Turnpike Trusts Bill
(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. George Clive, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Goldney*)
c. Ordered, after debate; read 1° *Mar* 19, [186] 139 [Bill 80]
Read 2°, after short debate, and committed to a Select Committee *May* 1, 1849
And, on *May* 6, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen (Chairman), Sir Robert Anstruther, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. George Clive, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Colonel French, Mr. Goldney, Lord Henley, Mr. Holland, Mr. Knight, Mr. Mitford, Mr. Jasper More, Mr. Read, Mr. Hastings Russell, Mr. Sclater-Booth, Colonel William Stuart, Mr. Welby, Mr. Whalley, and Mr. Woodd
Report * *June* 4
Report of Select Committee *June* 5 (No. 352)
Report * (*on re-comm.*) *June* 5 [Bill 189]
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

Turnpike Trusts Arrangements Bill
(*Mr. Secretary G. Hardy, Mr. Sclater-Booth*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 8 [Bill 233]
Read 2° * *July* 11
Committee *; Report *July* 12
Read 3° * *July* 15
l. Read 1ª * (*The Earl of Belmore*) *July* 16
Read 2ª * *July* 18 (No. 229)
Committee *; Report *July* 19
Read 3ª * *July* 22
Royal Assent *July* 25 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 66]

Tyne Pilotage Act (1865) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Ingham, Mr. Cowen, Mr. Trevelyan*)
c. Resolution; Bill ordered * *May* 24
Read 1° * *May* 27 [Bill 168]
Read 2° * *June* 3
Committee *; Report *June* 13
Read 3° * *June* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Ravensworth*) *June* 17
Read 2ª * *July* 26 (No. 157)
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª * *August* 1
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 78]

Uniformity Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Bouverie*)
c. Resolution in Committee; Bill ordered; read 1° *Mar* 7, [185] 1510 [Bill 68]
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *May* 29, [187] 1248
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Charles Selwyn*); after further long debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.;" A. 200, N. 156; M. 44; Bill read 2°
Division List, 1280
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 3, [188] 962; after short debate, Bill considered in Committee, and reported
Considered as amended * *July* 4
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Mr. Fawcett*) *August* 7, [189] 1048
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day three months" (*Mr. Bentinck*); Question, "That 'now' &c.;" A. 34, N. 41; M. 7; words added; main Question, as amended, agreed to; Bill put off for three months

United States
"*Alabama*" *Claims, The,* Question, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre; Answer, Lord Stanley *Mar* 25, [186] 471; Question, Earl Russell; Answer, The Earl of Derby *May* 21, [187] 861; Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord Stanley *July* 1, [188] 769; Question, Mr. Rearden; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 6, [189] 958
Correspondence—*Parl. P.* [3937]
Postal Convention with, presented (*The Duke of Montrose*) *August* 9, [189] 1200
Postal Service with, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Mr. Hunt *Feb* 22, [185] 811
Russian America, Cession of, to the United States, Question, Mr. Watkin; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 1, [186] 910; Question, The Earl of Clarendon; Answer, The Duke of Buckingham *April* 2, 979; Question, Sir Andrew Agnew; Answer, Lord Stanley *April* 4, 1108

University of London—Burlington House
Question, Mr. Layard; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 2, [186] 981; Observations, Mr. Layard; Reply, Lord John Manners; short debate thereon *April* 5, 1232; Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Duke of Buckingham *April* 9, 1323; Question, Mr. J. Goldsmid; Answer, Lord John Manners *May* 9, [187] 265; *May* 30, 1290; *June* 6, 1661; Question, Mr. Locke; Answer, Lord John Manners *July* 9, [188] 1263

Utilization of Sewage Act
Question, Sir John Simeon; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *April* 1, [186] 908

Vaccination
Legislation on, Question, Mr. Bruce; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 15, [185] 404
Memorandum of the Registrar General, Question, Colonel Barttelot; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 20, [187] 776
Memorial—(*Parl. P.* No. 276)

Vaccination Bill
(*Lord R. Montagu, Mr. G. Hardy, Mr. Earle*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *April* 30 [Bill 125]
Question, Mr. Barrow; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *May* 2, [186] 1878
Read 2° * *May* 16
Committee *; Report *May* 30 [Bill 175]
Committee (*on re-comm*); Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (*Lord Robert Montagu*) *June* 14, [187] 1863
After short debate, Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "the Committee be postponed till after the Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council, 1866, shall have been distributed" (*Sir J. Clarke Jervoise*), 1886; after further debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to; Bill considered in Committee—R.P.
Committee * (*on re-comm.*); Report *June* 17
Considered as amended * *June* 24
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *June* 27, [188] 649
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Vanderbyl*); after short debate, Question, "That 'now,' &c.," put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 3°
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord President*) *June* 28 (No. 189)
Read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee *July* 11
And, on *July* 12, Committee nominated as follows:—Ld. President, E. Devon, L. Boyle, L. Lyttelton, L. Hatherton, L. Portman, and L. Churston
Report of Select Committee *July* 19 (No. 239)
Committee * *July* 23
Report * *July* 25
Read 3ª * *July* 26
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 84]

Vaccination [*Gratuities & Expenses*]
Resolution in Committee * *May* 24

Valuation of Property Bill
(*Mr. Hunt, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. Secretary Gathorne Hardy*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 11, [185] 250 [Bill 12]
Read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee *Mar* 11, 1673
And, on *Mar* 19, Committee nominated as follows:—Mr. Hunt (Chairman), Colonel Barttelot, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Beaumont, Mr. Childers, Mr. Corrance, Mr. Dent, Mr. Dunlop, Colonel Dyott, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, Mr. Goldney, Mr. Graves, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, Mr. Hibbert,

[*cont.*

Valuation of Property Bill—cont.
Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Leeman, Mr. Neate, Mr. Portman, Mr. Read, Mr. Poulett Scrope, and Mr. Villiers
Report presented *May* 28 (No. 322)
Report * (*re-committed*) *May* 31
Bill withdrawn * *July* 18 [Bill 177]

Vance, Mr. J., *Armagh City*
Bankruptcy, Leave, [185] 1886
Courts of Law Officers (Ireland), Re-comm. *cl.* 35, Amendt. [188] 1250
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, [187] 1097, 1364, 1365, 1366, 1498; Comm. [188] 487
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. Amendt. [188] 117
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 877
  Dublin University, Professorship of, [185] 146
  Established Church, Res. [187] 118, 124
  Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Motion for a Committee, [186] 414
  Vartry Waterworks, [185] 469
  Wesleyan Missionary, Attack on a, [189] 1334
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1067
Mixed Marriages, 2R. [187] 213
Offices and Oaths, 2R. [185] 1127; Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1397
Railways (Guards' and Passengers' Communication), 3R. [188] 847
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 31, [188] 530, 533, 611; *add. cl.* 669, 673, 702, 789, 1014; Amendt. 1017, 1018, 1203
Representation of the People (Ireland), Leave, [186] 1352; [187] 1092
Supply—Bounties on Slaves, [188] 1772
  Nonconforming, &c. Ministers (Ireland), [188] 1677

Vandeleur, Colonel C. M., *Clare Co.*
Cape of Good Hope, Motion for an Address, [187] 1596, 1603

Vanderbyl, Mr. P., *Bridgwater*
Cochin China—British Consulate, [188] 427
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Removal of Magistrates, [186] 128
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 9, [185] 1620; *cl.* 43, Amendt. 1675, 1676
Sea Coast Fisheries (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1100
Vaccination, 3R. Amendt. [188] 649

Veal, Cruelties in the Preparation of
Question, Mr. Bagwell; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 1, [188] 770

Venezuela—Government of
Question, Mr. Goschen; Answer, Lord Stanley *May* 13, [187] 396

Verner, Sir W., *Armagh Co.*
Ecclesiastical Titles and Roman Catholic Relief Acts, Comm. [188] 487
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 880

Verner, Mr. E. W., *Lisburn*
Holyhead and London Railway Fares, [189] 1221
Ireland—Administration of Justice, Motion for Papers, [186] 855, 858, 864
  Black Death, [187] 1660
  Fenian Prisoners, [187] 390
  Management of City Prisons, [186] 1103

Verney, Sir H., *Buckingham*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 514
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1024
Ancient Monuments, Preservation of, [189] 486
Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [189] 137
  Military Education, [187] 1716, 1718
  Volunteer Corps, [187] 1758
Army—European Garrisons in Ceylon, &c. Res. [187] 1684
  Purchase of Commissions, Res. [186] 1811
  Transport and Supply Departments, [187] 1693
Crete—Affairs of, [185] 587
Luxemburg, Grand Duchy of, [187] 397
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. [185] 753; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1612; *cl.* 9, 1622; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1623; *cl.* 43, 1676; *cl.* 59, 1686; *cl.* 69, 1692; Amendt. 1693; 3R. 1862
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 40, Amendt. [186] 776; *add. cl.* 929
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* A, [188] 623, 632; *add. cl.* 1014, 1015, 1021, 1032, 1202

Verulam, Earl of
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil disturbances, [185] 375

Vice Admiralty Courts Act Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *April* 5 (No. 71)
Read 2ª *April* 9, [186] 1328
Committee*; Report *April* 11
Read 3ª* *April* 12
c. Read 1° * *May* 15 [Bill 155]
Read 2° * *June* 24
Committee*; Report *June* 28
Read 3° * *July* 1
l. Royal Assent *July* 15 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 45]

Vice President of the Board of Trade Bill (*Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Cave, Mr. Hunt*)
c. Ordered; read 1° *Feb* 14, [185] 356
Read 2° *Feb* 18, 470 [Bill 22]
Committee*; Report *April* 29
Order for 3R. discharged, after short debate; Bill (*re-comm.*); Considered in Committee —R.P. *May* 6, [187] 66
Committee; Report *May* 13, 475
Read 3° * *May* 14
l. Read 1ª* (*The Duke of Richmond*) *May* 16
Read 2ª, after debate *May* 21, 873 (No. 99)
Committee*; Report *July* 26
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" (*The Duke of Richmond*) *July* 29, [189] 327; after short debate, Bill read 3ª
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 72]

Vienna, Veterinary Congress at
Question, Sir J. Clarke Jervoise; Answer, Lord Robert Montagu *August* 8, [189] 1103

Villiers, Right Hon. C. P., *Wolverhampton*
Metropolitan Poor, 2R. * Appendix, [185] 1; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1611, 1614; *cl.* 9, 1616, 1620, 1622; *cl.* 41, 1675; *cl.* 44, 1677; *cl.* 55, 1684; *cl.* 59, 1687; *cl.* 69, 1695
Poor Law Board, &c. Re-comm. *cl.* 1, [189] 145
Representation of the People, Lords Amendts. *cl.* C, [189] 1190
Valuation of Property, 2R. * Appendix [185] 8

Vivian, Lord
Cornwall, Bishopric in, [185] 1303
Ireland — Military at Elections, Motion for Papers, [185] 1222
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil disturbances, [185] 371, 372; [186] 457

Vivian, Hon. Captain J. C. W., *Truro*
Army Estimates, [185] 1308
Land Forces, [185] 1497, 1647
Supplementary, [185] 1233
Army—Exclusion of Irishmen from the Foot Guards, Res. [187] 1681
Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1966, 1986; [186] 3, 291
Increase of Pay, [188] 1873
(India and the Colonies), Motion for a Committee, [185] 1054
Land Transport, [185] 1144
Lieut. Colonels of Cavalry, [188] 429
March of Troops to Hounslow, [188] 1525
Organization of the, [187] 373
Recruiting, Res. [187] 680
Rewards for Military Service, [189] 1449
Transport and Supply Departments, [187] 1689
Troops in New Zealand, [187] 1289
Army Transport Committee, [186] 727, 1873
Birmingham Riots, [188] 17
Metropolis—Hyde Park Review, [188] 772
Mexico—Fate of the Emperor Maximilian, [188] 985
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 22, [186] 776; *add. cl.* 796, 914
New Zealand—Troops in, [188] 2082
Parliament—Public Business, [188] 779
Volunteers, Res. [188] 728, 732, 744

Vivian, Mr. H. H., *Glamorganshire*
Representation of the People—Electoral Statistics, [185] 1823;—Forty Shilling Freeholders, [186] 283, 284
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 4, [187] 851; Amendt. 991, 998; *cl.* 8, 1322; *cl.* 40, Amendt. [188] 471; Lords Amendts. *cl.* 5, [189] 1124

Volunteers, The
Volunteers at Shoeburyness, Question, Mr. Darby Griffith; Answer, Sir John Pakington *August* 8, [189] 1101

[*cont.*

Volunteers, The—cont.
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil Disturbances, Question, Lord Vivian; Answer, The Earl of Belmore; debate thereon *Feb* 15, [185] 371; Observations, Lord St. Leonards; Reply, Earl De Grey and Ripon; debate thereon *Feb* 25, 919; Observations, Mr. W. E. Forster, 1550; Reply, Mr. Walpole; debate thereon *Mar* 8, 1562; Observations, Mr. Thomas Hughes; Reply, The Attorney General; short debate thereon, 1575
The Instructions, Question, Lord Vivian; Answer, The Earl of Longford *Mar* 25, [186] 457; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 28, 727; Question, Earl Cowper; Answer, The Earl of Belmore *May* 7, [187] 72; Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 17, 1936; Observations, Earl de Grey; Reply, The Earl of Malmesbury *July* 1, [188] 751
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *June* 28, To leave out from "That," and add "the Volunteer Force was established solely for the purpose of security against Foreign Invasion, and that the Members of that force, in cases of domestic tumult or disturbance, have no obligations or duties distinct from those of other Citizens, and are in such cases no more than any other Citizen liable to orders or instructions from the Military or Civil Authorities" (*Captain Vivian*), [188] 728; Question, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put, and negatived; Amendt. again proposed:—Amendt. proposed to the said proposed Amendt. by leaving out from the word "Citizens," to the end of the proposed Amendt. (*Mr. Ayrton*); Amendt. agreed to; original Question, as amended, put, and agreed to:—Resolved, "That the Volunteer Force was established solely for the purpose of security against Foreign Invasion, and that the Members of that Force, in cases of domestic tumult or disturbance, have no obligations or duties distinct from those of other Citizens"
Parl Papers—
Circular Letter . . . 153, 364
Capitation Grant . . . 184
Riots at Birmingham, Questions, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Whalley; Answers, Sir John Pakington, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 20, [188] 173; Question, Mr. Horsman; Answer, Sir John Pakington *June* 24, 428
Supply—The Volunteer Force, Report [13th June] *July* 1, [188] 844—Postponed Resolution considered; after short debate, Resolution agreed to

Wager, The Convict
Question, Captain Archdall; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 26, [186] 567

Walcott, Admiral J. E., *Christchurch*
Africa—West Coast—Naval Squadron, Res. [188] 2077
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, [186] 350

WALDEGRAVE-LESLIE, Hon. G., *Hastings*
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1208
Ecclesiastical Commission, &c. [189] 330
Expiring Laws, [189] 78
Gas and Water Bills, Res. [185] 1228
India—Famine in Orissa, [185] 82;—Indian Budget, [189] 79
Local Government Supplemental (No. 2), Lords Amendts. [188] 1421
Oaths Commissioners, [189] 78
Scotland—Collection of Fees, [188] 768
 Granton and Burntisland Steam Ferries, [188] 981, 1389

Wales
Poor Law—Holyhead Union, Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *Feb* 22, [185] 810
Sanitary Condition of, Question, Sir Thomas Lloyd; Answer, Mr. Corry *Feb* 22, [185] 809; Question, Mr. Owen Stanley; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Mar* 7, 1445
Treatment of Merchant Seamen in Welsh Ports, Question, Colonel Williams; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 4, [188] 989

WALKER, Major G. G., *Dumfriesshire*
Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [189] 133
Army—Quartermasters of Militia, [185] 467;—Snider Rifle, The, [188] 1517; [189] 79
Army of Reserve—Militia Ballot, Res. [189] 98

WALPOLE, † Right Hon. S. H. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Cambridge University*
Address in Answer to the Speech, Report, [185] 77
† Agricultural Children's Education, Leave, [187] 561
Agricultural Gangs — Children's Employment Commission, [186] 279
Agricultural Women and Children, Res. [186] 1923
† Andersen, Carl, Case of, [187] 622
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, 2R. [186] 696
Associations of Workmen, Leave, [185] 300
† Attorneys, &c. Certificate Duty, [188] 551
Banns of Matrimony, Publication of, [187] 5
Capital Punishment, [185] 78
Capital Punishment within Prisons, Leave, [185] 359
Cattle Plague, [186] 562
Chester—Apprehended Disturbances at, [185] 284, 287, 344
Cholerine, Physical Qualities of, [185] 1446
Church Rates — Mr. Grant of Kettleburgh, [186] 1584
Church Rates Abolition, 2R. [186] 243
Churchward, Mr., Appointment of, [185] 1914, 1915;—Case of, [186] 280, 472
Collieries, Inspection of, [185] 585
Constabulary—Reports of Inspectors, [186] 1109
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Removal of Magistrates, [186] 121, 730
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1206
[*cont.*

WALPOLE, Right Hon S. H.—*cont.*
County Rates, [186] 815
Court of Chancery (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1860
Criminal Law, 2R. [185] 681
Criminal Lunatics, 2R. [185] 993
Dogs, Duty on, [185] 1143
† Ecclesiastical Titles Act, [189] 1625
Education, [185] 1164; — Compulsory, [186] 819
Engine Drivers' Strike, [185] 1807
Factory Acts and Glass Manufactures, [186] 982
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1082
Factory Acts Extension, Leave, [185] 1271, 1280, 1282; 2R. [186] 450, 451, 452, 1787; † Re-comm. [189] 477; *cl.* 3, 483
Forfeiture, Law of, [185] 149
† Glossop Convent, [187] 525
Hours of Labour Regulation, Leave, [185] 1271
Hyde Park — Reform Meeting, [186] 1936, 1937, 1938, 1969, 1975; [187] 257, 258
Industrial Schools (Ireland), 2R. [185] 1755
† Investment of Trust Funds, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 1653
Ireland—Disturbances in, [185] 335, 336, 400, 401, 1448, 1549, 1550
 Fenian Prisoners, [186] 1987, 1988
 Martial Law, [185] 1647
 Professorship of Dublin University, [185] 147
Jersey—Royal Court of, [186] 562
Joint Stock Companies (Voting Papers), Comm. Preamble, [186] 1065; *cl.* 1, 1068
Kingston Assizes, [186] 903
Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 988
Lancaster Election Commission Report, [185] 726
Libel, 2R. [185] 1741
Licensing System, [186] 1874
Life Sentences, [185] 1928
Liverpool, Sanitary Condition of, [185] 1307
Luxemburg—Grand Duchy of, [186] 981
Master and Servant, Law of, [185] 1261
Meetings in Royal Parks, Leave, [186] 2024, 2026
Metropolis—Bunhill Fields Burial Ground, [185] 211
Metropolitan Cabs, &c. [185] 280
Mines and Miners, [186] 407
Murder Law Amendment, Leave, [185] 359, 369
Oaths and Declarations, [187] 255
Parks—Admission of Cabs to, [187] 370
 Public Meetings in the, [187] 266
 Public Right in the, [187] 7, 96
Parliament—Access of Members to the House, [185] 85
Pollution of Rivers, [186] 280
Prerogative of Mercy, [186] 734
Printworks, Juvenile Labour in, [186] 1478
Public Health Act, [186] 565
Public Health (Scotland), 2R. [186] 1927
Public Houses, &c. Leave, [186] 164, 165
† Public Schools, [189] 330
Railways, Royal Commission on, [185] 404; [187] 93
Representation of the People, Comm. [185] 974; [186] 1285; † *cl.* 17, [188] 49; *cl.* D, 648; Lords Amendts. *cl.* L, [189] 1198
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1141
Schools Inquiry Commission, [186] 1102
[*cont.*

WALPOLE, Right Hon. S. H.—*cont.*
Scotland—Canongate Church, Edinburgh, [185] 1704
  Game Laws, [185] 1145
  Poor Law, [185] 586
  Road Reform, [185] 1231
  Sanitary Laws, [185] 461
  Scotch Business in the House, [185] 283, 721; [186] 408
Spirits, Beer and Wine Licenses, [185] 1307
Spiritual Destitution, 2R. [186] 1079
† Sunday Trading, 2R. [187] 588
† Supply—Houses of Parliament, Report, [185] 682;—British Museum, [189] 342
Tests Abolition (Oxford), Comm. *cl.* 1, [186] 1447; † 3R. [188] 83, 1658
Theatres, &c. [185] 468
Toomer, John, Case of, [186] 904, 907; Motion for Papers, 1207, 1211, 1217, 1227, 1228
Totnes Election Commission Report, [186] 726
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 179, 193, 194, 203; 2R. 523, 529; Comm. *cl.* 2, 994; Amendt. 996; *cl.* 5, 999
Transportation to Western Australia, [186] 1173
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Leave, [185] 110, 111
Turnpike Trusts, [185] 211; Leave, [186] 156, 1268; 2R. 1835
Universal Exhibition at Paris, [185] 687
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil disturbances, [185] 1562, 1569; [186] 728
Wager, The Convict, [186] 567, 568
Wales — Sanitary State of Holyhead, [185] 1445
Weights and Measures, False, [185] 213;—Convictions for, [186] 1337
Weights and Measures, Inspectors of, [187] 371
Wolverhampton, Riots at, [185] 1031
Women and Children, Employment of, in Agriculture, [187] 258

Walpole, Resignation of Mr. Secretary
Observations, Mr. Neate; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, [187] 398

WALROND, Mr. J. W., *Tiverton*
Representation of the People, Comm. *add. cl.* [188] 881, 1233
Supply—Houses of Parliament, [188] 1700

WALSH, Sir J. B., *Radnorshire*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 29, [188] 181

WALSINGHAM, Lord
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Report, [187] 1368; Comm. *cl.* 31, Amendt. 1549

War Department Property Protection Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Longford*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *June* 27 (No. 183)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" (*The Earl of Longford*) *July* 5, [188] 1062; after short debate, Bill read 2ª
Committee * *July* 8 (No. 209)
Report * *July* 9
Read 3ª * *July* 11 [*cont.*

War Department Property Protection Bill—cont.
c. Read 1º * *July* 15 [Bill 255]
Read 2º * *July* 22
Committee *; Report *August* 8
Considered as amended * *August* 9
Read 3º * *August* 9
Royal Assent *August* 20 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 128]

WARNER, Mr. E., *Norwich*
Postal—Post Office Arrangements, [188] 1190
Representation of the People—Borough Franchise, [185] 1306; [186] 397, 469;—Compound Householders, 1479
Representation of the People, Comm. [185] 992; *cl.* 10, [187] 1975; *add. cl.* Amendt. [188] 1016, 1029, 1030, 1031

Warrington, Railway Accident at
Notice (*Mr. O'Beirne*) *July* 15, [188] 1518; Question, Mr. O'Beirne; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *July* 18, 1667

Waterford and Tipperary Elections
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *July* 25, To leave out from "That" and add "whilst this House regrets that it should be necessary to employ military escorts for ensuring the safety of Voters at Elections in Ireland, it is of opinion that the nature of the intimidation exercised at the recent Elections in the Counties of Waterford and Tipperary not only renders in such cases such a protection essential, but is further of opinion this House should pass a measure which will enable the Voter to freely and fully exercise the franchise in such a manner as he desires, without exposing himself to personal risk" (*Major Jervis*), [189] 104; after debate, Question, "That the words, &c.," put, and agreed to
Parl. Papers—
  Mr. Keily 165, 200, 237
  Employment of Military 216
  Police, Correspondence . 166

Waterford County Election
House informed that the Committee had determined, That Edmund de la Poer, esquire, was duly elected a Knight of the Shire to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Waterford; and the said Determination was ordered to be entered in the Journals of this House; House further informed, That the Committee had agreed to certain Resolutions
Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee to be laid before this House (*Mr. Adair*) *April* 3, [186] 1100 (*Parl. P.* No. 205)
Disturbances at Dungarvan, Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, The Solicitor General for Ireland *Mar* 18, [186] 4
The 12th Lancers, Question, Mr. Serjeant Barry; Answer, General Peel *Feb* 26, [185] 1030; Question, Mr. Lawson; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 14, 1802
Walsh, Dennis, Case of, Question, Mr. Maguire; Answer, Lord Naas *June* 27, [188] 605

Water Supply Bill
(*Mr. Whalley, Mr. Lusk*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *May* 16 [Bill 161]

Waterworks Bill
Question, Mr. A. Egerton; Answer, Sir Stafford Northcote *Feb* 18, [185] 466

WATKIN, Mr. E. W., *Stockport*
British North America, 2R. [185] 1187
Canada Railway Loan, Comm. [186] 762
Carriers' Act Amendment, Comm. [188] 1614
Ceylon—Government of, [188] 988
Contagious Diseases (Animals), Comm. *cl.* 45, Motion for Adjournment, [189] 1429
Corrupt Practices at Elections—Removal of Magistrates, [186] 127
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. [189] 982
India—Land Revenues, [188] 1395
Ireland — Petition on Fenianism, Res. [187] 1902
Limited Liability Acts, Motion for a Committee, [185] 1370
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1345
Meetings in Royal Parks, Re-comm. [189] 1584
Monetary Laws, [185] 147
Paris Exhibition—Search of Passengers' Baggage, Res. [185] 1590
Railway and Joint Stock Companies' Accounts, Leave, [187] 1592
Railway Companies Arrangements, Leave, [185] 100; Consid. *cl.* 4, [187] 1722, 1726
Railway Companies Debenture Debt, Res. [186] 1054
Railway Debenture Holders, Leave, [185] 297; 2R. 781, 790
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [187] 472, 473, 474, 695, 706; *cl.* 43, [188] 514; *add. cl.* 673
Russian America—Cession of, to the United States, [186] 910
Supply—Royal Palaces, [185] 507, 511
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 514; Comm. *cl.* 2, 995

Watson, William, Case of—Law of Arrest for Debt
Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, The Attorney General *June* 24, [188] 427

WAYS AND MEANS
Resolution in Committee; Consolidated Fund (£369,118 5*s.* 6*d.*) *Mar* 6, [185] 1427
Considered in Committee *April* 4, [186] 1110
The Financial Statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on moving the First Resolution
"That towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, the Duty of Customs now charged on Tea shall continue to be levied and charged on and after the 1st day of August 1867 until the 1st day of August 1868 on the importation thereof into Great Britain and Ireland, viz.— *s. d.*
Tea . . . the lb. 0 6"
After long debate, Motion agreed to; other Resolutions agreed to

[*cont.*

Ways and Means—cont.
Considered in Committee *May* 27, [187] 1192—£14,000,000, Consolidated Fund
Considered in Committee *August* 9, [189] 1291

SUMMARY.

WAYS AND MEANS.

SCHEDULE OF WAYS AND MEANS REFERRED TO IN SECTION 5 OF THE CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) ACT—VIZ.:

1866-7	£	s.	d.
Granted per Act 30 *Vict.* c. 4, for the Service of the Years ending 31st March 1866 and 31st March 1867 ...	369,118	5	6
1867-8			
Granted for the Service of the Year ending 31st March 1861—viz.:			
Per Act 30 *Vict.* c. 7 ...	7,924,000	0	0
Per Act 30 *Vict.* c. 30 ...	14,000,000	0	0
Per Section 1 of this Act	19,106,591	2	0
Per Section 4 of this Act (being Surplus Ways and Means granted for the Service of preceding Years)	1,475,177	18	0
TOTAL GRANTS OF WAYS AND MEANS to meet the following Supplies:— 1866-7 £369,118 5 6 1867-8 42,505,769 0 0	£42,874,887	5	6

WEGUELIN, Mr. T. M., *Wolverhampton*
Millwall Ironworks Company, [185] 1916, 1917
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 15, Motion for Adjournment, [187] 2003
Sale and Purchase of Shares, 2R. [185] 1409

Weights and Measures
False, Question, Lord Eustace Cecil; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 11, [185] 213; Question, Mr. Roebuck; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 9, [186] 1337
Inspection of, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Walpole *May* 10, [187] 371; Question, Mr. J. Goldsmid; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *June* 17, 1934; Question, Mr. Alderman Lusk; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 1, [188] 773
Law respecting, Question, Mr. Whalley; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 26, [189] 172; *August* 2, 765
(*Metropolis*), Question, Mr. J. Goldsmid; Answer, Mr. Gathorne Hardy *July* 4, [188] 987
List of Convictions—(*Parl. P.* 95, 577)
Standards of, Question, Mr. Miller; Answer, Mr. Stephen Cave *Feb* 18, [185] 466
First Report of Department—*Parl. P.* [3883]

Weights and Measures (Dublin) Bill
(*Lord Naas, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 18 [Bill 263]
Read 2° * *July* 24
Committee *; Report *July* 25
Read 3° * *July* 26

[*cont.*

Weights and Measures (Dublin) Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Clinton*) *July* 29
Read 2ª * *August* 5 (No. 266)
Committee *; Report *August* 6
Read 3ª * *August* 8
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 94]

Wellington, Duke of, Monument to the
Question, Mr. J. Goldsmid; Answer, Lord John Manners *April* 8, [186] 1267

WESTBURY, Lord
Court of Chancery (Officers), 2R. [188] 494
Criminal Lunatics, 2R. [186] 978
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway (Arrangement), 3R. Amendt. [189] 1537, 1538
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. [189] 303; *cl.* 4, 305, 307

Western Australia—Transportation to
Question, Mr. Childers; Answer, Mr. Walpole *April* 5, [186] 1173

WESTERN, Sir T. B., *Essex, N.*
Representation of the People, Consid. Schedule D, [188] 1481

West India Bishops and Clergy Bill
(*Mr. Remington Mills, Mr. Bazley, Mr. Lamont*)
c. Ordered, after short debate; read 1° *April* 30, [186] 1825 [Bill 126]
Read 2° * *May* 14
Committee * *May* 17—R.P.
Committee * *June* 18—R.P.
Question, Mr. Remington Mills; Answer, Mr. Adderley *July* 22, [188] 1878
Bill withdrawn * *July* 22

West India Colonies — Grants for Religious Purposes
Questions, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Mar* 22, [186] 393

West Indies—Mortality in the Harbour of St. Thomas
Question, Captain Speirs; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 21, [185] 722 — *Quarantine in the*, Question, Captain Speirs; Answer, Mr. Adderley *Feb* 21, 721

WESTMEATH, Marquess of
Clerical Vestments (No. 2), 2R. [187] 522
Established Church — Ritualistic Practices, [186] 1328, 1331
Parliament—Arrangement for Reporting, Motion for a Committee, [189] 1202, 1295
Representation of the People, Commons Amendts. [189] 1325
Traffic Regulation (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 19, Amendt. [185] 1912
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, 2R. [187] 1381; Comm. Amendt. [188] 1379, 1384; 3R. 1617

Wexford Grand Jury Bill
(*Colonel Tottenham, Sir James Power, Mr. Kavanagh*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *July* 18 [Bill 264]
Read 2° * *July* 19
Committee *; Report *July* 22
Considered * *July* 23
Read 3° * *July* 24
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Templemore*) *July* 25
Read 2ª * *July* 26 (No. 258)
Committee *; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª * *August* 1
Royal Assent *August* 12 [30 & 31 *Vict.* c. 77]

WHALLEY, Mr. G. H., *Peterborough*
Army—86th Regiment, [189] 330
Army Estimates—Increase of Pay, [189] 135
Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings, Comm. [189] 754; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 761
Banns of Matrimony, 2R. [188] 940
Birmingham—Riots at, [188] 174, 175;—Mr. Murphy's Discourses, 925, 1262, 1765
Carriers' Act Amendment, Comm. [188] 1614
Chester, Disturbances at, [185] 344
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1209
Ecclesiastical Titles Act Repeal, Leave, [186] 364, 370; 2R. [187] 572, 573; [189] 1339, 1625, 1628
Factory Acts (Educational Clauses), Res. [185] 1086
Glossop Convent, [187] 524, 937, 938
Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act Continuance (No. 2), 2R. [187] 982, 983
Hayes and Barry, Case of, [189] 1449
Hyde Park — Reform Meeting, [186] 1938, 1977
Indian Prize Money, [189] 1452
Industrial Schools (Ireland), Comm. [186] 558
Ireland—Fenianism, [186] 1932
  Galway Harbour, [187] 68
  Habeas Corpus Suspension Act, [189] 894, 895, 897, 898
  Maginn, Rev. Mr., [186] 395, 471, 1484, 1485
  Military at Downpatrick, [189] 601
  Railways, [189] 627
  State of, [189] 196, 197
  Taxation, Res. [188] 1308, 1309
  Tipperary and Waterford Elections, Res. [189] 117
  Trinity College (Dublin), Res. [189] 33
Libel, 3R. [189] 1064
Meetings in Royal Parks, Leave, [186] 2025; Re-comm. Preamble, [189] 1465, 1468, 1584
Merchant Shipping Laws, Res. [189] 1498
Metropolis Gas, Consid. [187] 362
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1428
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 210
Navy—Roman Catholics, [186] 317
Offices and Oaths, Leave, [185] 117; 2R. 1121, 1122, 1123, 1124; Comm. Preamble, [186] 1383, 1385
Parliament—Alteration of Notices of Questions, [188] 1065, 1067
  Meeting in the Tea-Room, [189] 768
  St. Stephen's Crypt, [188] 1486
Political Prisoners, Motion for an Address, [189] 1514
Poor Law Board, Comm. [188] 1419, 1421

[*cont.*

Whalley, Mr. G. H.—*cont.*
Railways Construction Facilities Act Amendment, 2R. [187] 758, 761
Representation of the People, Comm: *cl.* 3, [187] 452 ; [188] 1263
Roman Catholic Churches, Schools, &c. (Ireland), 2 R. [188] 954, 955, 956
Scott, James, Case of, Motion for an Address, [189] 1513
Supply—Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission, [187] 924
Department of Science and Art, [189] 1232
Greenwich Hospital and Schools, [189] 905
Learned Societies, Great Britain, [189] 1246
National Education (Ireland), [189] 1280, 1281, 1282, 1285
Polish Refugees, [188] 1489
Printing and Stationery, [187] 929
Public Record Office, [187] 857, 858
Queen's Colleges (Ireland), [189] 1242
Queen's University (Ireland), [189] 1241
Royal Irish Academy, [189] 1242
Superannuation, [188] 1458
Volunteers, Report, [188] 845
"Tornado," Case of the, [188] 2070
Trades Unions, Leave, [185] 202
Transubstantiation, &c. Declaration Abolition, Comm. [186] 1414 ; 3R. [187] 574
Turnpike Trusts, 2R. [186] 1837 ; [189] 1103, 1224, 1332
Weights and Measures, [189] 172, 765
Weights and Measures, Inspectors of, [187] 371
Wolverhampton, Riots at, [185] 1031, 1032
Young, Mr., Pension to, [186] 440, 441

Wharncliffe, Lord
Coal Mines, Accidents in, Motion for Papers, [185] 80
Cornwall, Bishopric in, [185] 1304
Egypt—Viceroy of, Visit of the, [188] 663
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 13, [187] 1195
Trades Unions, 2R. [185] 1437, 1438, 1439 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, [186] 271

Whatman, Mr. J., *Maidstone*
Canadian Loan Guarantee, [186] 1338
London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, Motion for a Committee, [186] 1342, 1343, 1346, 1347
Special Jurors, [185] 931

Whitbread, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, [185] 1491
Army—Flogging in the, Res. [185] 1988
Recruiting, Res. [187] 672, 679, 683, 686
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 10, [186] 767 ; *add. cl.* 917 ; Amendt. 926
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1499 ; *cl.* 3, [187] 312 ; *add. cl.* [188] 1234

White, Hon. Capt. C., *Tipperary Co.*
Increase of the Episcopate, [188] 1878
Scotland—Members for, [186] 396
Tenants Improvements (Ireland), 2R. [186] 1730

White, Mr. J., *Brighton*
Counsel to the Secretary of State for India, 2R. [185] 1205 ; Motion for Adjournment, 1209
Financial Statement, [186] 1127
Increase of the Episcopate, Comm. *cl.* 7, [189] 1073
Mutiny, Comm. *add. cl.* [186] 931
Representation of the People, [185] 1235 ;—Electoral Statistics, 1815
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 3, [187] 732 ; *cl.* 5, 1233 ; *cl.* A, [188] 629 ; *add. cl.* 808, 1006
Sumatra—The Dutch in, [185] 1645
Turnpike Acts Continuance, Comm. Schedule, Amendt. [189] 820

Whitworth, Mr. B., *Drogheda*
Constabulary—Reports of Inspectors, [186] 1109
Police—Constabulary Reports, [189] 1221

Williams, Colonel T. P., *Marlow* (*Great*)
Merchant Seamen in Beaumaris Gaol, [188] 989

Williamson, Sir H., *Durham, N.*
Representation of the People, Comm. *cl.* 15, [187] 2006
Volunteers, Employment of, in Civil disturbances, [185] 1580

Winchilsea, Earl of
Ireland—Established Church, Motion for an Address, [188] 421

Witnesses (*House of Commons*)
Moved, "That there be laid before this House, Copy of Recommendation of the Chairman of the Select Committee on Mines in the last Session to the Treasury, with reference to the expenses of Witnesses examined before that Committee" (*Mr. Neate*) *April* 9, [186] 1376 ; after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Return—(*Parl. P.* No. 6)

Wolverhampton, Riot at
Question, Mr. Whalley ; Answer, Mr. Walpole *Feb* 26, [185] 1031

Woodhouse Collection
Select Committee appointed, "to consider and report on the conduct of Mr. Consul General Saunders with reference to the bequest, by the late Mr. James Woodhouse, of his Coins and other Antiquities to the Trustees of the British Museum" (*Mr. Lowe*) *July* 15, [188] 1614
And, on *July* 18, Committee nominated as follows : — Mr. Cardwell (Chairman), Mr. Edward Egerton, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Howes, Mr. Layard, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Arthur Russell
Report presented *August* 8 (*Parl P.* No. 521)
Correspondence . . . . . . [3886]
(See *Supply*)

Writs for Re-Election
Observations, Sir Colman O'Loghlen *April* 5, [186] 119

Writs Registration (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Walpole, Sir Graham Montgomery*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *May* 16 [Bill 160]
Bill withdrawn* *July* 22

Wrottesley, Lord
Merchant Shipping, 2R. [188] 851

Wyld, Mr. J., *Bodmin*
Abyssinia—Prisoners in, [187] 524
Army—Staff Officers of Pensioners, [188] 1389
County Rates, [186] 815
Metropolis Gas, 2R. [186] 1577; Consid. [187] 362
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *cl.* 79, [185] 1697
Mines, &c. Assessment, 2R. [186] 1427
Representation of the People, Comm. [186] 1281; *cl.* 5, [187] 1240; *cl.* 8, 1337; *cl.* 9, 1540; *cl.* 29, [188] 220; *add. cl.* 810, 1021; Schedule A, 1279
Supply—Niger Expedition, [188] 1776
  Post Office Packet Service, [189] 704
  Royal Palaces, [185] 500
"Tornado," Case of the, [188] 2064

Wyndham, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
Agricultural Children's Education, 2R. [189] 513
Army—Promotion in the, Res. [189] 335
Metropolitan Poor, Comm. *add. cl.* [185] 1697
Mines, &c. Assessment, Leave, [185] 649; 2R. [186] 1417, 1431
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 615

Yarmouth (Great) Borough Election
Report of Bribery Commissioners [3775]

York, Archbishop of
Church of England in the Colonies, Address for Papers, [185] 395
Clerical Vestments, [187] 76
Increase of the Episcopate, 3R. [188] 247
Ritualism—The Royal Commission, [188] 243

Yorke, Mr. J. R., *Tewkesbury*
Lancaster Borough, Res. [186] 994
Metropolis—Hyde Park, [187] 7
Representation of the People, 2R. [186] 522; Comm. 1282; *cl.* 9, [187] 1527

Young, Mr., Agricultural and Historical Poet, Pension to
Observations, Mr. O'Reilly; Reply, Mr. Hunt *Mar* 22, [186] 428; long discussion thereon; Explanation, Lord Dufferin *Mar* 25, 454; Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 9, [187] 256

Young, Mr. R., *Cambridgeshire*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. [187] 196
Municipal Corporations Charities, 2R. [187] 208

Zanzibar, Slave Trade in
Question, Mr. Gilpin; Answer, Lord Stanley *August* 8, [189] 1106

ERRATA.

In Volume [185] p. 477, line 27, *for* formed *read* favoured.

In Volume [186] p. 214, line 36 (Mr. Leatham), *for* "and how they had recorded" *read* "and the way they subsequently recorded their votes for the hon. Member for Stamford when he came forward at Wakefield, is a proof they were Conservatives."

In Volume [187] p. 1176, line 13, *for* Clause 4, *read* Clause 5.

In Volume [188] p. 497, line 6 from bottom, *for* carefully in the will, *read* carefully read the will.

In Volume [188] pp. 1250 and 1251, *for* Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Warren), *read* Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Chatterton).

In Volume [188] p. 1262, line 22 from bottom, *for* Deus, *read* Dens.

In Volume [188] p. 1376, line 21, *for* Lord Athlumney, *read* Lord Meredyth.

In Volume [188] p. 1907, Vote 19, *for* £791, *read* £13,592.

END OF VOLUME CLXXXIX., AND FIFTH AND LAST VOLUME OF SESSION 1867.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, PRINTER, 23, PATERNOSTER ROW.

BIBL.

L 15 JAN 1968